



**SETTING UP A FRAMEWORK  
FOR THE GLOBAL GOAL ON ADAPTATION:  
*PROGRESS MADE IN BOTSWANA AND PROPOSALS***



## SETTING UP A FRAMEWORK FOR THE GLOBAL GOAL ON ADAPTATION: PROGRESS MADE IN BOTSWANA AND PROPOSALS

### Authors:

Pilar Bueno Rubial [1], Anand Patwardhan [2], María Luz Falivene Fernández [1], Joel Gonzalez [1], Victoria Laguzzi [1], Susana Zazzarini [1] & Carolina Passet [1].

### KEY TAKEAWAYS:

- Adopting a robust, comprehensive and balanced framework for the Global Goal in Adaptation (GGA) is key for Parties and groups. Latest discussions have reinforced the feasibility to establish targets for the elements of the adaptation iterative cycle, while paving the way for targets for other components of the framework.
- Further work is still to be resolved. The proposals on the table are diverse but different parties agree that there is a possible gap in the implementation of the framework that stems from the current reporting and communication system. While the parties agree to continue to use the current system (voluntary nature), it may be necessary to support developing countries in communicating and reporting on their progress on the framework targets in existing documents. In turn, the parties recognize different pieces of information on the progress of adaptation that would be needed between now and the next GST and are considering requesting them from different bodies.
- There is a common understanding that some sensitive issues may need to be resolved at a high political level -during the high-level segment of COP28. These could include: the references to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and means of implementation in a GGA framework and decision text, two critical issues for developing countries. In a similar sense, overarching layer and thematic targets could be considered. Nevertheless, exploring possible commonalities out of the already well known divergences during the first week of COP28 would help to extract core elements to be taken into consideration in the high level discussions.
- Siloing discussions between the Paris Agreement articles - particularly article 7.1 on the GGA from 7.6 and article 9- in the operationalization process of the agreement and the development of the framework is not an approach that could facilitate a landing zone for high level discussions. It is key that Parties, groups and stakeholders consolidate key messages and recognize the need to strengthen adaptation finance in the GGA framework and the decision text in light of the existing gap.

**Key words:** GLOBAL GOAL ON ADAPTATION - FRAMEWORK - TARGETS - MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION

## 1. Introduction

The 8th and final workshop of the Glasgow - Sharm el-sheik work programme on the global goal on adaptation, *“Taking stock of the Glasgow-Sharm el-Sheikh work programme: exploring areas of commonality in developing the framework and taking stock of progress”* took place in Botswana, from the 27th to the 29th of September 2023. The workshop was followed by an Informal Dialogue organized by the UAE as the incoming presidency of COP28.

Workshop’s expectations revolved around key themes for the GGA framework and a decision at COP28: **i)** consider the elements of the GGA decision and of the framework itself, **ii)** resume the ongoing discussions regarding target-setting, **iii)** discuss the role of enablers and means of implementation (MoI), and **iv)** advance discussions on further work. Both events were helpful to gain a deeper understanding of the different proposals of groups, Parties and stakeholders.

Much focus in further developing the GGA framework, clarifying the components of its structure and exploring in which ways they relate with each other was given during both events. Moreover, the identification of potential elements for drafts decisions on the GGA and GST and the need to fulfill the mandates on adaptation covering all items of article 7.14 were discussed.

Even though there are some areas of commonality, different perspectives of the elements of the framework and how it is expected to work remain unsolved.

This report provides a state of play after Botswana’s workshop. At the same time, and based on our previous report [3], a traffic light exercise assesses the degree of convergence or divergence of positions on the issues that would potentially be included in the GGA decision this year. Compared to the previous report, further elaboration has been done for some of the issues to better understand the points where positions still need to be brought closer together.

The aim of our report is to support the consultation process prior to COP28 in order to achieve the best possible outcome in Dubai for a long-discussed issue that still faces methodological, empirical, conceptual and political challenges (UNFCCC, 2021), but which is essential for accelerating and scaling action on adaptation.

## 2. State of play after the 8th workshop held in Botswana

The end of the GlASS seems to come with a common understanding on the aim of developing and establishing a framework for the GGA: to agree on a methodologically robust tool that would allow the international community -not only Parties but also different stakeholders across the multilevel climate governance- to assess progress and enhance adaptation action and support. More clearly, how to comprehensively capture the picture in terms of reducing vulnerability, enhancing adaptive capacity and strengthening resilience (**article 7.1 of the Paris Agreement**) that fairly represents divergent realities across the globe.

## 2.1. Elements of a GGA decision and of a framework

There is still no agreement on what should be considered part of the decision and/or part of the framework. While this is a key issue, there is still no certainty about the final component equation.

Botswana showed there is some agreement regarding having a **purpose for the framework**. Nevertheless, more work in terms of negotiating language would be needed. It would be useful to remind and highlight that text in paragraph 9 of Decision 3/CMA.4 already involves the majority of the elements that Parties have identified as necessary.

**Principles** can play a relevant role in the framework of the GGA in terms of guiding collective action in its implementation. In this sense, some of the principles on which there seems to be greater consensus include: based on the best available science, equity, country-driven, and others in Article 7.5 of the Paris Agreement. The key concern regarding this relates mainly to the presence of the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC) that developed countries are not willing to accept, rather than not having them at all. There's still pending work to differentiate between the principles and cross-cutting elements that currently overlap. While principles may guide the implementation from a holistics perspective, the cross-cutting considerations could be operationalized by indicators, such as gender-responsiveness.

