Notes on UNFCCC Secretariat mandated workshop on GGA indicators

Oct. 3-4, 2025, Bonn

Notes by Axel Michaelowa and Kurt Straif
michaelowa@perspectives.cc; straif.kurt@gmail.com

Opening by SBI Chair Julia Gardiner:

- Hybrid WS of experts in Nairobi August, subsequent publication of list of 100 indicators and accompanying report on Sep. 1
- Aim of WS: discuss indicator list to facilitate decision in Belem, want to "largely accept" expert work
- Focus on enabling factors and MoI

Overview from group of 78 experts – Timo Leiter leading presentation

- Aims:
    - Reduce from 490 to 100 indicators
    - Cover all sub-components of the targets
    - Increase consistency, relevance to adaptation
- Process
    - Break down targets into sub-targets
    - Decide whether existing indicator can be used, existing indicators can be modified or an entirely new indicator needs to be developed
    - team of consistency checkers from different group of experts after Nairobi WS
    - Common template, with the following
        - Disaggregation levels
        - Sub-target / other targets the indicator is relevant
        - Metadata availability
        - Data availability
        - Unit
        - MoI
        - Enabling factors
    - Systematic collection and sharing of stakeholder inputs
    - Options for three (MoI) indicators where political decisions need to be made
    - More even allocation of indicators to targets
    - Nationally relevant, globally applicable
    - Many policy cycle indicators (10) are directly relevant for thematic targets (9)
    - Disaggregation approaches
        - Demographic categories (sex, age, migrants, IPs)
        - Thematic targets
        - Industrial sectors
        - Geographic (rural/urban, river basins, ecosystems
        - Hazard categories
- Key caveats
    - Trade-offs were unavoidable

    - Name of indicators is insufficient to understand the indicator, especially regarding disaggregation
    - No sub-indicators!
    - 22 indicators have both metadata and data available; 8 indicators have neither of them available, modification needed for 60, less availability for stronger disaggregation
    - Operationalization needs to be formalized by Parties, including process and timelines
        - Technical guidance (methodologies, data standards)
        - Adequate resources at national level
            - Capacity building of governments
        - Collaboration with custodian agencies of official data sources, especially national statistical offices
        - New indicators to engage entities with subject matter expertise
        - Mechanisms for peer exchange
        - Indicator not to be seen in isolation, but in combination with package
        - Regular review and update of indicator set

Discussion

- Botswana obo AGN:
    - Process: this is the last WS under this agenda item. Need to "further interrogate" / discuss the specific indicators and not just process
    - Answer by SBI Chair: no presentation on specific targets/indicators, possibility to engage during the break-out groups
- Australia
    - Expert input is strong basis for work
- Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group
    - Support AGN. Parties need to share input on indicator list as a whole
    - Discussion on final decision would be premature
- India
    - Process needs to be driven by Parties
    - Back and forth with experts would not be useful
- EU
    - Important improvement
    - Discuss with experts
        - Which indicators are in need of most further development?
        - What concrete next steps – who should do what?
        - Attribution to adaptation needs to be clearer
        - How to engage specifically with the indicator list?
- Palau obo AOSIS
    - Is it feasible to elaborate on modification needs regarding metadata?
    - Clarify concrete modification needs
- Burkina Faso obo LDCs
    - Appreciate consolidated list as significant achievement
    - Further work needed to apply indicators at national level

    - Is there enough representation from each expert group available for break out groups?

