

GGA WS7, Day 2

Prepared by: Morgan Seag, International Cryosphere Climate Initiative

Date: 1 August 2023

Location: Virtual

Event Concept Note:

<https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/WS7%20Concept%20Note%20FINAL.pdf>

Workshop agenda: <https://unfccc.int/event/7th-workshop-glasgow-sharm-el-sheikh-wp-gga>

Relevant submissions: <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissionsstaging/Pages/Home.aspx>
(search Global Goal on Adaptation)

Background: The 7th workshop of the Global Goal on Adaptation covered interfacing the GGA with other processes, including a specific focus on the GST. It also considered a range of matters related to the framework, including the development and use of targets, indicators, and metrics; global adaptation priorities; and modalities for increasing international cooperation in support of the framework. A particular focus was on finding areas of commonality with the aim of identifying landing zones. The workshop took place through a combination of breakout group and plenary discussions.

NB: Due to technological issues throughout the workshop, notes on some sessions are partial or missing. As a result, the notes below are not comprehensive and do not reflect the views expressed by all participants/Parties.

Notes

Opening

- There are some areas where finding commonality will be a challenge
- Reminder that in this workshop setting, participants should ask questions of one another and try to find workable ways around sticking points
- We are running out of time, and should complete about 75% of the work during this workshop, as negotiations will be tight

Breakout groups

- Moderator
 - Propose to look at targets discussed yesterday, including level of ambition, timeline, and elements, to consider whether what we have is providing the needed level of ambition, is comprehensive, etc.
 - To begin: are the overarching targets “targets” or “messages”? Can any be merged?
- Kenya
 - We have a mandate for the implementation of the Paris Agreement, which is highly relevant to this – it ties important components together
 - Noting developing countries, where adaptation is most needed, need to have development pathway protected even as adaptation proceeds

- Article 7.1 gives us a sense of direction to realize this mandate, but it doesn't give us landmarks to determine whether we have reached it or not – this is the problem we are trying to address, how to know if we have strengthened resilience / adaptive capacity
- So our first task should be to provide those broader landmarks
- Hence, the need for an overarching target in support of Article 7.1 – the article gives us a sense of where we are heading, but doesn't tell us how we know when we have arrived
- AOSIS
 - AOSIS's 4th target (re: NAPs) is not reflected, and this is quite important, because the point of the AOSIS targets is to have both thematic and a process target among the four high-level targets
 - What AOSIS has tried to do is to have a high-level political target; easier to speak to something that feels concrete; needs something that goes into more depth than what's in 7.1
 - Notes also hard to make a political message that feels measurable
 - Therefore, try to find middle ground on something that can provide landmarks (measurable/trackable) but also gives political messaging that fleshes out 7.1
- Canada (virtual)
 - Agree it's difficult to agree on a target when it's not clear we'll know when we've arrived
 - Agree on need to balance what is measurable with high-level messaging that can be taken up by political officials
 - Noting adaptive capacity as a recurring theme across several targets, though hard to measure at a global level
 - See also recurring aspects in overarching indicators, repetition of CBD/SGD targets/messaging
 - We don't want to end up with the same problems we have with the GGA in 7.1 (not sure how to measure it or know if we're on track)
 - Difficult to parse indicators and targets; targets need to be measurable
- Germany/EU
 - We are making this more concrete by looking at steps needed to reduce vulnerability, enhance adaptive capacity, enhance resilience
 - Steps and overarching targets we're working on here, along adaptation policy cycle, should help us answer to what extent this process adds value to existing processes
 - 7.1 provides the overarching ambition – here, we move to a level of more concreteness for steps to undertake at a global level regarding priorities to implement
 - Would like to add one overarching ambition: pursue transformative adaptation (noting this raises questions in practice), as well as avoiding maladaptation (especially noting transboundary effects, including cascading risks)
- Argentina