On **cross-cutting considerations**, there are different proposals: AOSIS suggested clustering them into three topics (participation; equity and knowledge based); ABU and AILAC proposed to include them in the political message of the overarching layer and operationalize them through indicators; and other groups have mentioned the possibility to develop global targets per each of them.

Discussions also provided more clarity on the value of including **dimensions, themes, cross-cutting considerations and sources** by recalling paragraph 10 of decision 3/CMA.4 (a-d) in the decision text. The rationale behind this relates to explicitly establishing which are the pieces of the GGA framework structure. Consequently, an explanation on how they relate coherently to each other would be also needed either in the COP28 decision or as part of the additional work to be agreed on.

The remaining elements of the decision structure are incorporated in the following sections, such as **targets, indicators, enablers and MoIs, and further work**. **Budgetary implications** is currently a placeholder linked to the work to be agreed upon and required in the implementation of the framework.

## 2.2. Target setting

The discussion on targets at the moment finds the following proposals: overarching layer; dimensional targets, thematic targets and MoI targets. However, these proposals are not necessarily options, since several or all of them could be included together in the framework or as part of the decision.

As for the **overarching layer**, the debate in Botswana revolved around the following options: political message/s, signals, sentences, adaptation global priorities, objectives or quantifiable and time bound overarching targets.

Discussions slowly converge on having an overarching layer, which instead of being framed as a target, would send signals and political messages to the international community, stating what is missing and what needs to be accelerated in terms of adaptation action. Nevertheless, several groups of the G77 and China (AOSIS proposal is of high level targets - here considered as an overarching target-, AGN, LDC, Arab Group and LMDC) have proposed overarching targets in their submissions as shown in Table 3 of our previous report and restated here. Developed countries and other groups such as ABU and AILAC, don't believe such a target is needed.

The proposals of the groups seek to highlight the importance of relying on the 3 components of article 7.1 of the Paris Agreement to generate a first operationalization exercise that in some cases is more qualitative in nature by highlighting the circumstances, needs and priorities (LMDC-Arab Group) or by enhancing well-being and prosperity (AOSIS). In other cases, a **quantitative** approach prevails, focusing on reducing the impacts (AGN), reducing exposure to climate risks (AOSIS), maintaining, enhancing, conserving or restoring ecosystems; reaching or benefiting a number of people and livelihoods (LDC, AOSIS). Some of the proposals also focused on means of implementation or the support necessary (Arab Group-LMDC, LDC).

In order to reach an agreement, it must be decided whether a qualitative or quantitative overarching layer is needed. Then the elements to be incorporated tend to converge including the reduction of impacts and risk exposure of people and their livelihoods, the maintenance and restoration of ecosystems, as well as the timelines to 2030 and 2050.

**Table 1. Current positions of groups supporting overarching target/s**

ARAB GROUP and LDMC	AGN	LDC	AOSIS
Enhance adaptive capacity, reduce vulnerability, and strengthen resilience to reduce [withstand] the risk of climate change impacts in the context of the long-term temperature goal set out in Article 2, paragraph 1(a), of the Paris Agreement in line with different national circumstances, needs and priorities and in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, which should be considered with the commitments and implementation of financial support provided by developed countries to developing countries under the Convention and its Paris Agreement at the global level.	Enhance the adaptive capacity and resilience of the global population, including the reduction of climate impacts by at least 50% by 2030, and by at least 90% by 2050 compared to the business as usual scenario and expected impacts identified by scientific reports.	By 20xx, our goal is to reduce vulnerability and enhance long-term [effective] resilience and adaptive capacity reaching and benefiting xxx billion people and their livelihoods (economy), conserving xx % of land, freshwater, and ocean ecosystems [in line with the 1.5-degree target] while increasing [action and] support in line with increasing demand from increasing global warming.	-Enhanced well-being and prosperity by increasing access to water, food and nutrition, and health for the most vulnerable groups by 2030. -Reduced exposure to climate-related risks by reducing the number of individuals affected as a share of the country's total population by 2030. -Ecosystems maintained, enhanced, or restored by protecting at least 30% of the land and ocean by 2030. -All countries have formulated and are implementing NAPs, or other national adaptation policy instruments, by 2030 to reduce national and local communities' vulnerability to climate risk.

**Dimensional targets** are focused on paragraph 10.a of the Sharm decision, i.e. in the iterative adaptation cycle (IAC) that is the agreed language for the adaptation policy cycle (APC). There is some consensus on the need and opportunity to have targets on dimensions focused on the IAC: vulnerability, impact and risk assessment; planning; implementation and monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL).

In the **first dimension** "Vulnerability, impact and risk assessment" there are two main instruments almost present in all proposals: climate risk assessments and early warning systems. At the same time, there are other impact-oriented proposals based on reducing the impacts and exposure, overlapping with the proposals of the same groups for the overarching layer.

The AGN proposal relies on the IPCC AR6, and according to the group, it would be up to Parties to agree on the baseline that could be further elaborated after the adoption of the GGA Framework. However, different groups and Parties maintain it's important to prove the technical viability before mandating additional work regarding indicators. Then, only one proposal implements Mol in each dimension (ABU-AILAC).

