

Summary of the eighth workshop under the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation: Taking stock of the work programme and exploring areas of commonality in developing the framework

24 October 2023

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), at its third session, decided to establish and launch a comprehensive two-year Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation (GGA work programme), to start immediately after that session and be carried out jointly by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI). It also decided that four workshops should be conducted per year under the GGA work programme, with the support of the secretariat and under the guidance of the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies.¹
2. SB 56 requested the secretariat, under the guidance of their Chairs, to prepare a summary of each workshop² in the context of preparing a single annual report on the workshops for consideration at the sessions of the SBs coinciding with the sessions of the CMA.³
3. CMA 4 welcomed the progress during the first year of the GGA work programme and requested the Chairs of the SBs to select the themes for the workshops to be held in 2023.⁴ The themes for the fifth to eighth workshops were outlined in the SB Chairs' information note published on 8 February 2023.⁵
4. SB 58 invited their Chairs to continue considering, at the remaining workshops under the GGA work programme, matters related to the development of the framework for guiding the achievement of the GGA, inter alia, the development and use of targets, indicators and metrics, global adaptation priorities, and modalities for increasing international cooperation in support of the framework, and to include in the workshops sessions for Parties to explore areas of commonality in developing the framework and taking stock of progress.⁶

B. Proceedings

5. The eighth workshop under the GGA work programme⁷ was held in hybrid format from 27 to 29 September 2023 in Gaborone, Botswana, and broadcast live on YouTube,⁸ with more than 200 registered in-person and virtual participants.
6. The workshop was opened by Nabeel Munir, Chair of the SBI, via a video message, and in person by Motlhatlosi Ditsile, Senior Manager at the Ministry of Environment, Natural

¹ Decision 7/CMA.3, paras. 2–4 and 12.

² FCCC/SBI/2022/10 para. 192

³ Decision 7/CMA.3, para. 16.

⁴ Decision 3/CMA.4, para. 20.

⁵ Available at <https://unfccc.int/documents/626532>.

⁶ FCCC/SBI/2023/10, paras. 61–62.

⁷ The concept note, agenda and presentations for the eighth workshop are available at <https://unfccc.int/event/8th-workshop-glasgow-sharm-el-sheikh-work-programme-gga>.

⁸ Available at <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLBcZ22cUY9RL6BE-vu4wCipLXokStt9IA>.

Resources Conservation and Tourism of Botswana, Balazs Horvath, representative of the United Nations Development Programme Botswana and Harry Vreuls, Chair of the SBSTA.

7. The Chair of the SBI called on participants to ensure an ambitious outcome of the GGA work programme at CMA 5, to use time effectively and constructively and to design a framework that can change the status quo and make a real difference by strengthening resilience on the ground. Mr. Ditsile welcomed the participants to Gaborone and introduced the high-level officials attending the workshop.

8. Mr. Horvath highlighted the importance of both mitigation and adaptation, and the need for a whole-of-government effort. He highlighted that Africa suffers disproportionately from climate change while contributing little to it and emphasized the importance of addressing the adaptation finance gap by increasing funding, diversifying sources, developing appropriate frameworks and channelling finance from polluting practices into climate action at the national level. He recalled developed countries' commitment to provide USD 100 billion in climate finance per year, described the twenty-eighth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) as a critical opportunity to develop a framework to accelerate action and enhance gender equality and social inclusion, and emphasized the importance of the eighth workshop under the GGA work programme in achieving this.

9. The Chair of the SBSTA welcomed the progress so far in exploring concepts and developing the GGA framework and highlighted the aims of the eighth workshop, namely to take stock of the GGA work programme and seek commonalities related to the framework. He outlined the plan for the workshop and requested participants to focus on narrowing down options for the structural elements of the framework and to identify where substantive progress is possible without yet entering into negotiations. He urged participants to reduce the number of options for the structural elements of the framework so that the SBs will be able to develop an outcome in the short time available at COP 28.

II. Summary of discussions

10. This summary report is structured to reflect the chronological flow of the eighth workshop, in particular the six main sessions. Several issues were discussed by participants across different sessions, and therefore a number of points are repeated throughout the report.

A. Taking stock of the work programme

11. The first plenary session focused on taking stock of the GGA work programme. The representative of the UNFCCC secretariat provided an overview of progress and the approach to the eighth workshop. She highlighted that there were between 200 and 400 participants at each workshop, 59 per cent of which were women and 41 per cent observers, and that the work was informed by 114 submissions from Parties and observer organizations. It was also highlighted that aside from the workshops being fully in-person and fully virtual, 45 per cent of workshop participation was in-person. The discussions in 2022 focused on exploring the key concepts related to the GGA, in particular the goal itself, as well as relevant actions, methods, data, indicators and metrics. Following the mandate from CMA 4 27, the discussions in 2023 were concentrated on the design of the GGA framework, in particular potential targets, interfaces with other processes and the structural elements of the framework. She also highlighted the aims of the eighth workshop, which were to:

- (a) Take stock of the GGA work programme;
- (b) Further consider the structural elements of the framework;
- (c) Discuss the COP 28 outcome, next steps and follow-up work.

12. The Chair of the SBSTA then requested participants to highlight any additional views that had not yet been captured in the working materials, and to elaborate on how the eighth workshop could help to identify commonalities towards the outcome at COP 28.

13. Some participants provided wider reflections on the GGA work programme and the workshops that have taken place. It was noted that having in-person workshops with a hybrid

component provided participants with the opportunity to fully interact and engage throughout.

14. In the discussion, it was highlighted that the GGA framework should focus on, inter alia, people, livelihoods and ecosystems; drive efficient adaptation action; elevate adaptation; help minimize impacts and maladaptation; signal what is needed to accelerate adaptation on the basis of national plans; and enhance the ability to track progress while avoiding reporting burdens.

