Expert Report – Poverty and livelihoods group (target 9f)

Progress to date

- The group of experts had multiple meetings and exchanges of emails.
- All the indicators assigned to target 9f were assessed by 7 experts and the results below represent the common outcomes
- The 7 experts who assessed the indicators each went through all 391 indicators (without duplicates) under Target 9f and the assessment compared.
- The group has not yet begun to examine cross-cutting indicators or identify gaps in the indicators

Key findings *(details are in excel file)*

Total number of indicators for target 9f that were identified as "non-duplicates": 391 (assessment for each indicator is available in columns BO:BV (highlighted green) of an excel file.

Relevance to 12A - From 7 experts' assessment

Results for 12a:

- Indicators agreed as YES: 27
  - Nearly agreed (at least 5 out of 7 experts): 93
- Indicators agreed as NO: 14
  - Nearly agreed (at least 5 out of 7 experts): 59
- Indicators agreed as MAYBE: 0
  - Nearly agreed (at least 5 out of 7 experts): 49
- Indicators not agreed on (currently MAYBE): 149

Note:

- *N/A - some indicators were not assessed by all experts, were counted as "1" for all options (yes, maybe, no)*
- *0 or empty – did not select*
- *X, Y, N, Maybe – selected*

Relevance to 12B - From 6 experts' assessment

Results for 12b:

- Indicators agreed as YES: 73
- Indicators agreed as NO: 1
- Indicators agreed as MAYBE: 2
- Indicators not agreed on (currently MAYBE): 315, *of which at least 60 nearly agreed on by 5 experts*

Note:

- *N/A; #REF!- some indicators were not assessed by all experts, were counted as "1" or "no opinion" for all options (yes, maybe, no)*
- *0 or empty – did not select*
- *X - selected*

Additional high-level observations, including examples

- Some proposed indicators are country and context specific (e.g. Madagascar, Guinea, etc) with very limited applicability and may require further modifications
- Some of the proposed indicators have incomplete information or even titles
- There are additional indicators that could be labelled as duplicates. Some do not have the same label but it can be inferred that they are the same indicators. Others are the same indicators but expressed in a different statistical formats or disaggregation (e.g., number of people in poverty, versus proportion of the population in poverty)
- Some proposed indicators are just statements or questions and will be difficult to give an indication of level of progress

Common reasons for deciding relevance in relation to 12a and 12b

On most common reasons for deciding 'maybe' (and specific questions, and recommendations arising from this), please see below.

Insights on cross-cutting nature of the target, as well as links between thematic and dimensional targets, including examples

Many indicators tagged to poverty and livelihoods have links to other thematic and dimensional targets.

- Many indicators that are more directly relevant to one of the other targets were tagged to poverty and livelihoods because they have an indirect impact on this theme, but mostly through their impact on the other target. Most of these indicators were classified as 'maybe'.
- Many indicators that are more generally relevant to the adaptation cycle were also tagged to the thematic target on poverty and livelihoods. Where these did not make direct reference to poverty and livelihoods, they were also tagged as 'maybe'.
- Poverty livelihoods and social protection also hold relevance to other thematic targets. For example, social protection has important positive impacts on food security and health outcomes. A decision needs to be taken as to whether this means that other targets include those indicators that link across, or whether such indicators should be exclusively tagged to the target they are most closely related to.

Specific questions arising from the 'maybes' and recommendations for how to address them

While assessing the relevance of indicators tagged to target 9(f), a large number of indicators was classified as 'maybe' in the absence of clearer instructions and common criteria for decision-taking. The majority of indicators were classified as 'maybe' due to one of the following reasons:

1. The indicator is only indirectly relevant to target 9(f) as it affects poverty and livelihoods through its more direct relevance to one of the other targets. Most of the other targets, including water, agriculture, health, ecosystems, infrastructure and cultural heritage have implications for poverty and livelihoods and hence, one could include most indicators relevant to those targets also under target 9(f). Examples include:

- Number of long-term drinking water advisories for public systems on reserve (*more relevant to target 9a*)
- Area of contorta pine (more relevant to target 9b)
- Percentage of population that is food secure (more relevant to target 9b)
- SDG 3.d.1: International Health Regulations (IHR) capacity and health emergency preparedness (more relevant to target 9c)
- Habitat restoration (more relevant to target 9d)
- Number of local governments that have put green infrastructure projects into practice among the registered members of the Green Infrastructure Public-Private Collaborative Platform (more relevant to target 9e)
- Number of cyclone-resistant installations or those limiting risks caused by climate events: dams, buildings (more relevant to target 9e)
- Share of national budget allocated for protection and conservation of natural and heritage sites (more relevant to target 9g)

Recommendation: Where indicators are more directly relevant to one of the other targets, they should not be included under target 9(f) but rather under the other respective thematic target. Only include indicators under target 9(f) that are directly relevant to reducing the impact of climate change on poverty and livelihoods. Examples may include the proportion of the population living in poverty or covered by social protection.