Since the ABU-AILAC formulation is already sufficiently comprehensive of all the proposals, the AOSIS reference to the exposure level could be incorporated: *By 2030 all countries have effectively conducted climate assessments for national adaptation planning, have in place multi-hazard early warning systems, covering 100% of people, and developing countries accessed adequate finance to develop such assessments and systems through the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism.*

However, early warning systems could also be considered in other components of the framework, for example, as enablers.

**Table 2. Current positions of countries and groups on dimensional targets: Vulnerability, impact and risk assessment**

Group/Party	DIMENSION: Vulnerability, impact and risk assessment
ABU-AILAC	By 2030 all countries have effectively conducted climate assessments for national adaptation planning, have in place multi-hazard early warning systems covering 100% of people, and developing countries accessed adequate finance to develop such assessments and systems through the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism.
AGN	Reducing the climate impacts of people, economy and biophysical systems by 50% in 2030 and 90% by 2050.
AOSIS	Reduced exposure to climate-related risks by reducing the number of individuals affected as a share of the country's total population by 2030
Canada	By 2030, all Parties have conducted climate risk assessments
LDC	100% coverage of early warning system by 20XX
EU	All Parties have conducted climate risk assessments for national adaptation planning and have in place early warning systems by 20xx.
UK	100% of people are protected by early warning systems.

**Color code:** common elements (blue) other elements (green, yellow, pink and purple)

On the **second dimension**, “Planning”, there is consensus regarding the importance of developing national adaptation planning instruments and mainstreaming adaptation in other policy instruments, as well as in giving a solution oriented and actionable characteristic to this target. Nevertheless, there’s no agreement on reflecting support to develop national adaptation planning instruments (ABU-AILAC, AGN). LMDC also included a reference to the gaps and needs.

Hereby our exercise of merging including all the proposals on the table: *By 2030 all countries have comprehensive, implementable and effective national adaptation strategies, plans or policy instruments in place, addressing gaps, needs and challenges in adaptive capacities, 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.*

**Table 3. Current positions of countries and groups on dimensional targets: planning**

Group/Party	DIMENSION: Planning
ABU-AILAC	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.
AGN	Achieve 100% 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.
AOSIS	All countries have formulated and are implementing NAPs, or other national adaptation policy instruments, by 2030 to reduce national and local communities' vulnerability to climate risk.
LMDC	Until 2030 Parties are encouraged to finalize developing plans to address gaps, needs and challenges in adaptive capacities, outlining specific actions and strategies and support needed for the near, medium, and long term based on the activities on the first phase of the GGA.
Canada	By 2030, all Parties have undertaken inclusive and transparent national adaptation planning.
LDC	100% of countries having adaptation plans by 20XX
EU	All Parties have established inclusive and transparent national adaptation planning processes and have mainstreamed adaptation into all relevant strategies and plans by 20xx.
UK	100% of people covered by a national adaptation policy instrument which includes (MEL).
Australia	Parties have established inclusive and informed National Adaptation Plans and have mainstreamed them into relevant policies and plans by 20xx.

**Color code:** common elements (blue) other elements (green and pink)

On the **third dimension**, “Implementation”, almost all the proposals mention the implementation of adaptation plans, actions, strategies and priorities, but also many refer to the need of keeping the improvement of people’s life at the center of the target rather than seeking to showcase only instruments. Thus, there are many proposals of developing countries related to how these planning instruments reduce vulnerabilities to climate risks and impacts. In some cases, these references are qualitative and other quantitative and probably this is one of the main issues to solve.

Consistently with the other dimensions, the LMDC includes challenges, gaps and needs of the implementation process that could be consider with this formulation: *By 2030 the number of projects, plans, programs and adaptation actions in response to climate risks, addressing challenges, gaps and needs identified by developing countries in adaptation-related documents has been incremented in X% [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 the implementation of their NAPs.*

**Table 4. Current positions of countries and groups on dimensional targets: implementation**

Group/Party	DIMENSION: Implementation
ABU-AILAC	By 2030 the number of projects, plans, programs and adaptation actions in response to climate risks identified by developing countries in adaptation-related documents has been incremented in X% [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 the implementation of their NAPs.
AGN	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% by 2030, and at least 90% by 2050.
AOSIS	All countries have formulated and are implementing NAPs, or other national adaptation policy instruments, by 2030 to reduce national and local communities’ vulnerability to climate risk.
LMDC	Annual review of the implementation of adaptation plans from 2030 onward, challenges and gaps, and needs based on the indicators provided in 2027.
Canada	By 2030, all Parties have begun to see outcomes as a result of implementing national adaptation plans or strategies.
LDC	Enhancing the long-term resilience and adaptive capacity of 3.6 billion people in vulnerable countries.
EU	All Parties have made progress in implementing the adaptation priorities identified in their national adaptation plans/strategies by 20xx.

**Color code:** common elements (blue) other elements (green, yellow and pink)

Regarding the **fourth dimension**, of “monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL)”, all the proposals signal the relevance of setting up, designing and/or implementing MEL systems. ABU-AILAC and AGN also referred to the support needed, as well as to assessing and reducing the vulnerabilities in light of risks and impacts.