- Appreciate Canada's comments re balance between political messages and methodologically accurate targets
- Issue with having a quantitative target
- High-level political message for us is the best option
- No need to duplicate what's in 7.1
- Chile
 - Similar to Argentina's comments, but adding: if overarching target is qualitative (e.g., "are you reducing vulnerability and enhancing resilience?" etc.) – it will be difficult in Chile to say that concretely, with data
 - So even if targets are qualitatively measured, will be very difficult to measure in Chile
 - Therefore, prefer high-level political targets
 - Also support Germany's comments about maladaptation and transformative adaptation
- IISD
 - Risk of falling into unhelpful black and white thinking about what is "measurable" on high-level political messaging vs targets
 - Methods can be other than tracking and monitoring indicators (e.g., via evaluative analysis)
 - Tracking can help us understand if we are progressing, but can also involve complex/burdensome methods, and can include biases
 - Indicators are not necessarily needed to assess progress especially at global level
 - See, e.g., GST – using not just indicators (IPCC doesn't use specific indicators)
 - Not to say countries can't or shouldn't use indicators; just to remind that this doesn't explain how progress happens – this requires assessment/evaluation
 - Political messaging could still be informed by evaluation, if not indicators
 - Suggestion: overarching goal (qualitative) that gives a political message, with targets under each dimension on the policy cycle, with sets of indicators to inform those targets
 - Main point: targets can be assessed via evaluative analysis, not just by standardized indicators
 - FYI IISD made a submission ahead of 7th workshop
- Australia
 - Reasons for overarching targets to be reformulated as political messages
 - Media-savvy, potentially more impactful because easier to communicate
 - Lends itself to flexibility since they can be changed over time (e.g., per GST cycles)
 - Question: how do we benchmark? (as IISD, EU, Canada, Argentina spoke to)
 - To focus on hard to measure / abstract notions like "increasing resilience" seems difficult if not impossible
 - Don't want to see political messages around support provided / financial
 - Open to AOSIS remarks on concrete aspects of eg 100% NAP implementation – that's a real, understandable political message that can be measured and aggregated

- Could be NAP development or NAP implementation
- Kenya
 - Need to remind ourselves of what makes this process not redundant
 - You can't develop a plan if you don't have intention to implement
 - Once implemented, implied you have to report
 - Need to be aware of applicability across parties (see Article 7.9)
 - Example from Kenya re hypothetical flooding and planning around adaptation/resilience in the community
 - IPCC has methodologies for risk assessment; but the question is, if we come up with our own framework requiring updating/reworking of methodology, that will be an additionality
 - We need to respond to the question of what is "additional" – way are we here – to repeat what the qualitative aspects are? Or to make political messages about the importance of these issues, when back home we are already experiencing them? We need to come up with things that are not yet on the table, and then discuss, digest, learn, etc. as we work toward a mechanism that can help us track progress and implement.
- Japan
 - Support idea of political messages
 - Australia made important points
- Angola
 - I don't think that in having an overarching target we are rewriting 7.1; we are providing a target that gives us the basis to develop specific targets/indicators to help us achieve the goal of 7.1, which is the GGA
 - How we achieve the GGA requires the exercise of determining targets/indicators
 - This is our main task
 - GGA needs a set of elements, indicators, targets to flesh out what the GGA is and how it is achievable
- Germany
 - I think the idea is to say that we can identify priority activities and steps that help us contribute to achieving the GGA; the dimensions/steps along the adaptation cycle are part of it, but not all
 - I think we are talking about adaptation processes, including NAPs in the broadest sense (including policy cycle and many steps involved)
 - If we identify a high-level objective, there is much within it; we have to bundle, highlight what is important and what we need info on to describe progress, qualitative and/or quantitative
 - Reminder of need to capture maladaptation and ambition
- Speaker (missed)
 - Happy with this engagement
 - Reiterate importance of what is being added by this exercise
 - Importance of regional assessment in context of temperature goal, to identify challenges/gaps/opportunities

