

GGA

20 June 2025

Nairobi

19:00

This is the doc they're discussing:

https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/GGA_dt_sb62.pdf

Cof -

- Last night we published the first iteration of the text
- Let me explain the approach. We tried to capture all views and reflect them in a balance manner
- This is the starting point, first draft
- This is intended for you to share your views on how we can improve the text
- Where we heard pure objection or opposing views we created option, in differences in detail we used brackets. There are also different lists of items that were introduced with no objection
- There is also a mistake in numbering where there are two number 6's in one place so we'll refer to the first number 6 vs. the second number 6
- Wanted to keep the text a manageable length
- Please avoid repeating views that were already shared and that were already reflected in the text and focus on things that were misunderstood or that require further clarification
- Also welcome comments on how to remove options or brackets

Sri Lanka obo G77 -

- Agree to use draft text
- Propose to approach text section my section to ensure that we have a structured discussion
- We propose that we limit consideration at this session from para 1 to 19

Marshall Islands obo AOSIS -

- Align with G77
- Comments will go section by section through text
- On indicator package, number and structure of indicators. Para 4 work of the experts continue through [July]?. Also replace word streamlining
- Suggesting 4 sub-indicators (I think)
- We do not think option 2 of para 5 works because it has the potential to produce too many indicators for AOSIS to report on
- Propose to add first para 6 and would like to recall to improve readability

- For second para 6, we should add further sub-bullets to tell experts that indicators measuring hazards are removed
- On second #6 we prefer [??]
- Something that instructs the experts to include MOI indicators under cycle targets (10c) rather than under the thematic targets
- We expect to see headline MOI indicators

Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group -

- Would like to confirm the mode of work for engaging on the text. Is the G77 approach okay. We would like to hear from Parties their opinions

Cof -

- We were hearing from G77 that we should focus on the part of the text on indicators from paras 1-19 and we heard no objections on that

Uruguay obo Grupo Sur

- Agree on preambular paras
- On para 4 we don't think we can extend the work of the expert til Oct
- No more than 100 with a maximum of [missed]
- On refinement process, important to separate existing guidance from SB60 and 3/CMA.6 with additional guidance. Those are already agree. We think it would be better to acknowledge old criteria in one para without listing. emphasizing further guidance
- Consider components by target, include cross-cutting considerations
- On para 6 we prefer f option 1
- On MOI favor [??]
- ON cross-cutting, we stress the importance of having cross-cutting considerations in the global goal set. Cross-cutting should no be separate from guidance
- Recall paras 13 and 14 of 2/CMA.5 and (something) from 2/CMA.6
- All vulnerable groups in original paras should be included, as well as individuals of African descent and farmers
- On guidance and activities before CMA7. Our proposal is not captured in text. SB 62 adopts conclusion mandating experts to continue work after the session. First mid-august workshop in person my experts, report by end of August, then Sept a workshop between Parties and experts, 4 weeks before COP30 we have a final report/list for consideration at COP30

EU -

- Fine with G77 approach
- With understanding that the paras that we don't address in other sections will be bracketed
- Also see additional options that can be included as alternatives
- Critical that we do not micromanage the work of the experts so that we work on a sound technical basis
- On 1-19

- Preamble paras are fine
- On guidance, para 4 we emphasize that we need to have a timeline that works for experts. Mid-July is not realistic.
- Supportive of para 5 and prefer option 1
- Paras 6 and 7 repeat criteria. They are fine
- Second para 6 we're wondering if it's an alternative to 7 which comes before it. We suggest removing second para 6 because it's repetitive and micromanages the experts.
- Remove para 9. There are different views on this in the room and we shouldn't pass that onto the experts to decide
- On cross-cutting. EU is supportive and it's critical that these things stay in the text. We have to see if all the paras reflect the decisions from Baku
- On 14-19 we are supportive of option 1 - paras 14 and 15.
- Support workshop in Oct
- We are confused about para 16
- We are unclear whether 19 is part of option 3