Botswana’s workshop was useful to clarify different thoughts with respect to MEL in the context of the GGA framework: i) some groups and Parties expressed it is difficult to identify the benefit of MEL for global adaptation tracking purposes; ii) some groups and Parties do not think that MEL is a dimension but that it integrates the other dimensions and therefore, considering it as a dimension could imply overlaps. Thus, it is important to make clear that having such a target won’t impose or suppose any additional burden to the national processes.

Actually, the whole framework is meant to be voluntarily used by Parties and stakeholders. Then, a flexible target framed in terms of improvement and/or designing MEL systems could leave the door open to accommodate different national realities. In the end, the aim of this target is to assess progress and facilitate the implementation of MEL for those countries that are still experiencing difficulties.

New formulation is provided to introduce all the concerns raised by groups and countries: *By 2030 all countries have set up MEL systems for their national adaptation processes assessing climate risks and impacts and developing countries have been supported to design and implement such systems, including by accessing climate finance through the UNFCCC Financial Mechanism.*

**Table 5. Current positions of countries and groups on dimensional targets: monitoring, evaluation and learning**

Group/Party	DIMENSION: Monitoring, evaluation and learning
ABU-AILAC	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.
AGN	By 2030, all developing countries have been supported to design and implement monitoring, evaluation and Learning systems for assessing potential impacts and vulnerabilities and for tracking adaptation outcomes.
Canada	By 2030, all Parties have set up monitoring, evaluation and learning systems for their national adaptation processes.
LDC	Improvement of MEL systems in countries
EU	All Parties have set up monitoring, evaluation and learning systems for their national adaptation processes by 20xx.
UK	All countries have mechanisms in place to monitor, evaluate and learn from the implementation of their planning instruments.

**Color code:** common elements (blue) other elements (yellow and pink)

**Thematic targets** are included in the LDC and the AGN proposals. AOSIS also included water, food and nutrition and health as part of enhanced well-being and prosperity, and the enhancement and protection of land and ocean in its high-level targets. ABU and AILAC didn't include thematic targets in their first proposal, nevertheless, they showed a recent elaboration on this during informal conversations. EU, Australia, US, UK and other developed countries don't see the need to establish thematic targets at this stage, but rather address them from a bottom-up perspective decided by each country. Since LDC and AGN proposals are similar in nature, we hereby merge both using a qualitative approach and considering the main points highlighted in Table 6. In some cases, proposals from specific organizations such as GCHA are also considered in the case of health. At the same time, targets for mountain regions are already included in biodiversity and ecosystems.

*This work was done with the proposals on the table mainly from the groups, but it must be recognized that there are many other targets in other frameworks that must be taken into account at the time of negotiation. In turn, these proposals may come late for a negotiation that should be concluded in a little more than a month, which reactivates the role of further work.*

The timeline is always 2030 and the structure of the target is **DESIRED OUTCOME** (ex. reducing climate related water scarcity) + **CORRESPONDING ACTION** (sustainable water management). However, there are issues that still need to be solved, such as the role of the most vulnerable groups as a cross-cutting consideration applicable to all targets, and the multilevel nature of each action including local, national, international and transboundary approach.

- **Water:** By 2030, reduce climate induced water scarcity by implementing sustainable management practices such as water conservation, drought management, flood protection and climate resilient infrastructure.
- **Food and agriculture:** By 2030, reduce the adverse climate impacts on agricultural production and other food systems, improving food security by enhancing climate-resilient practices across all food systems and supply chains.
- **Cities, settlements and key infrastructure:** By 2030, reduce the vulnerability of people and infrastructure to climate change impacts by developing climate resilient urban and rural infrastructure and integrating climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction considerations into local, national, international and transboundary policies and planning frameworks.
- **Health:** By 2030, reduce the number of fatalities and illnesses associated with climate-related health risks by prioritizing prevention, risk reduction, increasing awareness and health risk management capacities in all countries, and strengthening public health systems.
- **Poverty and livelihoods:** By 2030, reduce climate change impacts on livelihoods and economic sectors by strengthening social protection, promoting climate-resilient alternative livelihoods and just transition.
- **Biodiversity and ecosystems:** By 2030, reduce the impact of climate-related risks in biodiversity and ecosystem services by promoting climate resilient management, protection and restoration of land, freshwater, marine and coastal ecosystems consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information.
- **Tangible cultural heritage:** By 2030, reduce the impacts of climate-related risks in tangible cultural heritage by promoting adaptive strategies for preserving cultural practices and heritage sites and developing climate-resilient infrastructure in collaboration with international organizations and guided by local communities' knowledge.