15. In terms of targets, participants called for a consideration of targets and how they fit in the GGA framework. It was highlighted, inter alia, that targets are the basis for tracking progress on action and support and for informing the global stocktake (GST), that they should be time-bound and quantified, and be considered in the context of the themes, dimensions and indicators under the GGA framework.

16. The issues of means of implementation and enabling factors were highlighted as further key aspects of the GGA framework and it was emphasized, in particular, that finance, technology and capacity-building support were essential for the implementation of the actions under the framework and should be applied across the entire framework. It was also highlighted that means of implementation and enabling factors are different concepts that are not mutually exclusive, but that some participants consider means of implementation to be a part of wider enabling conditions.

17. Several participants noted the importance of defining further work and/or next steps to enable implementation of the GGA framework, and it was suggested that such work could focus, inter alia, on the development of indicators through an expert process and on the review of the GGA framework. Others highlighted the importance of having a framework that can be operational and functional as soon as Parties leave COP 28, and that further work should be limited.

B. Session 1: Targets/priorities/political messages for the framework for the global goal on adaptation in relation to dimensions, themes and cross-cutting considerations

18. In this session, a distinction was made between overarching targets, priorities and messages on the one hand, and targets that are based around the framework dimensions or themes on the other. On the basis of the clustering of targets at the seventh workshop, reflected in the summary report on that workshop,⁹ participants were first asked to streamline the targets under each step of the adaptation policy cycle – also referred to as dimensions.

19. Across the breakout groups, participants discussed the targets, in particular from three complementary perspectives:

- (a) General aspects that relate to all targets;
- (b) The specific components of the targets to be defined under the GGA framework in terms of overarching targets and/or political messages, targets for the different steps of the adaptation policy cycle, and thematic targets on the basis of the list of targets compiled after the seventh workshop;
- (c) Further suggestions for targets.

1. General considerations on targets

20. When discussing targets, participants highlighted, in particular, that the targets should:

- (a) Be a means to an end, not ends in themselves, their main purpose being to provide more tangible direction, help measure efforts, enable improvements and/or complement or elaborate on Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Paris Agreement, and be a catalyst

⁹ See the summary report on the seventh workshop under the GGA work programme, pp. 6–7. Available at: <https://unfccc.int/documents/631606>

towards increased implementation of adaptation actions and, subsequently, increased resilience;

(b) Be applicable to all countries , global , measurable , climate-risk- and adaptation-specific and/or linked with the temperature goals of the Paris Agreement ;

(c) Avoid additional burdens, prescriptiveness, duplication of existing processes and excessive methodological work;

(d) Be articulated, in particular, around the steps of the adaptation policy cycle;

(e) Reflect lessons from other regimes, while bearing in mind that framework targets must reflect the specificities of climate impacts, adaptation and the UNFCCC process.

2. Components of the targets under the GGA framework

21. More specifically, participants discussed the components of overarching targets and/or political messages, targets related to the steps of the adaptation policy cycle and thematic targets.

(a) Overarching targets and/or political messages

22. There was convergence among the participants towards the inclusion of an ‘overarching layer’ in the GGA and its framework; however, there was divergence as to what form this would take, with some participants proposing a target, whereas others suggested that it should be in the form of a political message(s), priorities or signals. With regard to overarching targets, participants saw them, in particular, as an opportunity to provide a more holistic vision, to link the GGA with specific targets and to help policymakers communicate and internalize the framework. It was suggested that overarching targets should be climate-risk-specific, linked with mitigation targets and be global, but not be imposed on Parties. Several suggestions were made for the components of such targets, including:

(a) Specific aspects of adaptation action, including access to climate services, early warning systems, monitoring and evaluation, transformational adaptation, co-benefits, and science-based adaptation measures;

(b) Considerations of justice and equity, including climate justice, human rights, intergenerational equity and inclusion, gender perspectives and stakeholder engagement;

(c) Aspects of support, including the notion of doubling adaptation finance;

(d) Thematic areas: although these were discussed in greater detail later in the workshop (see chap. II.D.5 below), there was also a discussion during session 1 on targets linked to themes, as well as using themes as a basis for political messages within the ‘overarching layer’. Participants raised the importance of developing global thematic targets to link the GGA framework with people, ecosystems and sectors , and it was suggested that any adaptation plans should relate to sectors such as water and food. Some highlighted that while themes tend to be country-specific (e.g. the theme of oceans may not be applicable to landlocked countries), they are also universal . Others highlighted challenges related to, inter alia, how thematic targets would be considered at the global level owing to the different contexts of Parties, the availability of data in relation to the different themes, and how thematic targets for the GGA would differ from those under the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

23. It was also suggested that overarching targets and/or political messages could be linked to the long-term global temperature goal, operationalized through targets around the adaptation policy cycle and complemented by thematic targets.

(b) Targets related to the steps of the adaptation policy cycle

24. Participants discussed the proposed targets based on the steps of the adaptation policy cycle. There were divergent views on whether or not there should be targets for each step of the cycle, as well as on the number of targets for each step (e.g. one–two per stage, versus no limit on the number).

25. On targets for the assessment of impacts, risks and vulnerability, the three main areas of commonality were related to the notion that all countries should have in place early warning systems, climate information services and data, and risk assessments, with the goal of reducing exposure by a certain time frame (options ranged from 2027 to 2030). There was also a suggestion to reflect action and support for these processes within the GGA framework, while others would prefer considering questions of support outside of the framework. Yet others noted the methodological challenges of measuring climate impacts and exposure, especially in the short term and without clear baselines. It was suggested that assessment-related targets that defined for the GGA framework would benefit from methodological inputs and guidance from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and/or other scientific sources, while it was noted that such work would need to consider the different mandates from these processes.