- Importance for understanding risks of reaching different temperatures, which is challenging and part of what this process should help clarify
- Overarching target should encompass all targets/dimensions/etc., with clear language that can work whether quantifiable or not, and is ambitious while also ensuring our ambition is met with adequate means of implementation
- Argentina
 - Interested also in question of additionality
 - Simple answer: to have operationalization of 3 components of Article 7.1, with strong methodological basis, with something that technicians are already using
 - Need to have in mind that this is the first version of a framework that can be enhanced, based on agreed methodologies, which we can address now
 - Would like to see methodologies to quantitatively assess, but we are not ready at this moment for this
 - If we want something between 7.1 and sub-targets, but don't know how to assess what is in the middle, this will be problematic – in 5 years, we will be trying to negotiate without knowing if we can assess, with a tool that is likely to be unfair/inequitable/not reflecting our realities
 - Interested in IISD's idea on benchmarks, happy to explore
 - Importance of high-level political message (not a goal)
- Australia
 - Support much of what Argentina said
 - Respectfully disagree with Kenya's comments – we are sincere when we say we don't think we can measure global adaptive capacity – literature suggests strongly there is a whole series of tradeoffs if we attempt to do this, and many of the challenges render that approach undesirable (issues around attribution and aggregation, and what you will arrive at is at best a fuzzy picture of adaptive capacity)
 - Re additionalities: would say value added is to raise the profile of adaptation, increasing effectiveness of adaptation
 - Provides GST a framework tool to enable collective assessment of progress best we can
 - We do not want to set ourselves up for failure in 5 years etc. by providing high-level commitment/message/target that we aren't able to measure in a robust way – will not garner coordination/cooperation/trust
- IISD
 - My statement was about the difficulty and methodological implications specifically related to measurements/assessment measures other than globally standardized indicators under an overarching target
 - Output-level indicators (e.g., in Sendai Framework) are less problematic, and realistic
- Russia
 - GGA targets should be universal, reflecting great variety globally
 - Also noting context for adaptation may change globally and especially locally
 - So regular review of targets may be required

Break

Breakout groups

- Moderator
 - Moving from overarching messages discussion, into dimensions, combining targets, etc.
 - Looking at dimensions, do we see things needing to be fixed/combined/etc.?
- Australia
 - Utility of going the extra prescriptive step
 - SDGs/Sendai were backed by a great deal of research/negotiations; we should not just pluck details like dates/numbers from the air
- Kenya
 - I don't believe we're at the point to start testing the level of ambition of a target at a particular point in time; the understanding of ambition is still not standard
 - Suggest to not look at level of ambition to test targets until we have a common understanding of "ambition"
 - Not to get rid of ambition altogether, but to leave it as-is and not start arguing over indicators etc.
 - Re: elements on impact/vulnerability/assessment, I see the table covers almost everything discussed
 - Need to be clear when we are speaking about "all" countries vs "developing" countries in language
- Australia
 - No robust global assessment informed these targets
 - Shouldn't have placeholder numbers in – should be "XX"
- Moderator
 - Even though some dates etc. have been suggested?
- Australia
 - Yes but they have not been consensus dates – just suggested
- Germany
 - Request to include proposal for target that all parties have conducted climate risk assessments... and have in place EWS... by 20XX (not currently reflected in the list)
 - We need several activities to underpin the high level objective (including in defining "ambition")
 - Clarifying input vs output-related targets
- [break in connection]
- Germany
 - Vulnerability assessments are related to assessment of adaptive capacity
 - This should sit here as well
- Abdul (country?)

- Assessment should be first regional, based on existing methodologies, in the context of temperature increases specific to the region, giving countries a broad sense of adaptive capacity needs in the context of this assessment
 - So separate to EWS
- Germany
 - Need to understand what is meant by adaptive capacity
- Argentina
 - Not the right time to discuss definition of ambition
 - Should use what we already have under UNFCCC as far as timelines
 - Suggestions for combining aspects
- Abdul (country?)
 - We are fleshing this out; do not currently need to get into specifics of timelines
- Moderator
 - Agreed, we are not agreeing dates/timelines
 - Looking at where there is consensus; where can we get to near 75% agreement, as Harry noted in opening this morning
- Kenya
 - Re planning: well captured from yesterday's conversations
 - Two clarifications:
 - We already have some understanding on what adaptation planning processes are, under Article 7; what does it mean to establish inclusive and transparent adaptation planning processes, when we already have scope in Article 7?
 - (Moderator: placeholder for just using all the elements in the article)
 - When we talk about mainstreaming, as in elements in place that are not their primary home – therefore, suggestion for clarifying language
- [unable to follow quick interventions responding to written materials]
- Moderator
 - Shifting now to implementation
- Kenya
 - Clarification: I understand that projects are informed by plans and actions; projects do not exist outside the scope of plans and actions
 - Clarification: should we add element of % of people in vulnerable contexts? (to encompass more countries, as there are vulnerable people in almost every country)
- Chile
 - Further suggestions (difficult to follow since working on wording based on materials in front of them)
- Germany
 - Don't see MOI as part of the target discussion; though it is an important aspect which we need to discuss as part of framework (just not as part of target discussion)
- Abdul (country?)