2. The indicator is not specific to target 9(f) but rather holds general relevance to the adaptation cycle and thus, would be relevant to all other thematic targets and sectors also. Examples include:

- Share of indigenous villages that have carried out a climate- and vulnerability analysis and developed action plans for adaptation
- Percentage of women trained on climate change
- Level of participation of local actors and communities (including the most vulnerable groups) in climate adaptation related decision making (LLA principles)
- Number of people covered with climate information and early warning systems

Recommendation: Where indicators have a general adaptation focus but no specific thematic focus, include them under targets 10(a)-10(d) but not under specific thematic targets.

3. The indicator does not directly measure progress towards target 9(f), but instead captures climate risks that result from insufficient progress of climate change mitigation. Theoretically, these would be relevant to all thematic and dimensional targets (12a), but they do not hold specific relevant to adaptation action. They might be considered as contextual factors. Examples include:

- Average temperatures from regional meteorological monitoring weather stations
- Average annual rainfall
- Heat index (apparent temperature)
- Number of hazardous events per year (per type of hazard)

Recommendation: Consider the inclusion of such indicators as cross-cutting contextual indicators. However, their inclusion under each specific thematic target is not recommended.

4. The indicator name is not specific enough to assess its relevance and no additional metadata / information was submitted to infer what the indicator might be measuring. Examples include:

- Climate regulation – benefits of trees and greenery
- Number of training manual produced at each level (what kind of training manuals?)
- Number of specialised managers trained / retrained (trained in what?)
- Awareness rate of vulnerable groups (awareness of what?)
- Micro-projects rate
- Number of beneficiary communities for the fourth component (not clear that the 'fourth component is')

Recommendation: Indicators that are not specific enough to be assessed should be highlighted and parties or observers may be asked to submit additional information / improved indicator descriptions.

5. Indicator not stated as an indicator but as an incomplete phrase, question or reads as an adaptation option making it difficult to assess such indicator even though it may be containing certain elements that may be important for consideration under target 9f. Examples of such observed indicators include:

- Will park and recreation facilities be affected by climate due to increasing maintenance, changes in design or structure of facilities, etc.?
- Is your community involved in any way with private, local or state forestry management planning and projects and is climate adaptation incorporated in the plan?
- Awareness raising through the "Combat Heatstroke at Work" campaign
- Enhancing productive capacity of mountainous economies through provision of social protection measures
- Formulation of crisis management manuals (for water supply)

- Installation of equipment (aids to navigation) resistant to disaster

Recommendation: There is need to engage parties and non parties regarding such indicators for clarity and there should be subsequent flexibility to experts for modifications where necessary to develop appropriate indicators.

Suggestions for next steps post-COP and into 2025

- Perform a further round of cleaning duplicates, focusing not only on those indicators that are exact duplicates but also those that are essentially the same indicators. Experts could provide further recommendations here.
- Assess the indicators against the remaining criteria with a focus on identifying indicators that might be applicable across contexts and that could be part of a global indicator framework
- Assess the relevancy of indicators from classified under other targets, as they may be relevant to 9f
- Start engaging national statistical agencies
- Ask experts to develop an assessment report of gaps, including recommendations for additional indicators.
- Considerations for modification and for new indicators to be developed where relevant
- A more structured method for assessment among expert groups required for consistency and ease of comparability across groups.

Specific questions for Parties to address at COP 29

It is expected that parties provide further guidance to the work programme and the work of the experts to ensure that a consistent approach can be developed. This must include further deliberation and decisions with regards to:

- The objective of the indicators – i.e., global indicator framework versus 'menu of options'

- The purpose of the criteria (i.e., which ones are grounds for elimination versus prioritization)

- Terms of reference for the work of the experts including covering scope of work, roles, deliverables, processes, timelines and final outcome for the work programme's implementation in 2025 as well as modalities on how experts could work including creating synergies for cross cutting issues