26. On planning, participants suggested a range of common elements that could be included in planning-related targets, including the formulation of national adaptation plans (NAPs) or other planning instruments by all countries, and/or having the capacity to formulate them. In this context, participants also highlighted climate information systems and the process of mainstreaming adaptation into other policy elements. Other points raised by participants included the link to means of implementation to ensure that these planning instruments are implemented and make a difference on the ground, as well as the importance of inclusivity and transparency. Others would prefer not to consider means of implementation in the form of targets in this context. Participants also suggested targets for age and gender using disaggregated data, as well as for child-responsive planning, and highlighted the importance of ensuring the free, prior and informed consent of local communities and Indigenous Peoples for plans.

27. On implementation, a number of considerations were noted by participants. It was suggested that targets could relate, inter alia, to the implementation of NAPs and other planning instruments, and/or to the number of implemented projects or actions in response to climate impacts by a certain time frame (with 2030 being a common suggestion). Participants also proposed that implementation targets should relate to both action and support, and be linked with enabling factors and/or means of implementation within the GGA framework. Others highlighted the limitations of simply counting the number of projects implemented and the disadvantages of this, for example for small island developing States. In order to help with the challenges of measuring progress, participants highlighted the importance of outcome-oriented targets and suggested identifying, for example, qualitative outcome indicators or proxy indicators for this set of targets.

28. Participants also highlighted the key role of monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) in enhancing actions and assessing implementation. For targets, participants suggested in particular the aspiration that all Parties have designed and implemented MEL frameworks, and that developing countries have been able to access funds to do so. Participants also discussed how MEL links to each other stage of the adaptation cycle, how capacities should continually increase, and that consideration needs to be given to different levels of action (local, national, regional), access to data, and cooperation, education and participation.

(c) New suggestions for targets

29. Participants also shared numerous updated targets that have been included in submissions following the seventh workshop. These include quantitative targets for each dimension, as well as targets that are not specifically based on each dimension, but that use the dimensions as their basis. Several questions that overlapped across the different dimensions included the notion that targets should be time-bound, uncertainty regarding baselines, the need for adequate support to achieve targets, and queries over methodologies for assessing progress on the targets. Participants welcomed the opportunity to have these discussions, learn from one another and work towards finding areas of convergence.

30. Several participants shared or highlighted new targets, reflected in the table below. Table 1 contains additional targets compared with those outlined at the seventh workshop, which are reflected in the related summary report.¹⁰

New suggestions for targets

<i>Overarching/dimension/ theme/structural element</i>	<i>Target</i>
Overarching target/priorities/ political message	<p>Protect people, livelihoods and ecosystems by promoting an accelerated implementation of adaptation actions and by providing adequate, long-term, scaled-up, predictable, new and additional finance, technology and capacity-building to developing countries to achieve the GGA established in Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Paris Agreement.</p> <p>Enhance the adaptive capacity and resilience of the global population, including the reduction of climate impacts by at least 50 per cent by 2030 and by at least 90 per cent by 2050 compared to the ‘business as usual’ scenario and expected impacts identified by scientific reports.</p>
Impact, vulnerability and risk assessment	<p>By 2030, all countries have effectively conducted climate assessments for national adaptation planning have in place multi-hazard early warning systems covering 100 per cent of people, and developing countries accessed adequate finance to develop such assessments and systems through the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism.</p> <p>Reduce the climate-related impacts on people, the economy and biophysical environment (human, economic and non-economic impacts) by at least 50 per cent% in 2030, and by at least 90 per cent in 2050.</p>
Adaptation planning	<p>By 2030, all countries have national adaptation strategies, plans or policy instruments in place covering the diversity of ecosystems and sectors, adaptation has been mainstreamed into all relevant strategies and plans, and developing countries have effectively accessed climate financing through the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism for the preparation of NAPs.</p> <p>Achieve 100 per cent coverage of multi-hazard early warning systems and climate information services and response systems by 2027 and ensure all developing countries have been supported to have comprehensive, implementable and effective adaptation plans, policies and strategies, taking into account the GGA framework.</p>
Adaptation implementation	<p>By 2030 the number of projects, plans, programmes and adaptation actions in response to climate risks identified by developing countries in adaptation-related documents has been incremented in X per cent [baseline], all the vulnerable communities identified by countries and the diversity of ecosystems and sectors are covered, and developing countries have accessed funds from the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism for their NAP implementation.</p> <p>Accelerate implementation of adaptation action and support to close the adaptation gap by 2030 in line with reduction of climate impacts of at least 50 per cent by 2030 and at least 90 per cent by 2050.</p>
MEL	<p>By 2030, all countries have designed/set up/improved and/or are implementing MEL processes or systems in light of climate risks, and developing countries have accessed finance to develop such processes or systems through the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism.</p>

¹⁰ See <https://unfccc.int/documents/631606>.

	By 2030, all developing countries have been supported to design and implement MEL systems for assessing potential impacts and vulnerabilities and for tracking adaptation outcomes.
	100 per cent of people covered by a national adaptation policy instrument, which includes MEL.
	All countries have mechanisms in place to monitor, evaluate and learn from the implementation of their planning instrument.
Enabling conditions	Enhanced enabling conditions (leadership, institutional frameworks, policies, knowledge, financial resources, monitoring and evaluation, and governance) supporting adaptation plans and policies.
Early warning systems	100 per cent of people protected by early warning systems.
Health	Achieve universal coverage for addressing climate impacts by 2030 and reduce global climate-related mortality by 100 per cent and morbidity by 50 per cent by 2035–2040.
Ecosystems and biodiversity	By 2030, increase the resilience and adaptive capacity of biodiversity and ecosystem services, including through protecting at least 50 per cent of land, freshwater, marine and coastal ecosystems against climate impacts, and enhancing other ecosystem services.
Poverty and livelihoods	Reduce climate impacts on livelihoods and economic sectors by 50 per cent in 2030 and 100 per cent by 2050, including through social protection and economic resilience interventions.
Food and agriculture	Reduce adverse climate impacts on agricultural production and productivity by 50 per cent in 2030 and 100 per cent by 2050 and ensure food security and improved nutrition for all.
Cities, settlements and agriculture	Reduce people and infrastructure vulnerable to climate impacts by 50 per cent in 2030 and 100 per cent by 2050, whilst increasing development of climate-resilient urban and rural infrastructure.
Water	By 2030, achieve universal access to potable water, reduce climate-induced water scarcity for domestic, industrial and ecological purposes, through enhancing drought management, flood protection and climate-resilient infrastructure development.
Tangible cultural heritage	By 2050, protect all significant tangible heritage sites and cultural heritage from climate change impacts through infrastructure development that promote climate-resilient development to conserve tangible and intangible cultural heritage.
Mountain regions	Promote climate-resilient development through policies that reduce the vulnerability of mountain populations, ecosystems and protect threatened biodiversity and ecosystems from increased warming.