Answers from experts

- Sufficient number of experts available
- No use of term "adaptation attribution"
- Data readiness and feasibility was taken into account in selecting indicators
- Readiness of indicators is evenly spread across targets (9c and 10a is quite ready), but readiness differs across disaggregation levels
- Metadata development was beyond mandate and resources of expert group, but needs clearly defined in list
    - Use metadata from other processes as starting point (example from CBD where mitigation components need to be thrown out)
    - Work needs to be done by a dedicated group – one indicator needs ~7 pages
    - Need for guidance document how to use metadata for country level purposes (metadata "depth")
    - Formalization is needed to engage with custodian agencies

- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - Criteria / correct methodologies to engage with indicators
    - How can the indicators be aligned with NAPs and MELs, and reporting under GST2?
    - Local level plays important role – how can this be engaged with?
    - 10c06 metadata aligned to SDG 13 indicator of old finance goal, but not new one – adjustment needed
    - Need for readiness assessment after Belem
- India (Jairam)
    - Comprehensiveness or focus on essential elements?
    - Unclear regarding time required to increase readiness of application of indicators (beyond COP30)
    - Parties need space to reflect on indicators beyond expert workshop mode
- Botswana obo AGN
    - Remains unclear regarding process
    - Parties need to have substantive discussion on indicators!
    - Support Saudi Arabia and India – process for amendment of indicators?
    - Not able to engage in break out groups, need discussion in plenary first!

Expert response

- Balance ambition and pragmatism without losing meaningfulness of indicator!
- NAP technical guidelines have been rolled out, revision of NAPs is ongoing (77 countries so far) and allows alignment with indicators
- National aggregation of local information depends on national aggregation guidance – strong role of statistical offices

- Experts did not undertake data readiness assessment, but have provided basis for such an assessment (look at existing processes under Sendai)
- Time need depends on nature of the indicator, need to firm up metadata
    - Baku decision to update BTRs using GGA indicators – BTR2 due 2026, GST2 2027-28. Apply different time horizon depending on the readiness of indicators to enable use of as many indicators as possible already in BTR2.
    - Readiness phase could be completed by SB64 if group of experts is set up at COP30
- Diligent job – "comprehensive enough" list, "best 100 we could provide". But not "God's list", needs review and update, parties to decide on frequency.

- UK
    - Refrain from inputs on specific indicators
    - 9a01: are these metadata really available?
    - Cross-target indicators: 9b05: why duplicate finance here instead of having it in 10?
    - Indicators relating to people will require a lot of resources – has reporting burden been considered?
- Costa Rica obo AILAC
    - Why is MoI indicators mobilization and provision not specified
    - Custodian agencies – how define them? How can adequate resources be made available
    - Should a pilot be undertaken, and if yes how long?
- Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group
    - Supports AGN on process – not going for decision elements
    - Engagement of Parties for restructuring process
- China obo LMDC
    - New technologies to be transferred into practice – differentiation between developing and developed countries, additional burden for developing countries – NAP, NDC
    - Coverage of indicators relevant for global indicators
    - Clear arrangement for choice of indicators by targets
    - Support AGN re plenary instead of break-out groups to engage online participants (otherwise not inclusive enough)

Expert response
- Data availability – 9a01: global database already exists, 9a05: partially available – global database on some elements of this indicator; attribution needs refinement
- Custodian agencies could make modifications for GGA (example from Unicef)
- 10c four options: funding streams local level complementary – agriculture and food security is considered in PA preamble
- Reporting burden has not been addressed in detail, modification of existing indicators should be priority
- Custodian agencies of existing data collection processes can be brought in easily

- Recommend pilot for the 22 indicators where data are fully available, balanced across thematic targets [but the 22 are not balanced across thematic targets]
- SDG and Sendai framework end in 2030, GGA can help continuing data collections
- Data are to be always nationally reported and globally aggregated, not go for purely global top-down data, need for consistency – globally applicable statistical standards
- Country would only report indicators deemed relevant for it
- 10b09 is mainstreaming, not MoI indicator
- Focus was on measurable indicators

Plenary on indicator list as a whole / by target – questions 1) fit for purpose 2) priority issues for decision in Belem

- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - MoI indicators are key – total number is too low, anything **reporting on national budget is not an MoI indicator**, focus on access
    - Assess both action and support
    - Language in many cases is not aligned with ETF and NCQG, no overlap! Use what already has been agreed (under Art. 9 …, tabular format)
    - Options: **MoI indicators for each thematic target or cross-cutting, add MEL**
    - Eliminate overlap of adaptation and L&D
    - Move some indicators to other dimensions
- Japan (Yuko)
    - Japanese govt. is still checking each indicator, preliminary input
    - Indicators as a whole
        - Explanations are useful
        - Still ambiguous definitions
        - Majority of indicators currently not operationalizable in Japan
        - Happy to work on the basis of this list
        - Implementation without delay
- Norway
    - Solid foundation and good starting point for GST2
    - Avoid cherry-picking from the list
    - Norway does not yet have national indicator system
- Bhutan
    - Some hazards are missing (landslides)
    - Operationalization and capacity building critical
- Maldives
    - Capacity building in terms of MoI needs to be considered
    - Access to global (rather than local) funds
    - Indicator on CB is needed
    - 10c05: articulation of needs – thus CB indicator and not finance indicator
- China obo LMDC

    - Adaptation relevance needs to be ensured, **L&D indicators are not appropriate – e.g. mortality**
    - **Drought** indicator missing
    - MoI:
        - **national investment indicator is not appropriate**, thus delete
        - **Cover public funds only**
        - Options need to refer CBDR and previous decisions
    - Difficult to reflect indicators with new definitions (NBS)
    - Favour global reporting
- India
    - Support LMDC
    - Ready to engage with list
    - Preliminary input
        - No burden on parties
        - Not in state to accept all indicators, want to discuss specific indicators
            - **1. Acceptable (25), 2. Modification (reduce disaggregation), 3. Keep if pushed by other parties, 4. Excluded (35)**
            - Unclear definitions ("resilience" sometimes considering mitigation, as in agriculture)
            - **Intrusive and prescriptive policy indicators**
            - Lack of clarity on measurement
        - **Menu of options**
        - Parties to lead, **custodian organization are just supportive** (some custodian agencies are not bound by UNFCCC principles, eg equity)
    - Largely not ready for going ahead, explore modalities for going forward – refinement and then only operationalization
- Botswana obo AGN
    - Initial reflections, space needed beyond this workshop to engage with parties
    - List not ready for adoption in current state
    - **Relevance to MoI, enabling factors – columns are inappropriate as this is case for all indicators, delete**
    - Inconsistency of indicators regarding MoI – under dimensional and not thematic targets
    - Implicit relevant to MoI going against the guidance
    - Supports India regarding **overly prescriptive** (proportion of informal settlements …)
    - **NAPs are not defined top-down** (transboundary … NAPs inappropriate)
    - All MoI indicators need to refer to the three elements of guidance from SB62
- Australia
    - Imperfect, but good enough, more or less fit for purpose
    - Future review and update process for adjustment
    - Mainstreaming is key to progress – domestic mainstreaming indicators need to maintained, private sector engagement (2.1c, NCQG alignment)

    - Voluntary undertaking! Nothing mandatory or prescriptive… No need to revisit list as per Party preferences, any party can refrain from reporting
    - MoI, access and provision – disaggregation allows differentiation. GGA is not bifurcated (reference to Art. 7).
    - GST2 needs to be more informed regarding adaptation than GST1 – not let the perfect be enemy of the good
- Lesotho obo LDCs
    - Clarity of workplan that follows is critical
    - Welcome steps suggested by experts for future work
    - **Go for new indicators where data are yet unavailable**
    - Strike balance between ambition and pragmatism
    - **Framework for piloting**, to be improved over time
    - MoI is very important, capacity and finance are determining factor for success or failure – from aspirational to political tool indicators
    - Need to be realistic re capacities – **roll out those indicators that are immediately available for use after CMA7**
    - Enabling environment
- EU
    - List far from perfect, still complex, baselines and disaggregation challenging
    - Many specific improvement needs: Food: value chain as a whole, Health: selection of specific diseases is not globally valuable -> focus on climate-sensitive diseases, poverty: data sources unclear, more enablers, cultural heritage: all needs
    - Ambition vs pragmatism
    - Fit for purpose, but not ready for adoption as is, some not acceptable for EU
    - One-by one discussion or detailed editing not feasible
- Panama obo AILAC
    - Capacity available is critical
    - MoI focus currently limited, support Grupo Sur
    - Development or biodiversity fund could be diverted to adaptation
    - Standardized system for monitoring on adaptation finance
    - Baseline finance indicators needed; Resources mobilized vs provided
    - No new reporting burdens
    - No certainty that private sector will engage in adaptation finance
- Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group
    - List is not fit for purpose for measuring progress (Art 7.1, 1,5°C goal)
    - Measuring adaptation progress and MoI, **not L&D or impacts**, support LMDC, India and AGN
    - 9c01, 9c02: attributing change to adaptation is inaccurate
    - Failing to anchor list in context to temperature goal
    - 9d06-09 are statements and not measurable metrics
    - Some indicators highly linked to local context (9a04), define subgroups of globally applicable indicators
    - **Droughts** are missing

