

Concept note by the Chairs of the Subsidiary Bodies on the third workshop under the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation

17–18 October 2022

“Methodologies, indicators, data and metrics, monitoring and evaluation”

I. Introduction

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) decided, at its third session, 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 CMA 3 and be carried out jointly by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) (decision 7/CMA.3).¹ The CMA further decided that four workshops should be conducted per year, with the support of the secretariat and under the guidance of the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies (SBs).
2. At SB 56 (June 2022), the SBs took note of the sequence and themes of the workshops under the work programme outlined in the compilation and synthesis of submissions on the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme,² and that the themes and areas of work could require further elaboration as the process progresses. The SBSTA and the SBI invited Parties and observers to submit via the submission portal views on the subsequent workshops, including on general considerations, the topics for discussion under the themes identified in the compilation and synthesis of submissions, areas of work, expected outcomes, examples, case studies and modalities, for each workshop to be conducted in 2022, at least three weeks in advance of the workshop.
3. The SBSTA and the SBI also requested their Chairs, with the support of the secretariat, to make available a concept note and guiding questions relating to the theme and areas of work of each workshop, well in advance of the workshop, on the basis of the submissions referred to in paragraph 2 above.
4. The first workshop under the work programme took place on 8–9 June 2022 on the theme of ‘Enhancing understanding of the global goal on adaptation and reviewing progress towards it’. The second workshop on the theme ‘Enhancing adaptation action and support’ took place on 30–31 August 2022.
5. The third workshop under the GGA work programme will take place on 17–18 October 2022 in hybrid format, with the in-person element taking place in Cairo, Egypt. The theme of the third workshop is ‘Methodologies, indicators, data and metrics, monitoring and evaluation’, and builds upon the themes of the first and second workshops to achieve the objectives of the work programme as outlined at CMA.3.
6. As of 9 October 2022, a total of 20 submissions from Groups of Parties, Parties and observers have been made on the third workshop. Nine submissions were received from Parties (European Union, Australia, Japan, Canada, Colombia on behalf of the Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean group of countries³ and ABU (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay), Antigua and Barbuda on behalf of Alliance of Small Island States, Saudi Arabia on behalf of the Like Minded Developing Countries, Pakistan on behalf of G77 & China, and Zambia on behalf of Africa Group). 11 submissions were received from observers (Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI), Stockholm Environment Institute on behalf of the Adaptation Without Borders global partnership,

¹ <https://unfccc.int/documents/460952>.

² [FCCC/SB/2022/L:7](https://unfccc.int/documents/460952).

³ Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Honduras, Guatemala, Panama, Paraguay and Peru

World Resources Institute, International Union for Conservation of Nature, Rome-based Agencies of the United Nations (World Food Programme (WFP), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)), UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR), United Nations University Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS), World Health Organization (WHO), World Meteorological Organization (WMO), UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) on behalf of the Local Climate Adaptive Living (LoCAL) Facility, and the United Nations Environment Programme(UNEP)).⁴ This concept note summarizes the submissions and lays out the approach and agenda for the second workshop.

7. The outcomes of the third workshop will contribute towards the fourth workshop (5 November 2022), on ‘Communicating and reporting on adaptation priorities’.

II. Overview of Submissions

A. Themes and topics

8. Throughout the submissions, a range of themes emerged which Parties and observers suggested should frame the discussions and breakout groups in the workshop. These were, specifically: the differing scales of goals and indicators (global, regional, national and local levels), building on existing targets and indicators and the need for establishing new indicators and metrics, linkages with the global stocktake, metrics for measuring progress on adaptation support, strengthening monitoring and evaluation, using both quantitative and qualitative approaches to review progress toward the goal, and approaches to target setting.

Global, regional and national adaptation targets and indicators relevant to GGA

9. Many submissions highlighted that global level indicators, such as those under the sustainable development goals (SDGs), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Sendai framework, provide a good starting point for monitoring progress under the GGA. However, several submissions noted that when recognising varying geographies and contexts faced by Parties, a single, global set of indicators and methodologies is not fit for purpose for evaluating adaptation efforts, and therefore a ‘basket of approaches’ that reflect national circumstances is required.

10. Multiple submissions highlighted the importance of establishing areas of commonality across regions and sharing best practices, even where there are geographical and contextual differences. Reviewing adaptation progress at both national and global levels can inform Parties’ own national efforts. Several Parties highlighted in their submissions the actions they are undertaking at national level, including Japan’s PDCA cycle (plan, do, check, act) which uses sector-specific review processes to feed into its national climate action plan.