C. Session 2: Means of implementation and enabling conditions

31. Session 2 of the workshop considered means of implementation and/or enabling conditions/factors, and how they should be reflected in the GGA framework. The session began with a brief plenary discussion, during which participants highlighted their overall views on questions related to means of implementation, emphasizing, in particular, the following points:

(a) While there was a common view that both means of implementation and enabling conditions/factors have a role in the context of the GGA framework, some emphasized the importance of direct integration of means of implementation into the GGA framework, while others considered them part of several enabling factors that support the activities taking place within the framework;

(b) The differences between means of implementation and enabling conditions were emphasized, with several participants highlighting the importance of not using the terms interchangeably, not discussing them jointly and not replacing one with the other. It was also emphasized that while the concepts are different, they are also interlinked, and that some consider means of implementation as part of a wider set of enabling conditions;

(c) Some participants also suggested specific targets in relation to means of implementation, including in the form of outcome-based overarching targets (such as USD 400 billion in grants-based finance for adaptation per year by 2030), the provision of means of implementation for meeting other targets under the framework, as well as indicators to measure the provision of support to developing countries and the ways in which support enhances actions. Targets and indicators related to enabling conditions were also suggested; however, some participants highlighted that although they take note of means of implementation as an important issue, they do not see targets relating to means of implementation as being part of the GGA framework, and that they should be reflected in other ways;

(d) The linkages with other ongoing discussions were also highlighted, including the suggestion that the GGA work should consider linkages with agenda items related to finance, technology and capacity-building, in particular by ensuring coherence with the work towards the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) and consistency with Article 9 of the Paris Agreement. In this context, the importance of ensuring that at least 50 per cent of climate finance is allocated to adaptation was emphasized. Some participants noted, however, that the finance issues are already being considered in their respective negotiations, and that the distinction between those issues and the GGA should be maintained.

32. The plenary discussion was followed by four breakout groups, which were requested to focus on how means of implementation and enabling factors should be considered in the context of the GGA framework. While the groups worked independently, they focused in particular on three key issues: enhancing clarity about the conceptual understandings of means of implementation and enabling conditions, the role of means of implementation and/or enabling conditions for the GGA framework, and linkages with other relevant discussions and negotiations.

1. Understanding means of implementation and enabling conditions/factors

33. The session started with a discussion on whether means of implementation and enabling conditions/factors should be considered separate elements and reflected as such, or whether means of implementation should be seen as part of broader enabling conditions. In this regard, it was suggested that enabling conditions could be understood as non-prescriptive internal arrangements within countries (such as governance, policies, mainstreaming, institutions, data, climate information and education) that are crucial to the effective implementation of adaptation and the GGA framework, while means of implementation were considered to be a tangible and direct part of the existing obligations of developed countries under the Convention and the Paris Agreement to provide finance, technology and capacity-building support to developing countries. Participants also emphasized that means of implementation are not limited to finance but also encompass technology and capacity-building

34. Several participants raised concerns about the “or” in the SB 58 conclusions¹¹, noting that means of implementation and enabling conditions/factors should not be used interchangeably, should not be seen as an either/or choice (given that both are important for the implementation the GGA framework), and that enabling conditions cannot replace, or be a condition for, means of implementation. In this context, it was suggested that enabling conditions/factors may instead act as a stimulus for support, but also that without means of implementation, developing countries cannot establish enabling conditions/factors.

¹¹ FCCC/SBI/2023/10, para. 64. (d)(v)

2. Role of means of implementation and enabling conditions/factors in the framework for the global goal on adaptation

35. Several participants raised concerns that insufficient consideration of means of implementation as a stand-alone element of the GGA framework without clear links to the other elements of the framework would result in “an empty framework”, leaving Parties without the tools to achieve the GGA, with developing countries, in particular, losing out. Thus, it was suggested that means of implementation should be mainstreamed across the framework elements, possibly in the form of political messages, and/or that targets around the adaptation policy cycle should include provisions for means implementation. Other participants emphasized that they did not wish to “water down” means of implementation within the framework, but that discussions on enabling conditions should not focus solely on finance and that both should be part of a wider implementation package to operationalize the framework that will lead to positive impacts.

36. This conversation further advanced into how means of implementation should be captured in, or be complementary to, the GGA framework. Some considered means of implementation to be an integral part of the framework, while others suggested that they should be captured in a decision text accompanying the framework. It was also proposed to first agree on the overall design of the GGA framework and then decide on the consideration of means of implementation. Another perspective was that the consideration of means of implementation and enabling conditions should be determined in textual negotiations, rather than in a conceptual discussion.

37. More specifically, it was suggested that means of implementation could be reflected across the targets for each dimension of the adaptation policy cycle. The same was also suggested for enabling conditions/factors. However, others were of the view that the GGA framework should not include targets related to means of implementation. A further proposal was to draw inspiration from targets under other frameworks, including Agenda 21, the Sendai Framework, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the SDGs, though it was also emphasized that many other frameworks do not involve new and additional financial resources, and are thus difficult to apply in the UNFCCC context.