Botswana obo AGN -

- Can work with this text as a basis
- Want to share some views that were not reflected
- Align with G77 and agree with the structure
- Will keep intervention to paras 1-19
- Para 4 we think it's still unclear on the extension of the work of the experts. Paras 16 and 17 will outline more what the experts will view. This should reflect what is decided to do on paras 16 and 17
- Preambular language we need to include MOI indicators. Consolidated list of indicators including MOI indicators, which will be in the 100 that we previously agreed to
- On para 5, the AGN proposal is kind of between options 1 and 2. We propose that we merge these two proposals. We want to see headline indicators and sub-indicators and we want to give more guidance on how that would be structured. Not more than 20 headline indicators total. More than that will add additional burden
- On guidance for refinement. A distinction needs to be made with regard to existing criteria from para 12 of SB60 and also what came from 3/CMA.6. Also what is there can be further streamlined to avoid redundancies and conflicting ideas. For example, considering data sources but also that data availability should not restrict the development of new indicators
- Para 7, iv - right now it reads as "outcome and output", we think it should read "outcome and impact"
- Second #6. On 6a we don't understand what is actionable and we suggest to replace it with "measurable and specific". On 6c climate impacts should be refined to capture adaptation responses. On 6d we agree that ODA should be removed. On 6e we support option 1 that domestic budget should be removed. 6f we have language on option 1, which we support and will propose language at a later stage. 6g we don't understand the language of "qualitative narrative" and should stick to language of para 39 of 2CMA/5 which says develop quantified indicators

- Para 17 reflects some of our views but not entirely. We think that para 17a should read "organize under the guidance of the chair "an in person meeting with experts and parties in mid-August". Report to be published the first week of September. Then we keep the mandated workshop that is already in previous decisions

Sudan obo LDCs -

- Align with G77 and will keep comments to paras 1-19
- On para 4 we think second week of sept is a more realistic timeline
- Para 5 we do not support option 2 because it introduces different terminologies and diverges from the language we saw in the workshop
- Number of indicators should not be determined by us at this stage and it really depends on the nature to the target
- We see option 1 as the strongest starting point
- Revise option 1 point b we should say "various contexts" which reflects agreed language
- Keep language consistent to "adaptation and resilience"
- On second para 6, point c, we are not comfortable with removal because some of those indicators may be made relevant so we prefer the language "refined"
- On 6e we prefer option 1
- On cross-cutting, we support the inclusion generally but the current language could be streamlined. Can improve clarity
- On guidance on activities and timeline. Para 14 we support option 1 on 15 both sets of brackets are not ideal. We propose a middle ground where we say "no later than 4 weeks"
- On timing of workshop in para 15, October 2025 is sensible and early October is better for us
- On option 2 on that section, our understanding is that the final list of indicators is going to be produced before the experts workshop which defeats the purpose of the workshop itself. The workshop should be a peer review exercise. So we're not going to engage on option 2
- On para 18 we don't see it as an option. We don't support the secretariat undertaking a technical review of the indicators because we don't know what that really means. Maybe they tidy up the list and work with the experts to ensure consistency.
- On submissions we do not support a call for submissions at this point so we can preserve everyone's capacity

Mexico obo EIG -

- para 4 we prefer second week of Sept
- para 5 we prefer option 1
- para 7 2 (?)
- Don't delete any options at this juncture. Full range of options has to be preserved. Propose that the most opportune moment will be when the experts give their technical recommendations [?]
- Indicators should be aligned with PA. And climate resilient development pathways
- On guidance and consideration of cross-cutting issues. Para 23 of Decision 2/CMA.6(?)

- Para 17 - option of a hybrid opportunity of experts only by mid-sept

Australia -

- Para 4, prefer for expert work to continue into sept so they can have a workshop to cross-check and synthesize
- Para 5, there was a suggestion to call out a specific type of indicator but we are not supportive of that. Not suggesting that any tupe of sub-category of indicator is in or out
- Open to 100 indicators but the disaggregation element not included in the 100
- On guidance, most look good, on issue of data availability, ruling out indicators without data is an issue but it would be useful to know when there are limitations in data availability
- On para 6, directions on how to reduce the number of indicators. We are no in the political phase yet so we don't want to rule anything out yet. Parties will have sufficient time to debate the political yeses and nos
- Paras 10-14 on cross-cutting we support.
- Para 15, we have a preference for an October mandated workshop
- para 18 - role of sec. We understand that experts are doing a good job of self-organizing so we wouldn't want the secretariat to disrupt that
- There are two distinct phases here. Technical and political. We can start the political work at the mandated workshop and continue that work in Belem