- Re: not having MOI as part of targets: we should have clarity by now as to where we do see this fitting, and how it will enhance targets (are we saying they are detached from MOI?)
- (Further suggestions)
- Augustin Carrizosa in chat
 - “It would be interesting to hear the proposal from those countries against MOI of how to implement the targets being defined without any correlation to MOI”

Plenary

- Harry
 - For now, general reporting back
 - There will be opportunities after reporting back process for general remarks, etc.
- Breakout group 1
 - Looked at where overarching targets could fit, including do some need to move to dimensions, should we include political dimensions, etc.
 - Under dimensions, covered almost all sub-points
 - See flip charts for further info
 - Thank you for Secretariat
- Breakout group 2 (see previous section as well)
 - Revisited table they had put together yesterday (overarching messages, seeing them as landmark for assessing progress around Article 7.1 as well as political communication to drive higher-level ambition)
 - Discussion on whether these overarching targets / political messages are measurable, and whether they should be measurable
 - Discussion on whether quantitative or qualitative measures are needed
 - Discussion on whether there is a need for new methodologies vs using existing methodologies vs using more evaluative approaches
 - Suggested to include something on transformative aspects including avoiding maladaptation
 - Discussion on value addition of overarching political message (universalizing adaptation policy cycle? Or going beyond this cycle? What is value addition to take us beyond other frameworks that already exist?)
 - This is an iterative process, developing a framework that can be changed over time
 - Looked back at targets under each dimension, including where we could consolidate/refine
 - Discussion on ambition: difficult to assess without numbers/baselines/timelines
 - Weren't able to quite cover all elements/dimensions; notes invited for amendments
- Breakout group 3
 - Helpful discussions
 - Yesterday, did clustering of targets
 - Today, looked at further merging/streamlining

- Agreed adaptation policy cycle is useful to cluster, but also mentioning importance of MOI across all stages of policy cycle
- One group mentioned need to discuss linkages to other UNFCCC processes on finance
- Agreement that within clustering, some targets that are similar could be merged
- Importance of ambition in regard to targets
- Need to look at aspects not directly captured in wording of targets (e.g., transformational adaptation and avoidance of maladaptation)
- Discussed structure of GGA framework: instead of “overarching,” referring to “highest level”
- Another commonality: desire to signal something to the world with GGA framework
- Harry
 - Thanks to all for your work
 - Floor is open
- [missed speaker]
- China for LMDC
 - We think the target for the GGA is important, especially overarching targets
 - Very important place to deliver, especially expectations for adaptation at a global level
 - Need sub-targets to facilitate
 - MOI is very important as conditions to make sub-targets for each stage implementable
 - For GGA, need more potential methodology/tools to facilitate this work to be done in future (noting this is a challenge)
 - Need GGA to be clear under guidance of Article 7.1 how elements should be involved, especially for society/economy/environment
 - These are important to deliver political signals at global level and delivery success of sustainable development
 - Clear targets are important in this perspective to give us a clear orientation
 - Valuable experience at global level re lack of indicators for targets for tracking capacity/support – this should be noted under GGA, especially at this workshop, since we are talking about how to set up targets
 - Also need clarity on MOI for each stage of adaptation cycle – very important not only to consider under COP28, but also beyond
- [tech issue for virtual participants]
- Maldives for AOSIS
 - Clearly energy in the room to explore targets at different levels
 - Breakouts useful in finding areas of commonality
 - Agree with South Africa for AGN on need for targets to be ambitious and transformational, which should move past business-as-usual scenario
 - Elements such as society/environment/economy can bridge framework with Article 7.1 (we’re using different terminology but heading in same direction)