38. More specifically, participants made several proposals for targets related to means of implementation. Some suggested articulating an overarching target or a high-level political message which could reflect, for example, a specific time frame for delivery of support, as well as the importance of parity between mitigation and adaptation and grant-based finance. One group of participants presented the following target:

By 2030, achieve funding of at least 80 per cent of expressed needs by developing countries, within their nationally determined contributions, NAPs, or other nationally identified programmes and projects, with the quantum of adaptation finance reaching at least USD 400 billion per annum by 2030, and achieving 50 per cent adaptation finance of the total share of the total flows of finance to developing countries.

39. Some participants raised questions in relation to this target proposal and discussed the methodological challenges, including how to calculate the expressed needs and whether the target should be nationally determined or elevated to a global level. Participants also asked about the background of the USD 400 billion figure and the rationale for the 80 per cent target. The proponents explained that the proposal draws on existing literature, such as the United Nations Environment Programme Adaptation Gap Report¹² and recent peer-reviewed publications on adaptation finance, which all present figures in the region of USD 400 billion, and that the 80 per cent target was chosen to address the most urgent needs.

40. Participants also discussed how the GGA may potentially link to or inform the NCQG. They recognized that there was a link but that the nature of this link produced divergence. Some considered this link to be part of Article 9 of the Paris Agreement, whereas others considered that the GGA is related to Article 7 and although the importance of a balance of finance between mitigation and adaptation is reflected in Article 9, this is at a global level, and the proportions may differ regionally. It was suggested that means of implementation should be directed at areas where Parties have identified barriers and gaps in their adaptation

¹² Available at: <https://www.unep.org/resources/adaptation-gap-report-2022>

communications. Furthermore, it was proposed that the GGA could inform the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF), which could calculate adaptation needs for developing countries at each stage of the adaptation cycle and which would, in turn, be used to inform the NCQG in 2025. Others raised questions about the methodologies for calculating adaptation needs in this way, the availability of the necessary data and information, and the extent to which adaptation negotiators can influence the discussions on finance. It was also emphasized that the GGA framework should focus on adaptation action, while the NCQG could serve as its finance arm to support implementation.

D. Sessions 3 to 5: Development of the framework for the global goal on adaptation

41. During these sessions, participants began by clarifying how the outcome of the GGA and its framework would be presented in a final CMA decision. There was a general consensus that there would be a CMA decision text on the GGA containing a section with the structural elements of the framework. Participants then elaborated on the structural elements captured at SB 58¹³, as well as some additional elements they considered important.

42. Participants discussed in detail which structural elements should be captured in the framework sections, and which should be captured in other parts of the decision. It was suggested that the decision should conclude the GGA work programme, provide reflections on the results of the work and capture future work steps. Some participants suggested that parts of the information may be included in an annex to the decision or that the framework could be visualized using a diagram; however, these were not elaborated in detail. Others were asked to draw their proposed framework and/or decision text outline on paper and then share it with their group. This exercise helped to visualize how different elements of the framework fit together, and how the framework links with the other areas of the decision text, such as the preamble.

1. Preamble

43. Within the various framework proposals shared there was a range of commonalities, building on the structural elements set out in the SB 58 conclusions. A range of participants had included sections for the preamble, purpose and principles, and it was suggested that the preamble could contain, for example, the overarching considerations. Participants also highlighted the importance of including an articulation of the purpose of the framework, building on Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Paris Agreement and paragraph 9 of decision 3/CMA.4. In terms of specific purposes, participants highlighted, in particular, the objectives of enhancing action and support, providing guidance to the GST, promoting transformational adaptation, enhancing understanding of needs and gaps, and coordinating adaptation reporting while avoiding maladaptation and additional burdens.

44. It was suggested that a section on principles should be included to guide the operationalization of the framework. One group noted that these should be part of the ‘overarching layer’, although there was some discussion on whether they should be included in a separate section within the decision text. It was proposed that the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capacities should be included, and that the notions that the framework should be nationally determined and consider national circumstances should be emphasized.

2. Overarching targets or high-level targets, priorities and/or messages

45. Following the discussions on the structure of the framework, participants were asked to consider the substantive content of the ‘overarching layer’. There was broad support for including an ‘overarching layer’ within the framework, which for some encompasses a quantitative or high-level target(s), and for others would be best expressed in the form of priorities, signals or political messages. Proponents of overarching targets suggested that such targets would drive ambition for the GGA to move beyond abstract statements on

¹³ FCCC/SBI/2023/10, para. 64.

adaptive capacity, and that quantifiable targets would be necessary for measuring progress. Others considered that global overarching targets would be too general to help achieve adaptation goals and might have unintended consequences, and emphasized that any overarching considerations should be global, climate-focused, adaptation-specific and linked to national circumstances. It was also suggested that messages could be a vehicle to further communicate adaptation at a global level and suggested qualitative messages to that end.

46. More specifically, multiple groups and Parties have made proposals via submissions, upon which they elaborated. In one group, the discussion started with the proposals for overarching targets, priorities and political messages based around well-being, noting that the GGA should not just facilitate survival, but should instead stimulate ambition to improve lives. This further linked to the suggestion for reduced impacts to be included in the ‘overarching layer’, and that any targets should be outcome-oriented and used as a means to achieve the intended outcomes.

47. Several participants suggested that the overarching targets, priorities or political messages or signals should contain references to transformational adaptation and climate-resilient development, which would align with raising ambition of the GGA. While recognizing the merits of transformational adaptation, others highlighted that references to incremental adaptation should also be included, and that the framework should not discriminate against any one type of adaptation action owing to the different circumstances of countries. Participants also discussed specific formulations, with one participant noting that “well-being” is not mentioned in the Paris Agreement. Another participant responded that although the Paris Agreement can guide the GGA, it should not limit what the GGA can strive to achieve.