    - A lot of **finance indicators in thematic areas** that are inappropriate
    - Discuss target-by-target
- Japan
    - Oppose bifurcation, support Australia
    - Public, private and domestic financing needs to be covered
    - Private sector financing – investment opportunities exist in adaptation
    - Respect outcome of expert work, as Parties mandated them (100 indicators)
    - Encourage voluntary reporting, not to have perfect list for reporting by all Parties
- India
    - Party driven process, not expert-driven
    - Support AGN
    - GGA work ongoing process, GGA is for all, puzzled by voluntary reporting (Japan) find agreement**, pick indicators as work goes along,**
- Turkey
    - Children and youth-specific indicators (10c03 – 10b01 – 9c01)
    - Further work needed re adding specifics about children and youth
- Palau obo AOSIS
    - Not in a position to give definitive AOSIS view
    - Distinction between MoI and non-MoI indicators
    - Not appropriate to open specific indicator wording (beyond MoI negotiations)
    - Support LDCs on capacity building support need

Expert responses

- Taking into account temperature scenarios – progress indicators fundamentally disconnected with assessing the future
- Impact indicators are necessary to understand as precondition whether they have been reduced – 10a defines hazards (risk assessment allows country to specify any hazard deemed relevant) , 10c – reducing impacts
- Global assessments vs NAPs – national indicators to be formulated taking into account the global indicators, no replacement of the former by the latter

- India
    - Point of order, experts have no role here
    - SBI chair: experts provide further clarification, they are not negotiating

Break-out groups opposed by AGN, Saudi Arabia, LDC, chair notes that previous WS was criticized for too much time in plenary, but gives in and continues plenary

- China obo LMDC
    - MoI are priority, reflect CBDR-RC, Art. 7.1 PA
    - National investment not in global layer
    - NBS indicators concerning
    - Some not relevant to adaptation, don't include adaptation co-benefits

- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - Procedures: by dimension or by indicator? Chair: by indicator
    - Water: delete 9a10, adaptation mainstreaming already covered elsewhere
    - Food, delete 9b04 (same reasons), delete 9b05 on MoI, delete 9b07, 9b10 as these are L&D-related
- EU
    - Adaptation targets, not finance targets, need to be global and aligned with PA
    - Locally-led, CBA, NBS
    - How to engage before COP30?
- Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group
    - Support Grupo Sur
    - Water: delete 9a01, 9a04 only relevant for some countries, 9a09 difficult to define
    - Food: 9b04: too vague and hard to verify, 9b07-11 are all L&D, attribution challenge

Chair: Not "go down rabbit hole" discussing every single indicator… Key topics summary: MoI in dimensional targets only, should L&D be covered?, duplication, feasibility on local level, pertinent to GGA?