11. Due to the varying contexts mentioned, Parties noted that indicators, data and metrics should reflect regional and national circumstances, and should be administered at national level. This could then feed into a global aggregation process. It is also critical that the needs and circumstances of local and indigenous peoples be considered, and that they are represented in this workshop and the wider GGA process. Finally, some submissions identified the need to ensure that adaptation actions are aligned with principles of just resilience, and that the needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups are.

Building upon existing indicators and developing new indicators and metrics

12. A large number of submissions highlighted the secretariat’s compilation and synthesis of indicators, approaches, targets and metrics paper, as well as the 2021 Adaptation Committee Technical Paper on ‘Approaches to reviewing overall progress made

⁴ <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissionsstaging/Pages/Home.aspx> search ‘Global goal on Adaptation’

in achieving the global goal on adaptation’ as providing useful overviews of existing indicators and methodologies, which can help frame the discussion at the third workshop.

13. Many submissions noted the value of reviewing existing approaches, indicators and metrics that exist at varying scales, including the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, The 2021 UNEP Adaptation Gap Report (Chapters 3 and 5), and the contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC, specifically Chapter 17 as well as the work of the European Environment Agency and Japan at regional and national levels. Alongside this, existing reporting mechanisms under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, including Nationally Determined Contributions, Adaptation Communications and National Adaptation Plans should be utilized and built.

14. Many Party and observer submissions explained how sharing best practices, experiences and challenges is key when developing tools to monitor adaptation efforts. The workshop should provide Parties with clarity on where existing indicators and approaches can best be utilized within the GGA and how Parties can capitalize on existing reporting mechanisms under the Convention and the Paris Agreement. One submission provided a framework for evaluating existing indicators that could be included in measuring progress under the GGA, ensuring that they capture relevant information.

15. Due to the specific nature of measuring progress under the GGA, a key theme among submissions was the need to develop new indicators and methodologies that would provide a specific framework to evaluate themes such as adaptation finance and implementation of adaptation actions which can feed into the global stocktake.

16. Some of the guiding questions mentioned by a group of Parties that could facilitate discussion under this theme include: What set of global adaptation targets and sub-goals could be generated to provide a global framework for enhancing capacity for adaptation, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability based on national priorities and adaptation-relevant regional and global assessments? And how can national adaptation targets, subgoals and indicators be accounted for in assessing progress on achieving the GGA.

Measuring progress on adaptation support

17. A large number of submissions highlighted that finance for adaptation is currently inadequate and needs to be scaled up via existing mechanisms under the Convention and Paris Agreement and that there needs to be an approach under the GGA to assess adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation action and support. This includes flows to international climate funds which are earmarked for adaptation. Many submissions noted the need to enhance the quality and effectiveness of adaptation action, and that new monitoring and evaluation (M&E) efforts such as data collection must also come with adequate financial support for their implementation, avoiding additional burdens on developing countries. Some submissions also noted the linkages between progress under the GGA work programme and adaptation finance gaps at a local, national and global level, both in the short and long terms. One observer submission provided an example of proposed metrics that could be used to measure progress on topics, including finance, which could be a useful resource for this workshop, with another highlighting an existing mechanism, namely LoCAL–PBCRGs, to ensure climate resilience grants are used most effectively. Multiple submissions noted the work of constituted bodies under the UNFCCC as good sources to inform the workshop on methodologies for reviewing adaptation action and support, a specific example being the joint working group of the AC-LEG-SCF.

18. Some of the guiding questions mentioned in the submissions include: How can a target setting approach for the GGA enable enhanced and scaled-up adaptation implementation and support towards enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience, and reducing vulnerability? And what are approaches/metrics for assessing progress on adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation action and support? How can equity and CBDR principles be operationalized under GGA to enable developing countries to achieve the GGA and assess progress towards it?

Monitoring and Evaluation

19. A common theme in the submissions was the need to seek clarity on precisely ‘what’ should be evaluated within the GGA, before defining ‘how’ to measure it. One submission noted the importance of defining the purpose of M&E in line with IPCC findings. Multiple submissions also noted that M&E under the GGA should be informed by the best available science. It was also highlighted that when developing methodologies for M&E, the special circumstances of SIDS and LDCs need to be considered, and that placing additional burdens upon these Parties should be avoided.