48. It was also suggested that the overarching targets/priorities/political messages/signals should reflect the notion of mainstreaming adaptation into other policies and policy areas, which would also contribute to greater ambition and stronger impact of the GGA. One participant noted that an overarching message should not try to replicate the SDGs, but should complement and contribute to them, and that although the framework should be ambitious, Parties should consider the complexities and therefore ensure that it is realistic.

49. As noted above, some participants suggested that the overarching targets, messages or priorities should include scaling up support for adaptation for developing countries. Some suggested specific quantitative targets for adaptation finance, whereas others proposed messages that signal the need to provide adequate, long-term, scaled-up, predictable, new and additional finance, technology and capacity-building. Clarification was sought on how finance-related targets would link to expressed needs, and what methodologies would enable assessment of this. It was suggested that countries can self-report their needs via adaptation communications, and that academic research and literature exists on this issue.

50. Further to the discussion on the ‘overarching layer’ and the different proposals for targets, participants further elaborated on their ideas around indicators for different targets. Some suggested that overarching targets or messages should not have indicators, and that indicators should be developed for dimension-related or thematic targets. Others noted the challenges already faced by many Parties in relation to national reporting, and that developing new indicators would add to these difficulties and make implementation of the framework more complex. In terms of next steps, it was suggested, for example, to keep a placeholder for indicators at this point, and/or to first agree on targets around the adaptation policy cycle and then consider possible indicators.

51. Some highlighted that the GGA framework can learn from other processes. For example, the Sendai Framework has an ‘overarching layer’ that is rather ‘political’, had four additional targets to which a further three were added, and that the process for developing indicators took a number of years and was overseen by the secretariat of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction.

52. On the final day of the workshop, the SBSTA Chair requested participants try to come up with three key areas to be included within the ‘overarching layer’. Although none of the breakout groups were able to agree on three, several suggestions and ideas were common throughout, including: enhanced well-being (some proposed that this should be focused on people, poverty, livelihoods, communities, food, water, health, ecosystems and

infrastructure), scaling up support, accelerating action, reducing impacts and risks (aligned with Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Paris Agreement), mainstreaming adaptation, the importance of means of implementation, the importance of transformational adaptation while recognizing incremental adaptation, and avoiding maladaptation.

3. Specific targets

53. Further commonalities emerged in the context of specific targets, with convergence on the notion of defining specific targets for the framework around the adaptation policy cycle, and it was emphasized that such targets should be captured as part of the framework itself. Participants suggested outlining outcome-oriented targets, and it was emphasized that targets related to the adaptation policy cycle should not become too process-focused. Furthermore, there were several questions about the process to develop targets, including whether targets should be defined internationally or nationally, as well as about the expertise required. Chapter II.B above contains further information on the discussion dedicated to targets, while chapter II.E below outlines the proposals for further work.

4. Cross-cutting considerations

54. Participants also briefly considered the cross-cutting considerations, highlighting their key role in guiding implementation and discussing whether specific targets should be defined in relation to each of them or whether they are best captured as enablers of action under the framework.

5. Themes

55. It was also suggested that capturing themes or thematic areas within targets can reflect areas that are relevant for all Parties, given that core themes are globally applicable. It was also proposed that thematic targets can help bridge gaps between the national and global level, provide a better basis for reflecting outcomes, capture transboundary aspects and ensure an ambitious and comprehensive GGA outcome by linking thematic targets or messages to reducing impacts. It was emphasized that thematic targets are already being developed by organizations and that the GGA framework is an opportunity to lead that work. The potential themes proposed for targets were water, nature and ecosystems, oceans, transboundary aspects, sustainable societies, reduced damage, economy, society, well-being, communities, economies, food, health and infrastructure.

56. There were divergent views on how to reflect themes. Some consider themes reflected as part of the ‘overarching layer’ and on a global scale. For example, one group reiterated its overarching targets, in which “enhanced well-being and prosperity” and “ecosystems maintained, enhanced or restored” would incorporate five thematic priority areas, namely, food security, water, health, ecosystems and infrastructure. Another group also suggested that each theme reflected in decision 3/CMA.4 should have its own specific targets to be included in the outcome at CMA 5. Others suggested reflecting themes across the GGA framework rather than as stand-alone components, and that as each country implements the framework at the national level, they can do so on the basis of the themes that are relevant for them and report accordingly, thus ensuring that the consideration of themes is consistent with national circumstances. Yet others were of the view that thematic targets are already adequately captured under other international regimes, though it was acknowledged that references to themes could help the framework contribute to sustainable development by orienting the choice of national adaptation priorities.

6. Means of implementation and enabling factors

57. Although the majority of the framework and decision text proposals included references to means of implementation and enabling conditions, there was divergence on how this would be placed within the decision text or framework. Some consider means of implementation as relevant across the whole framework and would like to see them reflected accordingly, including in the context of overarching targets, targets for the adaptation policy cycle, and reporting. It was also emphasized that implementation of the entire framework requires means of implementation. Others considered means of implementation as a process

that is separate from the framework, which can support it but should be captured outside of it.

58. The role of stakeholders as an enabling factor was also emphasized, given their central role in the implementation of the framework by generating data and information, increasing awareness and providing technical solutions. It was therefore suggested that, as key enablers, their centrality should be captured in the framework itself. Others suggested that their role could be captured in a decision text, reflecting the provisions of Article 7, paragraph 6, of the Paris Agreement. The role of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and rural women was emphasized in this regard. In this context, it was also highlighted that further clarity would be needed about the definition of stakeholders and their specific roles.

59. Means of implementation and enabling factors were discussed in greater detail in a dedicated session, which is reflected in chapter II.C above.

7. Role of the framework for the global goal on adaptation in the global stocktake

60. Participants also considered the links between the GGA framework and the GST, emphasizing the mutually supportive relationship between the two, as well as their shared information basis. It was suggested that the framework should provide, in particular, input to the forward-looking parts of the GST, that it would be important to link the time frames of the two more closely, and that the two should be linked through consideration of the mitigation goals of the Paris Agreement. In this regard, it was highlighted that increasing mitigation efforts will be a contributing factor in successful adaptation outcomes, and that there is a clear link between the level of mitigation actions and emission reductions, and the required adaptation response.

