



Climate Action Network

Submission: Views on Matters relating to the UAE – Belém work programme on indicators for measuring progress achieved towards the targets of the framework

April 2024

Climate Action Network (CAN) is a global network of more than 1,900 civil society organisations in over 130 countries driving collective and sustainable action to fight the climate crisis and to achieve social and racial justice.

Introduction

COP28 adopted the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) framework, called the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience. As part of the UAE framework, a two-year UAE-Belém Work Programme (paragraph 39 of Decision CMA.5) on indicators has been established to develop indicators and methodologies for measuring the targets identified in paragraphs 9 and 10 of Decision 2/CMA.5.

Paragraph 41 of Decision 2/CMA.5 invites Parties and observers to submit views on the matters and modalities of the work programme, including organisation of work, timelines, inputs, outputs, and the involvement of stakeholders.

Climate Action Network (CAN) welcomes the opportunity to engage in this submission, outlining views on the modalities of the two-year UAE-Belém Work Programme (WP) and a brief/recommendation on critical principles/criteria/issues to consider for developing indicators for the GGA.

Modalities for the UAE- Belém Work Programme

CAN believes that it is of utmost importance that modalities of the work programme are agreed upon at the beginning and that there is consensus among the parties on how to progress. This starts with deciding on a common purpose and a work plan with timelines for the work programme. The first workshop under the work programme, scheduled for May 2024, should include discussing and detailing the work plan, criteria, principles, and factors to consider while identifying and developing indicators supporting the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience in protecting people and ecosystems. The Secretariat should produce a report detailing the work plan and criteria post-workshop, which should be adopted at SB60.

Considering the complex nature of the targets, CAN proposes the following approach for the work programme.

Workshops: Learning and reflecting on the Glasgow-Sharm-el Sheikh work programme on the Global Goal on Adaptation (GlaSS) experience, limited time and density of work, CAN suggests organising the work programme into seven theme-focused workshops and four in-session dialogues:

- Three workshops in 2024 and four workshops in 2025. Each workshop should focus on one or more related thematic targets. These workshops should steer the technical and political conversation and reflect on gaps and needs for the particular theme/s the target(s) address.
- Noting how difficult it is to dive deep into technical discussions during SBs and COPs, CAN believes that none of the workshops should be in conjunction with intersessional meetings. In fact, an in-session dialogue should be mandated as part of SBs and COP to take stock of progress and adopt consensus. One such dialogue could address the targets contained within paragraph 10 of decision 2/CMA.5.

Furthermore, the UAE-Belém Work Programme should not be organised as a classic negotiation workshop. Instead, it should prioritise activities such as breakout sessions with guided questions and rapporteurs to develop a structured approach to the indicator selection/pooling process.

CAN understands that a range of global metrics and indicators has already been adopted/proposed as part of other multilateral fora, such as the Sustainable Development Goals, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Resilience and the Monitoring Framework for the Global Biodiversity Framework. It is imperative to tap into existing metrics and indicators that may complement the 11 targets within the framework. Building on existing resources across conventions, CAN proposes utilising the UNFCCC secretariat's compilation and synthesis of indicators, approaches and metrics for reviewing overall progress in achieving the GGA¹, alongside relevant knowledge products from the Adaptation Committee (AC), in compiling relevant indicators that could be applied to the GGA targets. CAN also proposes a review of other relevant technical guidance as initial reference points to avoid duplication of previous work.

Pre Workshop Submissions: Three weeks prior to each workshop, there is a call for submission from parties, observers, and other relevant organisations regarding proposed indicators. The call for submission should be guided by questions that enable more streamlined inputs. The questions for the next workshop can be identified at the May 2024 workshop. One week before each workshop, the secretariat should share a synthesis/compilation of submissions to serve as a basis for starting discussions.

Post Workshop Report: Post workshop, a summary report should be produced that highlights key outcomes from the discussion, identified indicators, constraints, and learning. Technical papers/workshop reports should be made available to parties and observers at least 3-4 weeks

¹ <https://unfccc.int/documents/613843>

before workshops in order to enable regional consultations and productive exchanges at workshops. These reports should facilitate a final decision on the indicators at SB negotiations.

Mode of Workshop: To ensure inclusivity, CAN proposes that all workshops should be in a hybrid format, and at a time zone that enables the highest level of participation from all regions. Allowing sufficient time between workshops and intersessional work is essential to make meaningful progress, with a clear view of the work plan trajectory through to COP30. This will ensure that the work programme maintains momentum and produces high-quality outputs.