20. Some submissions highlighted the need for frameworks to review the adequacy and effectiveness of technology transfer and capacity-building approaches, whilst others specifically mentioned monitoring national level adaptation actions and those by non-Party and local level actors, and whether these can be aggregated to existing indicators. One example of this is the ‘national custom targets and indicators’ under UNDRR to enable Parties to measure national progress against the four priorities of the global level Sendai framework (UNDDR).

21. Some guiding questions relevant to this theme mentioned in the submissions include: In which ways can the monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems at the national level be linked to the GGA? What are the needs (including support), barriers, solutions and opportunities for establishing robust national monitoring, evaluation and learning systems for adaptation at the local, national and regional levels? What are the approaches/metrics for assessing progress on effectiveness of adaptation actions in case of achieving robust national M&E support and in accordance with adaptation priorities and projected risks and observed impacts?

Quantitative and qualitative approaches to measuring progress on adaptation

22. A large number of submissions agreed that a mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches is needed to monitor progress under the GGA but that clarity is needed on what elements of adaptation can be evaluated qualitatively or quantitatively to establish the most effective monitoring systems. Regarding quantitative approaches, several submissions discussed data, and specifically how it can be incorporated into the monitoring of adaptation action and support, whilst recognising that additional capacity will be required to collect, manage and use such data. One submission discussed the importance of measuring outcomes (effects of adaptation action) rather than outputs (processes related to adaptation action), and another noted the importance of setting timescales and baselines when reviewing progress. One submission provided an example of global quantitative data collection relating to implementing weather observation and warning systems, which could provide a basis for discussions at this workshop, whilst another highlighting how both quantitative and qualitative data is used as adaptation indicators as part of National Adaptation Plans.

23. With regard to target setting relevant to this workshop, one submission highlighted the adaptation cycle (assess, plan, implement, monitor) as a useful tool to frame and from which indicators can be developed. Others suggested that understanding risks and hazards related to adaptation (including maladaptation) and building resilience against them is a key element of target setting, both at a national and local level. Multiple Party and observer submissions highlighted the GAP-Track matrix as a comprehensive framework for assessing adaptation. Finally, several Party and observer submissions highlighted sector specific adaptation monitoring, in areas such as food security, early warning systems, nature-based solutions, and healthcare.

24. Some guiding questions relevant to this theme mentioned in the submissions include: Which global adaptation targets and sub-goals could be quantified and/or aggregated, and which could be qualitative and/or collated in the determination of progress towards the GGA? What examples of relevant quantitative and qualitative indicators could be used or adapted under the respective global targets/subgoals? What are the suitable approaches/framing that Parties could use for reviewing the overall progress made in achieving the GGA, as part of the first GST? Hazard/Risk approach, adaptation cycle,

sectoral approach, needs-based approach, or others? What timescales should be embedded in achieving the GGA targets or sub-targets (e.g. short-term/ medium-term/ long-term targets; x target by 2025, y target by 2030, z target by 2045)?

How the global goal on adaptation links to the Global Stocktake

25. Many submissions emphasised the need to ensure that any M&E efforts advanced under the GGA are undertaken in the context of the global stocktake, in line with Article 7 of the Paris Agreement, whilst others sought clarity on how monitoring and evaluation of adaptation efforts under the GGA can best inform the global stocktake, noting the linkages to the other three elements of Article 7.14. In particular, what elements relating to adaptation should be included. Some submissions queried how adaptation under the global stocktake could inform Parties in updating and enhancing their national level adaptation actions, with one Party noting that the global stocktake should reflect ethical and equitable treatment of indigenous knowledge as well as scientific and technical data.

26. Some guiding questions relevant to this theme mentioned in the submissions include: How will the methodologies, indicators, and metrics in assessing progress towards the GGA contribute to the first GST? How would we envision the review of overall progress made in achieving the GGA ideally evolving and being enhanced in subsequent GSTs? Could the envisaged GGA targets/goals be revised or updated following each GST? What are the linkages between the review of overall progress made in achieving the GGA and the other three elements of the mandate to the GST mentioned in Article 7.14 of the Paris Agreement?

B. Organization of the Workshop

Participation and Modalities

27. SB 56 requested that workshops under the Glasgow–Sharm el-Sheikh work programme be more interactive, and invited contributions at the subsequent workshops from practitioners and experts from relevant organizations, UNFCCC constituted bodies and the IPCC, ensuring equitable geographical representation, as appropriate. Parties expressed a desire to ensure equal participation from in-person and virtual attendees, with consideration for time zones.