8. Sources of information

61. While there was convergence on the key role of existing information sources in the operation of the framework, participants also discussed what specific sources of information are needed to operationalize the framework and undertake the necessary reviews. It was suggested, in particular, that specific information sources should be identified as part of the framework, that information sources should be identified for each indicator determined under the framework, and that one specific source of information could be a synthesis report on information relevant to an analysis of global and national targets. Others asked what additional sources of information would be needed in the light of the large amount of information already captured in national reports and informing the GST and enquired what it would mean functionally to identify sources of information for the framework.

9. Reporting

62. In this context, participants discussed how reporting could be arranged in ways that enable an assessment of collective progress. It was emphasized that reporting is not limited to the GGA but rather informs multiple processes, including the GGA framework, but also the GST and other processes, and thus exists independently of the framework. The role of existing reporting in avoiding additional burdens was emphasized, but it was also suggested that it could be complemented with analysis and additional orientation from the GGA framework towards what information is most relevant.

63. Participants also discussed how the GGA framework should link and complement other existing frameworks and processes, specifically the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction and the SDGs. Multiple participants noted that to avoid additional reporting burdens for the GGA, these frameworks and their reporting structures should be utilized, although it was also noted that the GGA framework should not complicate matters by undertaking areas of work already covered by other frameworks. It was also highlighted that although these frameworks and processes are taking action relevant to adaptation, it may not be possible to pick and choose certain targets, indicators or data sets from these frameworks and simply include them in reporting for the GGA.

E. Session 6: Next steps and operationalization of the framework; follow-up work

64. The final session of the workshop considered the next steps and operationalization of the framework, focusing on potential follow-up work. There was a general understanding that some follow-up work will be required following the adoption of the GGA framework at CMA 5, therefore signalling a move beyond the option of “no follow-up work” that was included in the SB 58 conclusions¹⁴. It was suggested that the work should focus in particular on the development of indicators and/or address emerging scientific assessments and challenges. It was also emphasized that the framework should be comprehensive enough to ensure that any follow-up work will be time-bound and specific, rather than a continued general exchange on the GGA. There was some divergence on the precise nature of what this would entail and who would do what and by when, as this would be dependent on the outcome at CMA 5. Several participants also stressed the need to come away from CMA 5 with a flexible and clean framework, which stakeholders can begin implementing immediately.

65. The discussions and suggestions around further work were expressed within a range of tracks, each of which could interact with one another at various milestones. These were: technical work on indicators; guidance and training to operationalize the framework; exchange of knowledge; assessment of progress towards the GGA; review of the GGA framework; and a process to oversee work and for understanding linkages across Article 7, paragraph 14(a–d), of the Paris Agreement. The following paragraphs elaborate on the suggestions made during the workshop about what needs to be done, how this would be done and who would do it, as well as timelines, where they were also mentioned.

1. Technical work on indicators

66. On the topic of indicators for targets that may be agreed for the GGA, building on the discussions outlined in the paragraphs above, several participants highlighted the need for a comprehensive approach to assessing progress, and that it is vital that the global nature of the GGA is reflected in this. Proposals for follow-up work in relation to indicators were as follows:

(a) There was a range of suggestions around the establishment of an expert group or task force to develop indicators, similar to the group for the Sendai Framework made up of nominated national experts and organizations. It was suggested that a similar expert group be established for the GGA, made up of technical experts familiar with MEL systems, with possible inputs from constituted bodies such as the Adaptation Committee (AC), Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), Technology Executive Committee, SCF and Paris Committee on Capacity-building. It was proposed that this work would take two years, concluding at COP 30. One of the proponents of this approach noted that it was similar to the Transitional Committee that was established in relation to loss and damage in decision 2/CMA.4;

(b) Another suggestion was that the AC prepare a synthesis of existing indicators used in other frameworks (namely the Sendai Framework, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the SDGs), which would consider indicators that may be relevant to and could be utilized when assessing progress under the GGA. This work would be prepared by 2025, after which the AC would decide on indicator development in 2026. It was suggested that building an understanding of what already exists should be a precursor to mandating further work on this topic. Further to this, some participants noted that a paper was prepared which covers a lot of details and existing information in relation to indicators, but that more information would be required on indicators for the targets that may be agreed under the GGA;

(c) Participants discussed the methodologies for using global-level indicators, noting that Parties report on a national level and, owing to differing contexts, will report different information, which makes developing global indicators challenging. It was also

¹⁴ FCCC/SBI/2023/10, para. 64. (h)

noted that a wide array of useful information on climate impacts is available, but it may not be in the form of a quantitative indicator, and that avoiding additional burdens for developing countries has been highlighted as a priority throughout the GGA work programme thus far. Finally, some participants reiterated that indicators should specifically relate to targets that may be agreed under the GGA.

2. Guidance and training to operationalize the framework

67. A number of suggestions were made by participants in relation to guidance and training to operationalize and apply the GGA framework and its targets and indicators that may be agreed. One of these was that training materials should be produced by the AC and/or the Consultative Group of Experts on how countries are to report on the GGA. Further to this, it was suggested that potential future technical work, for example on indicators, should inform the development of guidance, and that this should be reviewed and refined by COP 32.

68. In relation to providing guidance to governments in operationalizing the framework, some participants suggested a role for constituted bodies, specifically the LEG. Although a set role was not defined, this could be an area for exploration, and Parties could consider what inputs and data can be used and analysed by the constituted bodies and how the GGA can link to other workstreams such as the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change and NAPs.