Stakeholder engagement: For CAN, ensuring effective participation, inclusiveness, and transparency is critical. Thus, each workshop and in-session dialogue should be framed as a multi-stakeholder involving national and international experts from organisations, thematic/sectoral experts, including Indigenous science experts and Indigenous knowledge holders, policymakers, MEL practitioners, constituted bodies, different observer constituencies, and other stakeholders of the iterative adaptation policy cycle. It is a priority for CAN that all the workshops and dialogues are open for observers with more than one representative per constituency and with active virtual participation.

Factors / Principles to consider when developing the indicators

Developing indicators to measure adaptation progress accurately presents a complex challenge. These indicators should be fit for purpose and must be sensitive to the diverse realities of vulnerable regions, countries, and communities & ecosystems. The heterogeneity of geographical, political, ecological, institutional, and socio-economic conditions, as well as the nature of adaptation, requires a nuanced approach, where striking a balance between globally applicable indicators and those more regionally or nationally specific becomes imperative. This balance is critical to fostering effective monitoring, evaluation, and learning systems that can inform adaptation strategies and measure their success.

Indicators, whether drawn from existing frameworks or newly proposed or developed, should undergo evaluation based on a range of critical parameters, which include:

1. Their relevance to climate change adaptation and resilience building
2. Their significance for impact and outcomes, aligning with GGA targets and ability to effectively guide action towards achievement of GGA in line with the purpose of the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience as described in 2/CMA.5 para 7 and to encompass both incremental and transformational adaptation
3. Their broad applicability across various contexts through an up-to-date understanding of climate hazards and the key drivers of exposure and vulnerability in different countries
4. Their potential for scalable usage, encompassing existing practice/deployment and cost-effectiveness
5. Their ability to be aggregated. A global study is carried out and regularly updated based on information gathered at national and sub-national levels.

6. Indicators must provide the potential to standardise the assessment of adaptation approaches by capturing factors that affect adaptive capacity and resilience, including but not limited to vulnerability, exposure and sensitivity.
7. The vulnerability context is critical for capturing the additionality/ relevance and providing added value to what already exists in the context: linking dimensional and thematic indicators.
8. Guarding against maladaptation, whereby an indicator in one thematic area might incentivise actions undermining progress in that same target or another target or result in other climate or non-climate harms.
9. Adaptation must not constitute any additional burden on poor and vulnerable populations with low adaptive capacity and resilience, and interventions must ensure that these communities are primary beneficiaries. Indicators must provide a credible basis to assess equity and justice in the planning and implementation of adaptation and capture the diversity of relevant forms of justice, including but not limited to economic justice, environmental justice and social justice.

Considering the above, laying out a set of criteria, principles, and considerations is a critical first step in the work programme is crucial. These considerations are as follows:

Principles, Criteria and General Considerations:

- **Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC):** The impacts of climate change are unequal, and so while developing indicators, it is pivotal that the principle of CBDR-RC is applied to ensure equity and justice - these will ensure equitable distribution of support and means of implementation. The GGA is intended to alleviate the burden of climate change by enhancing adaptive capacity and resilience, and should not constitute any additional burden on the most vulnerable populations and communities.

The Paris Agreement reiterates the responsibility of developed countries to provide financial resource assistance to developing countries toward both mitigation and adaptation. Decision 2/CMA.5 reaffirms Paris Agreement language which directs developed countries to aim for a balance between adaptation and mitigation in scaling up the provision of finance. Given the relative paucity of finance flows toward adaptation, this must entail an urgent and rapid scale-up of provisions toward adaptation, especially through public finance avenues and grants.

Equity and CBDR-RC, however, must go beyond financial means of implementation - and include capacity building, technology transfer and Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE) in enhancing adaptive capacity.

Indicators must take into consideration capacity constraints in developing countries as noted in Decision 2/CMA.5, but also reflect the responsibilities of developed countries in facilitating the bridging of financial, technological and technical capacity gaps.

The goal and national strategies must ensure that adaptation does not amount to additional burdens placed on those least responsible for climate change and also least capable of adapting to its impacts. To this end, it is essential to acknowledge and emphasise that principles of equity and CBDR-RC, to the greatest extent possible, must also be reflected in country-driven adaptation strategies in order to ensure just outcomes for the most vulnerable populations and communities.