**Table 6. Current positions of groups on thematic targets**

Thematic targets	Group/ Party	Position
Water	LDC	By x, ensure all communities have implemented sustainable water management practices, including efficient use and conservation of water resources, to adapt to climate change and reduce water scarcity.
	AGN	By 2030, achieve universal access to potable water, reduce climate induced water scarcity for domestic, industrial and ecological purposes, through enhancing drought management and flood protection and climate resilient infrastructure development.
Food and agriculture	LDC	By [x], enhance climate-resilient practices across all food systems and supply chains, with a focus on empowering vulnerable populations, including small-scale farmers and fishers, thereby improving global food security and reducing vulnerability to climate-induced hazards and disasters.
	AGN	Reduce adverse climate impacts on agricultural production and productivity by 50% in 2030 and 100% by 2050, and ensure food security and improved nutrition for all.
Cities, settlements and key infrastructure	LDC	By [x], foster the development of climate-resilient urban and rural infrastructure, including housing and public facilities, across all human settlements, and integrate climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction measures into local, national, and international policies and planning frameworks.
	AGN	Reduce people and infrastructure vulnerable to climate impacts by 50% in 2030, and 100% by 2050, whilst increasing development of climate resilient urban and rural infrastructure.
Health	LDC	By [x], significantly reduce the number of fatalities and illnesses associated with climate-related health risks through the strengthening of early warning, risk reduction, and health risk management capacities in all countries, aligning with global health strategies and standards.
	AGN	Achieve universal coverage for addressing climate impacts by 2030, and reduce by 100% global climate-related mortality and 50% morbidity by 2035–2040.
Poverty and livelihoods	LDC	By xx, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty.
	AGN	Reduce climate impacts on livelihoods and economic sectors by 50% in 2030, and 100% by 2050, including through social protection and economic resilience interventions.
Terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems	LDC	By xx, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements.
Biodiversity	LDC	Ensure that by 2030 at least 30 percent of areas of degraded terrestrial, inland water, and coastal and marine ecosystems are under effective restoration, in order to enhance biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, ecological integrity and connectivity.
Ecosystem and biodiversity	AGN	By 2030 increase the resilience and adaptive capacity of biodiversity and ecosystem services, including through protecting at least 50% of land, freshwater, marine and coastal ecosystems against climate impacts, and enhancing other ecosystem services.
Tangible cultural heritage	LDC	By xx, strengthen the resilience of tangible cultural heritage to climate change impacts. Promote adaptive strategies for preserving cultural practices and heritage sites, while strengthening international regulations and collaboration with organizations like UNESCO to safeguard cultural diversity amid changing climate conditions.
	AGN	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	LDC	By 2030, ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development.
	AGN	Promote climate-resilient development through policies that reduce the vulnerability of mountain populations, ecosystems and protect threatened biodiversity and ecosystems from increased warming.

**Color code:** common elements (blue) other elements (yellow, purple and pink)



### 2.3. Enablers and/or means of implementation

The SB58 draft conclusions included two different options to reflect this in the framework's structure: Enabling conditions or means of implementation. The way it was formulated, as mutually exclusive, generated a lot of discussion and different interpretations. Developing countries' main concern revolved around those enabling conditions being conditional for Parties to access MoI, and that framing putting pressure on the domestic field instead of fostering the international cooperation needed to accelerate adaptation action on the ground. This leads to a scenario of unnecessary polarization.

Even though there were some proposals to call them enablers or enabling environment, conversations in Botswana clarified that they are not mutually exclusive, but can complement each other. Nevertheless, there is no agreement on whether and how to include them in the framework and/or the decision. Our approach is that both are different and relevant.

In terms of **MoI**, there are several options on the table for including MoI in the decision text and/or framework that are not mutually exclusive: *purpose, decision text, overarching target/political message, MoI target and dimensional targets.*

#### PURPOSE

The reference to support in purpose is already present in paragraph 9 of Decision 3/CMA.4. Therefore, it would be expected to be acceptable, although it certainly does not provide clarity on how the MoI should support the implementation of the framework (process) and the progress of adaptation as a global challenge. This does not detract from the fact that it is key that the purpose of the framework involves the balance between action and support present in the PA.

#### DECISION TEXT

Something similar happens with the inclusion of paragraphs in the decision text, such as paragraphs 19 to 21 of Decision 9/CMA.1, including further guidance on adaptation communication.

By using Decision 9/CMA.1 textual proposals are provided for GGA framework decision text:

-SUPPORT FOR ADAPTATION ACTIVITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (according to differentiation in article 9 of the PA). Urge developed country Parties to provide resources and invite other Parties and organizations to mobilize support for adaptation actions in developing country Parties in line with the needs and gaps in adaptation-related documents and with a view of achieving the Global Goal on Adaptation in article 7.1. of the PA.

-SUPPORT FOR ACCELERATING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADAPTATION PLANS AND ACTIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE GGA FRAMEWORK (implementation oriented). Encourage the Green Climate Fund, the Global Environment Facility, the Adaptation Fund, the Climate Technology Centre and Network and the Paris Committee on Capacity building to enhance support to developing country Parties for the implementation of their adaptation plans and actions in accordance with the priorities and needs outlined in their adaptation-related documents and in line with the targets above mentioned in paragraph X.

#### OVERARCHING TARGET/POLITICAL MESSAGE and MoI TARGET

As shown in Table 1, LDC and LMDC included references to action and support in their overarching target texts. However, AGN recently separated the two issues in its submission, considering a finance target separated from the overarching layer and including a quantitative approach to covering i) 80% of needs by developing countries in adaptation-related documents reaching at least \$400bn per annum by 2030; ii) achieving 50% adaptation finance of the total share of the total flows of finance to developing countries; iii) delivering grant and concessional basis instruments for achieving the purpose the GGA; and iv) ensuring that at least 50% of the NCQG agreed goal is delivered to adaptation and resilience.

Some of the elements of this text could be included in a political message covering the entire framework.