- Technical work later on will be needed to identify indicators to measure progress with such a target
- Chile
 - Thank you all
 - Good discussion, additional work needed
 - See commonalities that show we have advanced since workshop 6
 - Further discussion also needed e.g. on need for overarching targets or not; ALLAC's view of importance of high-level political messages
 - Would appreciate more time to discuss MOI in Plenary – we think this is key to make GGA a reality
- EU
 - Thank you all
 - Importance of discussions including exploration of overarching elements
 - Reiterating that see framework as needing to be simple and understandable for politicians
 - Solution-oriented approach
- Philippines
 - Need for country-driven framework
 - Need for studies and application of targeted adaptation measures
 - Suggest integrated global system
 - National systems should be strengthened
 - Metrics should be limited to barest minimum, easily generated and comparable in consistent manner
 - Checklist could be helpful
 - Harmonizing targets/indicators/metrics at geographic and governance levels, including avoiding adding burdens to developing countries by ensuring coherence with existing frameworks

Plenary (including GST)

- [poor audio at start]
- Farhan Akhtar and Harald Winkler, co-facilitators of the GST TD
 - Presenting on progress as co-facilitators
 - Adaptation important to GST
 - Questions to consider
 - What added value can the framework bring when assessing adaptation at GST2?
 - Given a lot of inputs from previous discussion, what would be clear output and contribution of GGA WP to the GST1 and GST2?
 - What should be the immediate input of the GGA WP to GST1? (Content/form/modality of submissions, preparation process)
 - What should be the long-term relationship between GGA framework and future GSTs?
 - Intro

- Important to understand adaptation within GST process
 - Important to strengthen connections between GST and other workstreams
 - Adaptation: productive tension across local/national/int'l scales
 - TD of GST1 has drawn on Article 7.14 and referred to adaptation cycle
- Where we are
 - Completed all 3 meetings of TD1
 - Strong technical basis
 - Party-led process with participation by NPS
 - Co-facs now drafting, supported by secretariat
 - Co-facs to present findings at Oct workshop and during high-level events
- Plans for GST outcome at COP28 are being developed by Parties/Presidencies and coordinated by the Secretariat
- Emerging messages related to adaptation available here: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/GST.TD_.2023.SummaryReport2_31March2023.pdf
- Challenges and ongoing issues
 - Timing (TD of GST1 in parallel with GGA work programme)
 - Parties still understanding GGA more fully
 - Framework to guide achievement of GGA and review of overall progress in achieving GGA only established in Sharm el-Sheikh, 3/CMA.4
 - In future, how can methodologies to assess collective progress be developed? How can GGA/GST discussions work in sync?
- Adaptation cycle in GST
 - UN climate regime generally moving to implementation
 - Adaptation cycle useful in considering implementation
 - Included in GST TD Summary Report 2
- Challenges related to adaptation cycle and implementation
 - Iterative and ongoing nature of adaptation actions; no singular endpoint
 - Parity with mitigation within TD messages – providing information on good practices that can focus on areas of effort and guide mobilization of support
 - Feedback on inclusion of support for adaptation in key findings; how to assess adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation action/support
 - What forms of *non-financial* international cooperation can enhance action on adaptation?
- Ecuador
 - How do you see potential input from GGA coming into synthesis report?
- Speaker (?)
 - Would there be anything helpful for GST work on adaptation that this room or the next workshop can work toward, to help with final GST outcome?
- EU
 - Guidance on ensuring clear, concise outcomes?
- Argentina

- During SBs, much progress regarding elements for GGA framework; in your view, how can this progress be captured in the Sept GST report, especially related to targets?
- (missed second question)
- Harald
 - What GST can take on board:
 - We are coming to the end of the process and writing the report; there is not another TD meeting coming up
 - There are however further calls for inputs on political consideration of outputs, but there is a joint contact for this, it is not with us
 - We have had very good interactions in the past up to GGA 5th workshop
 - There have been opportunities (including in Bonn), and we have observed people bringing these together despite lack of formal mechanism for bringing these together, which we can and are taking into account in drafting key findings
 - Emphasize that “emerging” messages are emerging and will change
- Farhan
 - We are concluding our synthesis note, which captures discussions we’ve had and 3 TD sessions, feeding into political phase of GST
 - Views of GGA have been considered and will be captured by summary reports / proceedings and reflected back to potential political phase of GST to be looked at