- **Integration with existing frameworks:** Identify and leverage relevant indicators from existing frameworks such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Sustainable Development Goals, the Kunming Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), and other multilateral agreements. The integration of relevant indicators across the GBF and the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience should be done to ease the reporting burden and get a full understanding of shared implementation actions across conventions. Such integrated approaches could help avoid redundancy and promote coherence across climate, development, and biodiversity agendas while potentially reducing the reporting burden on countries.
- **Easy to institutionalise:** Indicators must connect to the existing UNFCCC reporting mechanisms, such as the National Communications and the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement.
- **Gender-responsive:** Indicators identified and developed across all stages of the adaptation policy cycle must consider gender-responsive measures.
- **Human rights-based:** Indicators should reflect the human rights impacts of adaptation measures, and data collected should be suitably disaggregated to ensure that differential impacts on individuals and groups can be assessed. In this regard, guidance from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on human rights indicators and tools should be followed². Paragraph 13 of Decision 2/CMA.5 recognises children and human rights approaches as cross-cutting considerations and requests that cross-cutting considerations should be considered where possible. This language should be strengthened and operationalised through the work programme, and selected metrics should be directly relevant to children throughout the life course in order to address children's varying needs at each stage of childhood and recognise the importance of each stage for subsequent stages of maturation and development.
- **Qualitative and quantitative Indicators:** Indicators should encompass quantitative and qualitative measures with gender-disaggregated data and give more space for less traditional reporting modes such as community testimonials and narrative case studies. Lead times for measurement should be factored into the selection of indicators, with due priority accorded to indicators that are measurable immediately in national reporting. These should complement indicators that provide valuable insights but may not be feasible to measure immediately.

²<https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/tools-and-resources/human-rights-based-approach-data-leaving-no-one-behind-2030-agenda>

- **Outcome, output and input indicators:** Typically, commonly reported metrics focus on assessing the resources allocated to adaptation (inputs) rather than the resultant effects (outcomes), primarily due to the ease of quantifying input-type indicators compared to outcome-based ones. It is imperative that the WP includes outcome-based indicators and identifies the necessary methodologies and resources for their evaluation and reporting, in addition to output and input indicators.
- **Means of Implementation:** Recognising the essential role of means of implementation (Mol) as detailed in paragraphs 32 and 24 of decision 2/CMA.5, and estimates by Parties that such needs are in the hundreds of billions USD per annum, it is crucial for the UAE-Belem work programme to integrate the development of indicators highlighting the means of implementation gaps in developing countries (and progress to bridging those gaps), including with indicators for finance, capacity and technology (and other inputs) indicators needed to achieve the GGA across each of the 11 targets. While developing such indicators may come too late to ensure the information on Mol as required by the process to set the NCQG in 2024, efforts must be made to inform the NCQG process as best as possible concerning Mol gaps via the UAE-Belem WP. The GGA Mol-related indicators must be developed with the aim of informing future cyclical revisions and adjustments of the NCQG. In addition, beyond means for adaptation policy implementation, this process should look into identifying financial and technical resources developing countries need for other stages of the adaptation policy cycle, to meet the costs of requirements in: costs of assessments of risk, vulnerability, and adaptation potential; costs of developing policy plans (included costs of expanded NAPs and other documents); and costs of monitoring, evaluation, and learning, and reporting.
- **Participatory and Locally led Adaptation (LLA)** - Identifying and developing indicators that reflect the effectiveness of LLA practices is crucial. These indicators should measure the extent of local community engagement, with a particular focus on women and girls therein, in adaptation projects, access to information on climate impacts and proposed adaptation efforts, the incorporation of indigenous and local knowledge into e.g. conflict-sensitive adaptation planning in regard to natural resources, and the effectiveness of environmental co-governance or devolution governance structures that include multiple stakeholders. Furthermore, the programme should explore the intersections of LLA and ACE, particularly in enhancing community resilience through improved climate literacy and active participation, especially with the active involvement of vulnerable, in adaptation processes. Active participation should include involvement in the design and the benefits and financial flows directed at communities in vulnerable situations.
- **Process and timeline for reviewing UAE Framework:** The UAE framework timeline must align with GST, NDC, and NCQG cycles in the future so that GST points out gaps in what needs to be measured, and NCQG provides commensurate finance to achieve the targets, country experiences preparing BTRs? --> 2029. It is critical to have indicators taking into account the economic vulnerabilities of countries (due to the

burden of debt or their GDP) to align the means of implementation linked to international financing with the cost of long-term adaptation trajectories to make adaptation solutions achievable and realistic. Adequate institutional/governance and technical and financial capacities to address climate change are required.

Conclusion

The significance of the first workshop under the UAE-Belem Work Programme rests on the direction and momentum it sets. The modalities and trajectory it charts out for the rest of the WP will be critically important in this endeavour. Indicators for measuring adaptation progress must be established and designed to offer a standardised basis of assessment responsive to a diversity of contexts, circumstances and vulnerabilities. Indicators must support needs-based approaches prioritising poor and vulnerable populations and communities with low adaptive capacity and resilience. For an effective assessment that reflects the principles of the UNFCCC and instruments thereof, indicators must be both quantitative and qualitative and effectively reflect how outcomes incorporate justice as a key tenet of enhancing adaptive capacity among poor and vulnerable populations at the frontline of climate impacts. Developing indicators toward the GGA must not be insulated from similar or related parameters established under other multilateral fora. It must offer interoperability between the GGA and other internationally agreed targets and goals.