*Enhance the wellbeing of people, secure livelihoods and protect ecosystems by 2030 through accelerated implementation of adaptation action and support by reaching at least \$400 bn per annum to respond to the current and increasing adverse impacts of climate change and increasing needs of developing countries, in the context of the long-term temperature goal set out in Article 2, paragraph 1(a), and with a view of achieving the GGA established in article 7.1 and for tracking progress of adaptation action and support as a global challenge.*

#### DIMENSIONAL TARGETS

The alliance between the ABU and AILAC groups has maintained in their submissions the relevance that the MoIs should not only appear in a paragraph of the decision, but implemented in the dimensional targets (Tables 2-5). Other groups of the G77 and China have gradually joined this proposal, including AGN in its recent submission, although not excluding the quantitative MoI target of \$400 bn.

## ENABLERS

The presence of enablers in the framework according to the proposals on the table could imply the consideration of elements that are currently not found anywhere else in the framework and that could be key, not only in the construction of enabling environments within countries for strengthening their adaptation cycles (governance, institutional and regulatory frameworks) but also through the international cooperation necessary for effective implementation (data and information, knowledge, best practices, experiences and lessons learned, etc.). However, enablers could also reinforce - not replace - the usual means of implementation, such as finance, technology and capacity building. At the same time, the enablers may also have associated targets.

### 2.4. Further work

#### WHERE TO HOST THE FURTHER WORK

There is consensus between countries and groups on the need to close the GlaSS and the related agenda item. Consequently, Parties and groups should consider where the additional or on-going work for completing the GGA framework and monitoring its implementation could be done. In this regard, the G77 and China proposed to establish a new agenda item to carry out this work, while developed countries asked to streamline the existing adaptation agenda items. Thus, the countries and groups acknowledged that further work could be needed, but *what, how, when and by whom* are not solved. A potential landing zone could be to agree on the establishment of a new agenda item for adaptation that specifies and differentiates different negotiation tracks needs: 1) further work on the GGA framework; 2) work programme on adaptation in the GST process; 3) any other business. This option would replace the current agenda item on the GlaSS.

#### TRACKING PROGRESS

In Botswana, Parties and groups converged on the importance of assessing the existing indicators that have been developed in climate and non-climate related processes, in order to avoid duplication. Some work to compile existing indicators has already been done in 2022 by the UNFCCC Secretariat[3], so having a comprehensive picture of this shouldn't take so long. Additionally, UN Foundation (2023)[4] along with other organizations also made available a compilation of targets and indicators. Beyond the list of indicators in use in other frameworks, the targets to be agreed at COP28 and the characteristics of the UNFCCC process will require specificities and in that sense, expert work could be required. A logical next step for this is to develop those indicators that are key for the framework for assessing progress. Differences rely on who should take care of the work and how fast or by when this task should be completed.

The groups of the G77 and China agree that further work needs to be done developing indicators, based on the targets agreed in COP28 and by COP30 before the second GST. However, there are still a variety of options on the table related to who should do this work. Other groups and countries remain more reluctant to this development so far (EU, US, Australia and Canada).

#### OTHER MANDATES

Current positions (Table 7) include a range of activities that are synthesized in these main areas of concern:

- Alignment of existing guidelines of the adaptation-related documents to the framework, using existing communication and reporting system.
- Reports assessing: the progress of adaptation; the progress on implementing the framework; adaptive capacity gaps, challenges, and needs in light of risks and impacts from increasing global temperature; and financial needs related to the implementation of the framework.
- Annual dialogues on potential risks and impacts associated with a given temperature rise.

It should be noted that the revision of the further guidance on adaptation communications is planned for 2025 (Decision 9/CMA.1) and for 2028 for the BTR (Decision 18/CMA.1) which would reveal a gap to implement the framework with the existing guidelines. At the same time, it is unclear whether the AGN proposal to launch a process for adaptation communications would tie in with the review process.

**Table 7. Current positions of groups and countries on further work after COP28**

Further work	Party / groups	Specificities according each group and Party
Assessment and development of indicators	G77 + China	Development of indicators by experts according to the targets agreed in Decision X by COP30.
	ABU & AILAC	Indicators based on dimensions, themes and cross-cutting considerations, by an <i>ad hoc</i> working group of experts, that reports back to COP29 and finishes by COP30.
	LMDC	Establish an ad hoc working group of experts that report back in COP29 and finish their deliberations in COP30.
	LDC	Developing a set of robust and universally applicable indicators for the GGA Framework by IPCC and relevant UNFCCC constituted bodies and extensive stakeholder consultation.
	AGN	Development of indicators for each of the targets set for both dimensions and thematic areas; with the objective of providing the necessary understanding of the metrics to be used to track the targets, with the work completed by COP 30.
	EU	Assessment of the existing basis first to work with, only then extending a mandate to develop indicators. Considering a basket of approaches to assess progress.
Agenda item on the GGA	G77 + China	Establishment of a joint SBSTA-SBI agenda item on the GGA.
	ABU & AILAC	Additional to the GGA agenda item or in conjunction to establish a work programme to address all components of 7.14 (a-d).
Mandates to the SBs and constituted bodies	ABU & AILAC	Mandate to the AC and CGE to develop further guidance/materials to assist countries when communicating and reporting progress on the GGA framework using existing systems and without putting additional burden on developing countries, by SB60/COP29.
	AGN	Launch a process to further define guidelines and methodologies for Adaptation Communications to reflect outcomes of the work programme; with a view of completing the work by COP 30 built on the GGA framework.
		Launch a process to ensure consistency between the BTR guidelines in decision 18/CMA.1 with the GGA framework; with a view of completing the work by COP 30, so that there is at least one set of BTRs using the GGA framework going to the second global stocktake.
		Assessment of the finance related needs to achieve each of the targets, with a clear separate assessment of developing country's needs, to be done by the SCF and to be delivered by COP29, and to inform the NCQG.
	UK, Japan, Canada, EU	NWP, LEG, AC to support further work for the framework and its own functioning.
LMDC	SBI and SBSTA Chairs and constituted bodies to provide a regional assessment of the adaptive capacity gaps, challenges, and needs, especially in developing countries, to withstand the risks and impacts from increasing global temperature and climate change in the near term, mid-term and long term.	