- UK
    - Not tweak specific indicators
    - Timing challenge
    - leverage BTR2 and GST2
    - Reporting needs to be feasible and start quickly after COP30
    - Options
        - **Phased implementation in stages**, experts to flag indicators that can be developed quickly
        - **Simplified list** adopted in Belem
- Botswana obo AGN
    - Water: 9a10 already covered under 10b – delete
    - Food: 9b04 already covered under 10 a – delete, delete 9b05 (finance, but not MoI as considering national budget)
- India
    - Major portion of indicators is not ready to go, settling issues needs time
    - Level of disaggregation, some intrusive
    - If voluntary or no objective content, not clear it is useful
    - Water: 9a02 only part of menu,
    - 9a04 optional
    - 9a05-06 delete, 9a07-10 acceptable subject to minor changes
- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - Health: delete 9c05, is L&D
    - 9c09, covered via disaggregation (in first dimension)
    - 9c10, make it part of dimensional target

    - Ecosystems: 9d10: qualitative assessment instead of just counting
- Saudi Arabia
    - Health: support Grupo Sur re deletion of 9c05,
    - 9c01 exposure and impact – adaptation? Reword as changes in mortality.
    - rewording 9c02, delete 9c03, 9c04 delete – just impact; delete 9c06 (too prescriptive), 9c07 SDG, not GGA-relevant
    - Ecosystems: delete 9d06 lacks transparency, 9d07, difficult – revise;
    - 9d08, 09 rewording area restored
- China obo LMDC
    - Water: amend 9a09 as too data intensive
    - Food: amend 9b02 too prescriptive, lack of resources for reporting
    - 9b05-09 suffer from attribution gap – replace by "improved varieties"
    - Health: 9c04-05 need to be simplified – knowledge disseminated to public; knowledge enhancement about disease
    - Ecosystems: delete 9d01, 03: disaggregation difficult b/o mixed landscape, remove
    - 9d06, delete 9d10 – specific criteria for NBS
    - Settlements: delete 9e02, 03, 06, 07, (9e06-7 only applicable to EU)
    - Poverty: combine 9f01-03, delete 06 (or needs amendment)
    - Cultural heritage: amend 9g03, 06
    - In response to CH question, China needs more time to reflect on other indicators
- Lesotho obo LDC
    - Preliminary analysis, as a package
    - Delete 10b09-10 (national budget)
    - Delete 9a08 as it is not climate relevant
- India
    - 9b06-08 term "climate-related drivers and events" problematic
    - 9c02, Problems with, calculation by one institute (Heidelberg)
    - 9c06, relation with GGA?
    - Problems with 9d01-03 (NBS issues), 06 (new indicator requires discussion), 10 relevance of NPAs, NDCs?
- Azerbaijan
    - India cannot be understood, need written input with detailed explanation
- Botswana obo AGN
    - Health: delete 9c04, shift 9c08 to 10a, 9c10 make more specific towards climate change and health
    - Ecosystems: Not be prescriptive re NBS, amend 9d10 as NAPs are not NDCs
- EU
    - Not in place to amend, as not in negotiations
    - Support LDCs regarding indicators being a set, maybe phase in
    - 10b09-10 are critical, in line with NCQG

Expert response

- 9a08: useful indicator of overall progress of adaptation, spanning various targets

Chair summary of day 1: This is a workshop, not formal negotiation session. No specific proposals on the table, just exchange of views. Views shared will be considered in the WS report. Discuss scenarios of subset indicator lists (22 data ready indicators), phased approach.

- Botswana obo AGN:
    - wants explanations on background of data readiness

Expert response: Column L in Excel file provides data availability info (perception by experts)

- Botswana obo AGN:
    - Not satisfied. Better focus on indicators that are relevant.

- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur: agree on programme of Day 2
    - Cover whole indicator list discussion in the morning, MoI in afternoon

Opening by SBI Chair Julia Gardiner on structure of **day 2:**

- Comments on remaining three thematic targets
- Comments on dimensional targets
- MoI
- Ways forward

Comments on 9e,f,g (settlements, poverty and cultural heritage)

- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - Settlements: Move 9e02 to planning dimension, move 9e03 to ERAS (10a), disaggregate by sector and hazard, 9e04 "implemented" instead of planned, more disaggregation levels, delete 9e07 as covered in 9e03,
    - Poverty: Delete 9f01-03 as meth for all parties will take long time,
    - Cultural heritage: 9g01 delete non-listed cultural sites; delete 9g03 as not needed, merge 9g04 with 9g05, 9g08
- EU
    - Clustering of indicators
    - Clarify how to further engage
    - Mainstreaming is important
    - 9b04, 9d10, 9e02 need to be kept
    - 9e06 goes beyond taxonomies and needs to be kept
- Palau obo AOSIS
    - Fuller AOSIS position will be available by Belem
    - Careful assessment of cultural heritage
        - Non-tangible heritage and non-UNESCO sites need to be covered by indicators

- Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group
    - Settlements: Delete 9e02 and 04, 9e03 difficult – modify; delete "resource allocations" from 9e05, delete 9e06 as policy prescriptive, move 9e07 to 10a and reword it include NAPs, policies and strategies
    - Poverty: Delete 9f01-07 (varying reasons, not adaptation, not aligned with GGA); 9f08-9 retain when reworded
- India
    - Ecosystems: Delete 9d01 as too broad.
    - Settlements: Delete 9e01 locally-led and co-designed as intrusive and policy prescriptive, delete 9e02 as transboundary risk should not be covered, delete 9e03 as tipping points and adaptation risk terminology is controversial, delete 9e05 as NBS and EbA is too narrow
    - Poverty: do not have final position – lowering vulnerability is adaptation and indicators should reflect this
    - Cultural heritage: do not like intangible heritage, oppose 9g08
- Australia
    - Moving from thematic to policy targets could be ok
    - Deletion on technical arguments does not make sense as there are always technical counterarguments, impossible to resolve these
    - Not to discuss what one does not want to see
    - Want to retain indicators on mainstreaming including domestic work, NBS, transboundary, cultural heritage
- Japan
    - Support Australia
    - Refrain from changes in the list
    - Retain
        - NBS and EbA
        - Private sector
        - Mainstreaming
- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - Retain 9e02 transboundary, move it to planning section and generalize it beyond current theme, disaggregate by geography
- Botswana obo AGN
    - Settlements: 9e01 delete "locally led and co-designed" not agreed by UNFCCC, 9e02 delete "infrastructure", broaden to water, and to put into planning, delete 9e03 b/o tipping points), 9e04 include "implementation", 9e05 remove NBS and resource allocations, delete 9e06 due to MoI issues
    - Poverty: 9f01-03 should replace "exposure" by "vulnerability", delete 9f05 - increase capacity of private enterprises, delete 9f07 how to cover most vulnerable, affordability of premiums, 9f09 – define disaggregation levels
- India
    - 9e06: "taxonomies" do not conform with climate finance definition under UNFCCC
    - Views of experts cannot be binding for Parties

    - 9f, Want menu of options as referred to in para 20b of 3/CMA.6
    - Not forcing all parties into straitjacket of 100 indicators
- Palau obo AOSIS
    - Mandate to include transboundary risk in CMA.5 decision – support AGN in transboundary water mgt, but need to incorporate ocean issues
    - EbA are critical for SIDS and biodiversity convention, and AR6 IPCC
    - Indicators are voluntary!
- Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group
    - List is not an academic product
    - Parties need to change list
- Colombia obo AILAC
    - Absence of baseline or metadata should not be a reason to exclude indicators
    - Not limit work to indicators used in other processes
    - Biodiversity-related indicators are indispensable, NBS should be further strengthened
    - Delete 9d06 as unlikely to be measurable, reword 9d10 as NDCs are not instrument to report progress
    - Support Grupo Sur 9e02 – planning dimension
    - Delete 9b05, 9e06 oppose mixing of public and private finance
    - Delete 9f05-06
    - Finance indicators need to reflect provision of finance to developing finance
    - Oppose indicators on domestic funding
    - Number of documents is not a good indicator
    - Which other elements are needed to take decision at CMA.7, for refining and advancing GGA in future
- China obo LMDC
    - Support Arab Group and India
    - Detailed proposals on all indicators, simplify descriptions
    - Guidance too detailed
- Sudan obo LDC
    - Not able to engage as analysis of current list not completed
    - Wanted to understand the exclusion of indicators
    - What process to address concerns?
    - Political exercise, supported by best science
    - Take as a package, ask experts to discuss implication of removal of specific indicators
- EU
    - Supports LDCs, implications of removal of indicators?
    - 35 deletions proposed / priority to retain those that measure progress on targets;
    - Para 10 targets are critical:
        - 10b cross-cutting considerations on gender, children,…
        - Reflect on disaggregation levels