28. Regarding modalities, many Parties expressed appreciation for the breakout group format utilised in the second workshop, and thus the third workshop will follow a similar approach to maximise inclusiveness and interaction. This will enable a wide range of topics to be discussed. Parties requested two breakout groups, each featuring expert presentations, followed by a discussion facilitated by a moderator(s). After this, the moderators will report back to the whole group on what was discussed in their group.

29. One submission expressed support for an interactive and innovative approach, including ice-breaker activities and on-screen tools such as a Miro board.

30. Many Parties and observers called for informing the workshop through examples and case studies in line with the themes and topics of the workshop. For many, case studies can, and should, demonstrate both success stories and implementation challenges faced by Parties in developing effective adaptation action, so that Parties can learn from best practices and experiences. As outlined in the agenda below, the workshop will feature a wide range of presentations from experts, which will inform the subsequent breakout groups.

Expected Outcomes

31. According to the submissions from Parties and observers, the workshop should:

(a) Provide clarity on specifically what should be assessed under the GGA, and what methods are best suited for measuring overall progress;

(b) Increase understanding of and identify concrete steps that can be taken to strengthen monitoring and evaluation approaches, both qualitative and quantitative, with the aim of informing and achieving the GGA;

(c) Contribute to the overall goals of the GGA, to review progress pursuant to Article 7 of the Paris Agreement, identifying what specifically should be assessed under adaptation within the global stocktake, and what are the priority needs;

(d) Establish metrics for measuring progress on adaptation support and finance;

(e) Identify capacity needs for establishing and implementing adaptation monitoring systems and indicators in developing countries, recognising the special circumstances of SIDS and LDCs, and the needs of local and indigenous peoples;

32. Some Parties highlighted that even though the workshop will build towards outcomes at COP 27, it should not be misconstrued to be a space for negotiation.

C. Draft agenda

Day 1: Monday 17th October 2022

8:30–9:30	Registration
9:30–10:00	Opening and welcome remarks
Theme 1 – Global perspective: global level targets and indicators	
10:00–10:40 Presentations	Secretariat presentation on the compilation of targets and indicators
	UNDRR: Sendai targets and its target setting experience
	IPCC (TBC)
	WMO: SDG targets and indicators in the context of extreme events
10:40–11:20 Q&A and General discussion	All participants and experts
11:20–11:30	Coffee Break
11:30–12:30 Presentations and Q&A	UNSD: Global set of climate change data and indicators and recent methodological developments in measuring climate change vulnerability and adaptation
	FAO: Essential SDG metrics to assess progress towards the GGA with a focus on food security indicators
12:30–14:00	Lunch
14:00–16:00 Breakout group discussions	BOG 1: Global level targets and indicators for baseline assessment of the current state of adaptation to climate change
	BOG 2: Forward-looking global level targets and indicators for an aspired state of being adapted to climate change
16:00–16:15	Coffee Break
16:15–17:00	Reporting back and closing day 1

Day 2: Tuesday 18th Oct 2022

09:00–09:10	Opening
Theme 2 – Regional, national and local levels	
09:10–10:00 Presentations and Q&A	European Environment Agency: EEA interactive report on climate hazards and its indices
	LEG: Methodologies for reviewing the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support (joint work of the AC-LEG-SCF)
	AC: Development and application of monitoring and evaluation systems at the national and subnational level
10:00–10:45 Panel discussions	Panel discussion (countries)
10:45–11:00	Coffee Break
11:00–12:30	Panel discussion (countries): continued
12:30–13:30	Lunch
13:30–14:45 Presentations and Q&A	Adaptation Fund (TBC)
	UNCDF–LoCAL: Assessing Climate Change Adaptation Framework (ACCAF): a multi-country M&E framework, guiding the effectiveness of adaptation investments
	WRI (TBD): Proposed Metrics for Tracking Finance for Locally Led Adaptation
	London School of Economics and Political Science: Usefulness of indicators for M&E (with national and local examples)
14:45– 16:00 Breakout group discussions	BOG 1 Measuring progress on adaptation support and implementation
	BOG 2 Monitoring and evaluation
16:00 – 16:15	Coffee Break
16:15 – 17:15	Reporting back from BOGs
17:15 – 17:30	Wrapping up and closing remarks