3. Exchange of knowledge

69. With regard to the exchange and enhancement of knowledge, multiple proposals were made:

(a) It was suggested that the UNFCCC secretariat should prepare a report on transformational adaptation and how it is defined and understood at different spatial scales, and how planning and implementation of such approaches can be assessed. It was suggested that this report be prepared before SB 60;

(b) One proposal was for an annual dialogue for Parties to share their experience in applying the GGA framework, which would serve as preparation for future reviews and revisions of the framework. This dialogue would include two workshops per year, and the secretariat or SB Chairs would be requested to develop a summary or report on the discussions for consideration at future sessions of the COP or the CMA.

4. Assessment of progress towards the global goal on adaptation

70. In relation to the assessment of progress towards the GGA and to feed into the GST, a range of proposals for reports by different stakeholders were made:

(a) Firstly, it was suggested by multiple participants that a synthesis report be prepared by the secretariat on the implementation of the GGA framework and progress towards the GGA, with inputs coming from a range of sources, including relevant constituted bodies. Some suggested that this be prepared annually, whereas others proposed that it should be a single report published prior to the second GST (2027). Others suggested that this report be prepared by the AC, and that it could reflect progress towards any of the targets that may be agreed for the GGA;

(b) As noted in paragraph 40 above, it was proposed that the SCF assess adaptation needs before COP 29, which would serve as input to the NCQG in 2025. However, some participants noted that this decision would not be made under the work on the GGA;

(c) One participant suggested inviting the IPCC to provide a regional assessment report on adaptive capacity gaps, challenges and needs, especially in developing countries, to withstand the risks and impacts of an increasing global temperature and climate change in the near, mid and long term;

(d) Finally, one participant recalled paragraph 21 of decision 3/CMA.4, suggesting that the IPCC be invited to consider updating its 1994 technical guidelines for assessing climate change impacts and adaptation as part of its seventh assessment cycle, as appropriate.

5. Review of the framework for the global goal on adaptation

71. Regarding the review of the framework, there is a mandate in paragraph 11 of decision 3/CMA.4 to review it prior to the second GST, although participants had questions on what exactly would be reviewed and when. Several participants suggested that the review be completed before the next GST cycle begins (between COP 30 and COP 31), which would then consider what does or does not work well. Several participants noted that the second GST will be the first opportunity for the GGA to provide a full input, and therefore the review of the framework should not take place until after it concludes. When discussing this topic, it was also suggested to review the framework periodically, but others also suggested not doing so.

6. Overseeing the future work on the global goal on adaptation

72. Finally, it was suggested that to oversee further work on the GGA and the implementation of the framework, a new standing agenda item under the SBs be established. This would enable Parties to guide the work over the coming years, and participants also noted that having an agenda item is crucial to ensure parity with mitigation under the UNFCCC process. This would be linked to progress on the framework and would provide a bridge between the technical and political level. Several participants indicated that there is no need for a new agenda item, and that the GGA framework should facilitate a streamlining of adaptation work under the UNFCCC and make it more efficient, and that it is important to consider how other workstreams such as the Nairobi work programme and NAPs can feed into this. One other proposal was to hold ministerial meetings on adaptation as a way to provide the space for and continue to elevate the topic.

73. Further to this, it was suggested that under the new agenda item, a three-year work programme would be established on understanding the linkages across Article 7, paragraph 14(a–d), of the Paris Agreement, with proponents noting that progress on adaptation is currently behind that on mitigation. It was noted by others that there are existing mandates for the AC and the LEG; however, this is in relation to Article 7, paragraph 14(c), of the Paris Agreement, acknowledging that there may be further work to consider Article 7, paragraph 14(d), on the GGA.

F. Closure of the workshop

74. At the closure of the workshop, groups of Parties thanked the host government, the SB Chairs, the moderators and the secretariat for organizing the workshop, and highlighted their priorities for concluding the work.

75. Participants reiterated their understanding of the purposes of the framework, including that it should operationalize the GGA, enhance action and support, guide implementation, help measure progress, enable transformational adaptation while recognizing incremental adaptation, help avoid maladaptation, and create a balance between mitigation and adaptation.

76. In terms of the guiding principles of the framework, the importance of adhering to the principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capacities was highlighted, and it was emphasized that the framework must be inclusive of all national approaches (e.g. not limited to transformational or incremental adaptation). It was also suggested that the framework be connected with global mitigation efforts, in particular through the +1.5 °C target, while others questioned the feasibility of such links.

77. In terms of further attributes of the framework, it was highlighted that the framework must be applicable to all countries without differentiation. However, it was also emphasized that the universality of the framework does not erase historical responsibility, the need for differentiation and existing obligations. The importance of methodological feasibility was also highlighted.

78. In terms of targets, it was suggested that targets should:

- (a) Be defined for each step of the adaptation policy cycle;

- (b) Be quantified, time-bound and measurable;
- (c) Informed by existing processes, but also fit into the UNFCCC context;
- (d) Cover themes such as food security, health, ecosystems and infrastructure;
- (e) Not be defined in an excessively top-down manner.

79. Several participants highlighted the importance of capturing means of implementation in the framework, as they were understood as being fundamental for implementation of adaptation, as well as for equity and effectiveness of the framework. It was suggested that means of implementation could be captured in the context of principles, overarching and specific targets, the adaptation policy cycle, and political messages, as well as by linking them with the negotiations on the NCQG and/or with Article 9, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement. The importance of separate treatment of enabling factors and means of implementation was emphasized. In this context, it was also suggested that, instead of financial targets, work should aim to identify which adaptation priority areas can best attract private sector investment.

80. Participants also reiterated their preferences for future work, including the suggestions for a stand-alone and independent SB agenda item on the GGA, for an expert process to develop metrics, indicators, methods and/or other related guidelines, and for considering how UNFCCC constituted bodies can be leveraged to support the implementation of the framework.

81. The workshop was closed by remarks by Motlhatlosi Ditsile and Harry Vreuls, Chair of the SBSTA, who thanked the participants for their constructive work and provided words of encouragement towards a successful outcome of the GGA work programme at COP 28.