**Table 7 (continues). Current positions of groups and countries on further work after COP28**

Mandates to the Secretariat	ABU & AILAC	From 2025, an annual synthesis report including information on how countries are communicating and reporting progress in light of the GGA framework. The analysis would provide global information on: 1) Progress on action and support IAC targets, identification of existing gaps; 2) Themes and cross-cutting considerations addressed under the framework; 3) Enablers; 4) articulation between the GGA framework and BTR, AdCOMs, and other adaptation-related documents.
	UK	“Adaptation Synthesis Report” ahead of the second GST, and then one year ahead of each GSTs, fed with information coming out from the framework and Parties’ reporting. The analysis would provide global information on: 1) Progress on global priorities and targets 2) National targets/priorities 3) Enablers 4) Policies and plans 5) External factors.
	AOSIS	By 2024, produce a report on transformational adaptation.
Invitations to the IPCC	LMDC	Invite the IPCC to provide a regional assessment report of the adaptive capacity gaps, challenges, and needs, especially in developing countries, to withstand the risks and impacts of increasing global temperature and climate change in the near term, mid-term and long term.
Review of the framework	LMDC	Periodic review of the framework including prior to the second GST.
	ABU & AILAC	Postpone the review of the framework after second GST
Annual dialogues	LMDC	Establish an annual dialogue consisting of two workshops to enable the exchange of knowledge and to further the understanding of potential risks and impacts associated with a given temperature rise across different regions.
No further work needed	Australia	Any potential feedback on the framework received from the GST in light of GST1 lessons learned, to be addressed by the Adaptation Committee.

### 3. Traffic light assessment on the structure of a GGA decision

A new traffic light assessment has been elaborated based on the structure proposed in the informal note by co-facilitators prepared in SB58 and the concept note by SBs chairs for 8th workshop of the GlaSS. As in the previous report, this exercise seeks to help countries and stakeholders to identify possible next moves and strategic steps for the incoming conversations. In relation to the previous assessment, some categories have been opened to provide greater clarity.

This assessment shows convergence in several elements, nevertheless Parties haven’t worked in common language yet. The structure of the decision; purpose; principles (except for CBDR-RC references); dimensions; themes; sources of information; current communication and reporting system and dimensional targets based on the AIC are assessed as **green**.

General and cross-cutting considerations; enablers; overarching layers (target/s or political messages), additional mandates to the Secretariat, constituted bodies, etc.; indicators to track progress; a new agenda item under SBSTA and SBI on the GGA and financial and budgetary provisions are assessed as **yellow**. Finally, regarding the issues on which the parties are still far apart (assessed as **red**): means of implementation; dimensional targets including action and support and targets on themes.

In terms of **structure (green)**, a few advances have been made in terms of identifying possible content for a decision: take stock of the GlaSS, GST interlinkages from a forward looking perspective (the role of the framework in subsequent cycles) while the GST decision containing a more backward looking one; stakeholder engagement through the framework; establishment of the framework; recalling paragraph 10 (a to c) of decision 3/CMA.4 to set the pieces of the framework; and then substance regarding each of them.

Regarding the **purpose (green)**, there weren't further discussions since the first traffic light. For **principles**, there is a general consensus now on the value of having them, but despite being assessed as **green**, the CBDR-RC discussion won't be solved at a technical level. The overlapping with **cross-cutting considerations (yellow)** still remains as groups and Parties didn't have the chance to have a focus discussion around them, but there wasn't opposition against having them in the framework.

In relation to the **dimensions (green)**, discussions reaffirmed they play a key role in the framework and they can be addressed through **specific AIC targets (green)**. As mentioned above and reflected in table 6, some groups of the G77 and China have clustered them in order for streamlining purposes, but more work is needed. Regarding **sources of information (green)**, there are some doubts about the function they have in the whole framework, but no strong opposition has been shown in this regard. More clarity on how all pieces of the framework relate to each other would be helpful. **Reporting (green)** has not shown updates since Parties and groups agree on the importance to avoid reporting and communication overburdened and to use the existing mechanisms.

With regard to **targets**, the discussion is still ongoing, and as for many groups the GGA framework is a package composed of different pieces still under development, a final decision on its nature would have to wait. On **thematic targets (red)**, many G77 and China groups have pushed for them and the whole group shows convergence to develop such types of targets in the remaining time, without sacrificing methodological robustness. Nevertheless, there is a big reluctance from developed countries on carrying out this task only by Parties and before COP28.