Breakout groups: Group 1

- Moderator
 - Imagine you are co-chairs of GST 2 – your job is now to draft the section on adaptation and resilience for GST 2
 - We will brainstorm 3-5 messages/headlines/targets that you’ll report against in GST 2 to look at progress on adaptation and resilience globally
- [Virtual group discussion follows – notes were made on Miro board, which was a useful visual tool but made it difficult to follow while also taking notes]
- Canada
 - We’ll have the benefit of having GST 1 review done
 - Useful to look at NAPs to see how they’ve evolved between GST1 and 2
 - See whether plans/reporting have changed
 - Scope for qual eval of what countries are reporting re needs etc.
- Speaker (?)
 - Consider global warning for all initiative (full achievement as a headline)
- Morgan Whalen
 - Headline: Countries better able to ID risks and needs based on various indicators
 - Headline: CC being considered systemically in decision-making across all levels of gov’t or within private sector
 - Headline: Communities on front lines able to take a leading role in solutions
 - These are idealistic/ambition
- Saskia Werners

- Synergies between adaptation and mitigation
- Jamie Williams
 - Vulnerable and marginalised people are leading adaptation interventions in their localities
 - Adaptation in all its variety is defined, recognised and properly supported in the frame of climate justice
- Kira Sadat
 - Climate adaptation expert is required to be in all highest-level decision making meetings in government and private sector
- Emilie Beauchamp
 - Countries can now access GCS money within 6 months of application
 - In MEL space, global actors support countries in doing assessments based on bottom-up information
- Morgan Whelan
 - Climate-related disasters result in fewer negative outcomes in terms of lives and livelihoods
- Lucy Njuguna (ILRI)
 - Mix of process- and outcome-based messaging
 - Process: all countries have relevant frameworks...
 - Something like, 80% of African countries have halved food insecurity
- Reporting out from online group
 - Quite a few mentions of local ownership, and communities at the front lines taking decisions
 - Quite a bit on countries using adaptation cycle as a way to understand and communicate and advance adaptation
 - Countries being able to access money within 6 months
 - [more – and all on Miro board]
- Moderator
 - I assume you'd want to therefore see something about use of adaptation policy cycle, how adaptation experts are used, timelines for accessing finance, etc.
- Reporting from Group 2
 - Not consensus
 - Have a chapter/section on dimensions of adaptation policy cycle, including dimensions
 - Another chapter to provide theme-related information
 - Another chapter on cross-cutting considerations
 - Chapter on GGA as a whole, since framework is just one component of GGA, and so we ask, is framework synthesizing all adaptation action under Paris – is it all encompassing – or do we need to differentiate?
- [missed some]
- Reporting from Group 3
 - Discussion, not consensus
 - Attempted to provide an outline of adaptation chapter as we'd envision it in GST

