

# Target 9(f) – Poverty and livelihoods

Expert group update: Anna, Catherine, Lama, Nega, Portia, Pramod, Valeria

Workshop under the UAE-Belém work programme on indicators  
Sharm el-Sheikh, 8th and 9th October 2024



# Summary of the current state of review and refinement of the mapping

- Total number of indicators – 393 indicators (more than 25% duplicates)
  - Existing indicators (as reported) – 361 indicators
  - New indicators (as reported) – 29 indicators
  - No info (as reported) – 3 indicators
- In progress – review of the list on relevancy to the target 9f and to the adaptation
  - Indicators relevant to the target agreed on (5/7 experts)
    - Relevant – 44 indicators (20 of those to be potentially merged with others), including 10 indicators that may require additional info
    - Indicators “not relevant” – 65 indicators
    - Under discussion – 284 indicators (at least 80 can potentially be merged)



# Methodologies and assumptions

Para 12. The SBSTA and the SBI also agreed that the mapping

	Indicators should be assessed against each criterion:	Methodology
Step 1	a. The relevance of the indicators to measuring progress towards one or more of the targets referred to in paragraphs 9–10 of decision 2/CMA.5;	in progress* <i>(framework under discussion is in the annex slides)</i>
	b. The specific relevance of the indicators to adaptation, including enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change;	
Step 2	c. Whether quantitative and/or qualitative information applies to the indicators;	not started
	d. Data availability for the indicators;	
	e. The ability of the indicators to reflect regional, national and local circumstances;	
	f. The applicability of the indicators across different contexts;	
	g. The ease of interpretation of the indicators;	
	h. The clarity of methodologies associated with the indicators;	
	i. The ability of the indicators to be aggregated across levels and disaggregated by demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, such as vulnerability, gender, age, disability, race, socioeconomic status, and status as Indigenous Peoples, as appropriate and depending on national circumstances;	
	j. The indicators' basis on the best available science;	
	k. The indicators' basis on traditional knowledge, Indigenous Peoples' knowledge and local knowledge systems;	
	l. That the indicators should not be used as a basis for comparison between Parties.	

# To-do list

1. Agreement on the common methodology
2. Revision and agreement on the relevancy of the rest of indicators
3. Revision of the indicators against the rest of the criteria
4. Merge relevant indicators
5. Establishing the links with other targets
6. Establish the level of disaggregation required for each indicator
7. Assessing the methodology/definitions/data readiness for the existing indicators
8. Identification of gaps – new indicators?

# Challenges encountered

- Large number of indicators (especially, those that we still have to agree on), and not all of them are expressed as indicators but rather statements or questions (should be modified to measurable indicators)
- Some indicators lack definitions and may create different interpretations of a given indicator.
- Some indicators are not directly related to adaptation to track the progress of GGA
- No clarity on the end objective and the timeline
- Lack of uniform methodology and processes across expert groups
- **Applicability and data readiness across contexts:** Many proposed indicators are only relevant to very specific contexts and/or will have limited data readiness in many countries.
- Disaggregation of the indicator (gender, age, others ) is a critical point that should be discussed and harmonized between the groups





# Questions for broader discussion

1. To what extent should the refinement of the mapping result in a reduced number of indicators? What is the role of the criteria (art. 12(a) –(l)) in this process?
2. What is the feasibility of developing more uniform guidance to the indicator refinement process?
3. What is the role of very specific locally applicable indicators in a global framework for adaptation? (i.e., should there be different tiers of indicators – some that are applicable to all contexts, versus some that are applicable to specific contexts only?). Scale of the indicator regarding the final objective of the work (global indicator, aggregate indicators etc.)
4. If criteria A (relevance to the target) is met, how much to work should be invested into adapting existing indicators to the objective (SDG indicators for instance)