The discussion on **enablers and Mol** is critical at this point in time. After many conversations, there is a common understanding that they can't be used interchangeably since they play different functions on adaptation action and the achievement of the targets. **Enablers** are assessed as **yellow**, in the sense, Parties and groups recognized the importance to strengthen them, but there is no clarity how and where this could be reflected in the framework or the decision. When it comes to **Mol**, discussions didn't make any progress: developed countries don't support any kind of reference, the reason why dimensional targets including action and support are assessed as **red** as well.

Finally, on **further work** some areas of convergence could be highlighted. In terms of **indicators for tracking processes (yellow)**, there is a recognition of the need to have them for tracking the progress made on the established targets. However, there is no agreement on how they should be finally established.

Developed countries' proposal is an assessment (to be made through submissions and by constituted bodies such as the AC and the NWP) of what already exists, probably within a year. Their preference is to wait for that report/document before agreeing on a mandate to develop new ones. Developing countries have the opposite vision to this, and even there are several views on who should take this task forward (group of experts, constituted bodies, IPCC, etc.) they believe this should be done relatively quickly to test them before the initiation of the 2nd GST (2027). In relation to **additional mandates (yellow)**, there were some updates in terms of ideas to facilitate the usage of the GGA framework, but nothing concrete or in common has been identified so far. With respect to the new agenda item under **SBSTA and SBI on the GGA (yellow)**, even though the G77 and China agreed on this point in Buenos Aires and developed countries have rejected it, there is an opportunity to advance on it at the cost of streamlining the existing adaptation agenda items. Nevertheless, this wasn't further discussed.

**Table 8. Traffic light assessment**

<p><b>GREEN</b> There is some kind of rapprochement</p> <p><b>YELLOW</b> There is no approach yet but it is not impossible</p> <p><b>RED</b> Still a long way off, should be assessed as to whether it is feasible</p>	Structure of the decision			
	Purpose			
	Principles (except for CBDR-RC)			
	Dimensions			
	Themes			
	General and cross-cutting considerations			
	Sources of information			
	Reporting			
	Enablers			
	Means of Implementations			
	Targets	Overarching layer (target/s or political messages)		
		Dimensional targets based on the iterative adaptation cycle		
		Dimensional targets including action and support		
		Targets on themes		
	Further work	Indicators to track progress		
Additional mandates to the Secretariat, constituted bodies, etc.				
New agenda item under SBSTA and SBI on the GGA				
Finance and budgetary provisions				

## FOOTNOTES

1. ARG 1.5

2. UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

3. STATE OF PLAY AND PROPOSALS STATE OF PLAY AND PROPOSALS FOR THE 8TH WORKSHOP OF THE GLASGOW SHARM EL-SHEIKH WORK PROGRAMME (GGA 2). [HTTPS://ARG1PUNTO5.COM/INDEX.PHP/2023/09/26/STATE-OF-PLAY-AND-PROPOSALS-FOR-THE-8TH-WORKSHOP-OF-THE-GLASGOW-SHARM-EL-SHEIKH-WORK-PROGRAMME-GGA-2/](https://arg1punto5.com/index.php/2023/09/26/state-of-play-and-proposals-for-the-8th-workshop-of-the-glasgow-sharm-el-sheikh-work-programme-gga-2/)

4. UNFCCC (2022). COMPILATION AND SYNTHESIS OF INDICATORS, APPROACHES, TARGETS AND METRICS FOR REVIEWING OVERALL PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING THE GLOBAL GOAL ON ADAPTATION. [HTTPS://UNFCCC.INT/SITES/DEFAULT/FILES/RESOURCE/REPORTGGATP\\_FINAL.PDF](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/reportggatp_final.pdf)

5. UN FOUNDATION (2023). COMPILATION OF ILLUSTRATIVE TARGETS AND INDICATORS FOR THE GLOBAL GOAL ON ADAPTATION. [HTTPS://WWW4.UNFCCC.INT/SITES/SUBMISSIONSSTAGING/DOCUMENTS/202305311331---UNITED%20NATIONS%20FOUNDATION.PDF](https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissionsstaging/documents/202305311331---united%20nations%20foundation.pdf)

## **SOBRE ARGENTINA 1.5°**

Somos un equipo de investigadores e investigadoras, especialistas y activistas que promueve la elaboración de herramientas para la transparencia y el monitoreo de los esfuerzos frente al cambio climático en distintos espacios; a la luz de nuestras responsabilidades, de la solidaridad intergeneracional y guiados por la proyección de los esfuerzos. Construimos y desarrollamos contenidos con análisis cualitativos y cuantitativos sobre la acción climática de Argentina y otros países, en las negociaciones internacionales en el marco de la Convención Marco de Naciones Unidas sobre Cambio Climático y en el G20, así como en lo relativo al régimen jurídico y a las políticas climáticas nacionales y subnacionales.

## **SOBRE FUNDACIÓN AVINA**

Es una organización global que impulsa cambios de raíz (sistémicos) a gran escala. Nacida en el Sur Global, Fundación Avina impacta a través de procesos colaborativos, a favor de la dignidad humana y el cuidado del planeta.