- Headings might include:
 - Intro to GGA in Paris, with some index-level of detail on what it is
 - Overview of approach/methodology taken by GST (including introducing framework and how it has been applied to data collected)
 - Findings
 - Next steps / recommendations (could include examples of best practice, identifying next steps/recommendations to address gaps that have been identified; could also include recommendations to improve framework to best support GST 3)
- Also debated quantitative aspects, which took a lot of time
- Moderator
 - Everyone found GGA has a role in informing the GST, but that it would potentially be very iterative
 - Policy adaptation cycle as part of framing, with additional elements
- Kenya
 - That was a good exercise
 - Speaking now as transparency negotiator
 - We have agreed planning/policy process
 - Parties will provide info through reporting based on thematic areas provided
 - Right now, every country reports based on how they think it should be reported – need for uniformity and collective process
 - Framework can provide some guidance within that particular context
 - Most important thing we do here: indicate to Parties that if you want to park your progress on e.g. ecosystem protection, which targets you would be able to use based on your circumstance and the nature of your ecosystems
- Argentina
 - What tasks will lead us to the 2nd GST?
 - We need agenda item under SBI and SBSTA to further the framework; will be very very important
 - In terms of how to carry out that work: establish an ad hoc working group of experts to lead the item, and the item could be managed by an open-ended contact group that could receive inputs from the ad hoc working group
 - Re additional work: need constituted bodies (LEG/AC) doing work on this, e.g., training materials
 - Role of secretariat: in 2024, BTRs to be presented, to contain rich info prob re to GGA Framework; from 2025 would be useful to have synthesis report by secretariat by end of year to assess what has been reported
- Moderator
 - Pointing now to other questions to discuss
- Australia
 - For Australia: Framework will not produce new and unnecessary burden for developing countries in terms of reporting
 - We see the GGA as something the GST uses, not that Parties use

- Looking for elegant framework that countries can submit existing reports to – but not new reports; then that info gets organized/analysed under the framework we develop for the GST
- It's not a prescriptive framework telling countries what to do; it's providing the GST a way to understand inputs and come up with something meaningful re global progress on the GGA
- Germany
 - Framework shall guide the review on adaptation action taken, and inform us on whether we've made progress
- Kenya
 - We'll still agree to disagree with Australia
 - This mandate was not provided by GST to inform GST – it's a mandate from parties to elaborate and facilitate operationalization of Article 7.1
 - That is not to add any additional burden, but to use the words of German colleague, to provide framing on how to provide that info in a manner that is uniform so that anybody consuming that info to assess progress will be dealing with info that is organized around broader thematic areas
- [missed]
- United States
 - We have come a long way since Cancun
 - We need to keep hope, while noting how much we have left to do
 - A framework we put forward can help set an understanding of what's been accomplished, clear signals about how to successfully accelerate adaptation while acknowledging where there is work yet to do, including in relation to GST
 - Data can be analyzed in a lot of ways – we need to send a clear signal of how that data can be pulled together in a useful way
- Chile
 - GST is going to be by COP28, so there won't be a framework yet
 - There is further work to do to contribute to 2nd GST
 - Added value from framework: main focus/utility of framework is to give info to GST
 - As adaptation professional, I will look at the framework to see what I can do better in the country, how I can report better, but the framework would not guide my whole structure in my country
 - I don't see what happened with SDGs, happening in my country (e.g., building institutional arrangements/structures to report)
- Germany
 - We shouldn't wait to send these clear signals until the 2nd GST
 - Our assumption is that any point we should report on has some merit/value in practice – otherwise, why is it included? So the question: do existing reporting requirements sufficiently provide the info we need to inform the progress we would like to see? Or are certain activities missing or in need of further focus?
 - In general though, use existing information where possible

Plenary

- Breakout group 1
 - Looking for coherence between GGA and GST decision at COP28
 - Need to harmonize further work and timelines on adaptation/GGA with GST cycle
- Group 2
 - Recognizing and addressing gap enabling us to transition to 2nd GST based on understanding of what additional work needs to be undertaken
 - There needs to be a map toward this roadmap, structuring work in a way that provides context and addresses alignment gaps re: different reporting cycles and communications
 - Developing indicators (including, by who?)
 - How do we streamline adaptation agenda items?
 - How to create a space for a GGA agenda item within SBSTA and SBI?
- Group 3
 - Local/community ownership
 - Review of use of adaptation policy cycle as a basis for structuring
 - Use of climate expertise in climate decision making
 - Improved access to climate finance
 - Re: structure: different points of view on whether GGA should be seen as an analytical lens for the GST, used to synthesize/analyze/present info; or a reporting guidance for countries for BTRs and other reporting instruments for uniformity
 - Re: sources of info for GST 2: divergences on whether party and non-party sources of info, or only party sources; whether there would be assessments to help inform
 - Standing agenda item (open ended contact group, ad hoc group of experts)
 - Might want to review the framework before the next GST to update it to reflect new thinking
 - Re: GST 1: shouldn't lose this (narrowing) opportunity

End of day