Panama obo AILAC -

- Align with G77
- Can work with this text
- Good with 1-3
- Para 4 we propose that the expert group be given a mandate to complete the list by end of August. Workshop in early August
- Mandate workshop at end of september/early oct
- Para 5 open to option 2 and look forward to open discussion
- On refinement, we agree to separate existing criteria with new criteria posed in this room
- Good with 6 and 7
- Second 6 we refer to a,b,d,e option 1, and f option 1
- Para 8 and 9 okay
- on guidance for cross-cutting we have stated that the cross-cutting considerations are very important for the guidance to refine
- On timelines, we support option 1. ON 14 we support b, with an adjustment of the date of the expert meeting to the end of Aug
- Add a para after 14 that asks the Sec to prepare a summary report of the expert workshop that will be taking place
- On para 16, we would like it to be clarified that the Sec report will be based on list provided by experts
- We also don't want any call for submissions by parties

UK -

- Support mandate til Sept
- Para 5, agree to go with option 1 and don't want to specify number at this phase but could set out something manageable like AOSIS suggested
- For criteria for refinement we can streamline, remove para 6 and 9
- On para 7, v, we could include "where possible a qualitative narrative" - want to keep this possibility for countries to tell their stories
- [missed a bit]
- para 13 don't want to single out vulnerability and instead consider all elements of GGA
- On timeline we think we need something clear and succinct. Option 1, will not engage with options 2 or 3. We don't want a mandated list after the workshop
- List will go from the expert to the Parties. We can specify the role of the secretariat in tidying up the list
- No submissions. Want to engage through mandated workshop

Turkiye -

- Para 4 - prefer reference to second week of Sept 2025
- Para 5 option 1
- Focus should be on developing new indicators that re designed for adaptation and do not support indicators that are taken or only slightly modified for things that are not climate change
- Okay with cross-cutting
- Guidance and timelines - option 1
- Para 14 option b
- Para 15 option 1
- We support preparation of technical report
- Para 19 we think that parties submitting views should ensure transparency and accountability in the process

Japan -

- Para 5 option 1
- For second 6, b-f include political elements so they should eb avoided
- Consideration of these political elements should be started later
- On cross-cutting, these elements are also important, particularly the private sector being included
- After SB62 peer review between groups is necessary. July-August peer review, early Sept mandated workshop in hybrid mode
- Four weeks before COP30 publication of finalized indicator list

China obo LMDC -

- Align with G77
- Para 5, on "no more than 100" we want the 100 to involve MOI. In line with articles 9, 10, 11, and 13. Indicators are a package

- Para 5 options, we prefer option 1, and on b we want to delete "local and national" before contexts
- Delete option 2
- On refinement of current list, para 6 we want to add "recall para 24 in decision 3/CMA.6" which refers to national circumstances and country-driven process
- Para 7, there are sub-bullets but the needs and gaps of developing countries is missing
- For existing sub-bullet 3 under 7, we want to delete after first comma on national databases
- For second para 6, prefer to remove mitigation and loss and damage from current indicators
- For other sub-bullet f, from developed countries to developing countries should be added
- For option under f, we prefer option 1. Want revision for this para but generally we want to say that it's not only finance but tech transfer and capacity building
- For guidance on consideration of cross-cutting issues. We see many things related to most vulnerable groups, this is confusing for us. We noted and acknowledged that those groups belong to vulnerable groups with adverse impacts to climate change. Why point it out group by group. Instead streamline this section by saying vulnerable groups
- On timelines, we prefer option 2, and expert groups their work could be finalized by end of July
- Want o see the report two week prior to workshop, which could be held in September

Canada -

- Para 4, expert work will continue until Sept
- Para 5 we don't support adding a mention of one category of indicators over another so we don't support adding MOI indicators
- On options under 5 we support 1, sub para a we support AOSIS wording to "a small number"
- Para 6 we want to reframe to encourage experts to consider existing criteria
- Also support proposal to remove second para 6
- Work should remain technical and we caution against prescriptive criteria
- Para 9 we support intervention by Australia and EU
- On cross-cutting we suggest paras 10 and 11 are combined
- Keep para 12 and we think that para 13 is redundant so remove
- On timelines we prefer option 1
- We don't support a timeline where work ends before end of august
- We don't think there is time for an additional party and expert workshop prior to COP. Just the mandated workshop
- We support keeping the text consistent about final list of indicators

Cof -

- We are hearing a lot on the dates
- I think it would be good to take a step back and focus less on logistics and more on substance

- Sec will play its role in deciding when an event can take place and where
- Maybe shouldn't go into the nitty gritty at this point

New Zealand -

- On guidance - we support headline and sub indicators. Final list should be no more than 100. But we shouldn't place a number on the sub-indicators
- More helpful to have enough sub-indicators and not limit
- On refinement, in practice MOI will be a small part of total landscape of adaptation action. Domestic budget and private finance will also be important and we don't want to lose those
- Lack of data should not be the only reason to remove indicators from the list. New means of producing data for these indicators could develop
- On guidance - mandated workshop as late as possible. Gives experts time to refine the indicators. Should be hybrid. We prefer virtual additional workshops if we have them

Audi Arabia obo Arab Group -

- No issues with first 3. Would like to add a 4th paragraph that aligns with para 33 of 2/CMA.5 (MOI)
- Work of experts finalized by end of July, max. early Aug. Then submit them to the Sec
- Para 5, option 1
- We also don't understand the language of disaggregation and segregation
- On guidance we see our proposal missing. Exposure indicators should be removed. Indicators from other platforms should be reevaluated and refined for adaptation specifically. All indicators must reflect adaptation responses in the context of the technical goal. Indicators related to mitigation should be removed
- ON para ii for data availability we support the "other data" that LMDCs wanted to delete
- Agree with AGN on saying measurable instead of actionable
- On f we like option 1 and will provide our amendment to this option through the G77 and will not support option 2
- On g it is confusing
- On cross-cutting, whole text requires a streamlining. On para 13 we could not trace to any previous decision
- On guidance and timelines, we prefer option 2 with some amendments. Want to clarify the role of the Sec and we expect the Sec to ensure alignment with the criteria outline, identify redundancy across themes, ensure alignment with adaptation and 7.1
- After workshop we ask parties to send their thoughts on the list of indicators
- Then a synthesis report from Sec at least 2 weeks prior to Belem

Cof -

- You mentioned a mandated workshop and something else?

Arab Group -

- No, workshop and then submissions from Parties

Kyrgystan -

- Guidance should be given to experts for further refinement
- We emphasize relevance of indicators to measuring progress on adaptation including elements of 7.1 and the targets
- List of indicators should support development of outcome-oriented new indicators

Marshall Islands obo AOSIS -

- Will pick up from where I left off
- Want to add a new point under second para 6 asking experts to include MOI indicators under the dimensional targets. We think they should go under 10c. So we would expect to see headline MOI indicators such as finance, tech transfer, and cb
- Want to see menus of sub-indicators under each of these
- Para 7 should only refer to previous guidance rather than re-listing
- Data readiness or a plan for this assessment should be included in the final list of experts
- Something about specifying temp goal to "1.5 degree temp goal"
- On cross-cutting, paras 10 and 11 we are in strong agreement on inclusion of these elements
- We should be aligned with the latest ACE language on the support for the empowerment of children and young people
- On timelines, experts need at least one more in person engagement. Should be an in person expert workshop
- Option 1, para 14, experts will undertake quality control for clarity
- Para 15 should read "to enable the issuance of reports at least 3 weeks prior to the mandated workshop"
- Also request SB chairs to explore 1-2 days of expert only engagement in October. Also agree with no more submissions

India -

- Align with G77 and LMDC
- In preamble we want to add para 11 of 2/CMA.5 on country-driven nature
- Para 5 we would like to see language that states "well below 100" that of course includes MOI
- ON 5 option 1, bullet b we again want to qualify number of sub-indicators to small number of sub-indicators
- Also allow for disaggregation
- Prefer to delete option 2 in that para
- Para 7b we want to delete national databases. Also add a phrase on "data aggregated from national datasets"
- 7e, option 2 we want to see deleted on domestic budgeting
- on bullet i option 2 we want to see that deleted
- Paras 11 and 12 there is usage of status as indigenous people, we want to add local communities

Norway -

- Want to keep expert groups as long as possible, so prefer late sept
- Support option 1 in para 5
- [missed]
- Satisfied on cross-cutting
- Workshop as late as possible in para 15

Morocco -

- Align with G77 and AGN
- Just add briefly 2 points
- On second para 6c, it's true that indicators on impacts can be used in the scope of adaptation, we think these indicators can also be used to measure vulnerability reduction and resilience building so maybe they can be refined
- Support inclusion of cross-referencing of indicator on poverty eradication across all targets

Cof -

- Anyone else? no.
- We will suggest that we move on to next section on BAR

[After almost 2 hours they decided to go onto the BAR as the next section of the text. The G77 didn't seem prepared to talk about it and they requested they have time for a huddle. It was 9pm, we left]