        - MoI and enablers need to be well balanced
- Botswana obo AGN
    - Transboundary reflected in indicator name specifically (e.g. 9a04), support AOSIS
    - Intangible cultural heritage needs to be covered

Session on indicators on para 10 (dimensional) targets

- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - Cross-cutting considerations : one could have developed indicators for each element of the decision
        - Gender and IPs should be reflected in the entire package
    - Delete 10c02-04 as L&D
    - 10a09: definition of "up to date"? Disaggregation beyond economic sectors needed
    - 10d05: institutional capacity needs to be defined
- Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group
    - Delete 10a07, 10c02-03 as L&D
    - 10a10 add developed to developing countries
    - 10b03 aligned with MoI indicators,
    - Delete 10b06-07 as referencing national budgets, as well as 10b08-10
    - 10c04 not adaptation
    - 10c06 - Support Options 3 and 4
    - Delete 10c07 as national budget
    - Support 10c08 Option2
    - Delete 10d04-05 as national budget or difficult
- India
    - 10a01 reconsider high specificity
    - 10a02 define "understandable", 10a05 too specific
    - Support Saudi Arabia regarding L&D indicator deletion
    - Delete 10b02, support Saudi re 10b03 (rewording) and deletion of 10b07-10 which are intrusive, 10b06 definition of "local" can vary
    - Delete 10c01, "degree of implementation " problematic
    - Support 10c06 Option 4 ambiguous
    - Delete 10c07 as intrusive
    - 10c8 still reflecting on involvement of private sector
    - Support 10c09 Option 1
    - Problems with all MEL (10d) indicators as intrusive
- China obo LMDC
    - Many indicators are ambiguous, duplications -> MoI discussion
    - Delete national budget indicators
    - Delete L&D indicators
    - Delete 10a02 as ambiguous, 10a05 too specific (not one threshold)

    - Combine 10b01 and 02, amend 10b03 according to convention, delete 10b09-10 (national budget)
    - 10c01 “degree” difficult to operationalize
    - 10c06, 8 will come back w/ MoI
    - Delete 10d04-05 “level” and “sufficient” difficult to operationalize, duplication w/ targets
    - Gender is only one of vulnerable groups, be inclusive (eg IP)
- Sudan obo LDC
    - Combine 10b01 and 02
    - 10b04-05 capture via disaggregation levels – expert clarification?
- UK
    - Indicators on enablers are important
    - Generally happy with most indicators in section 10, eg 10a, 10d01-4
    - 10b experts clarification
    - 10c -> MoI
    - Get more coherent understanding
        - Data availability and readiness as key criterion
        - Which new indicators could be implemented quickly from a technical perspective?
    - Process
        - Which indicators can be agreed in principle? start implement > COP30
        - Which indicators require further technical work?
- EU
    - Support Grupo Sur on cross-cutting
    - Global applicability of 10a10 and 10b03 is critical
    - Gender responsiveness, IP knowledge important
    - 10a01 and 02 and 09 are very important
    - 10b01-02, 04-05 are very important
    - National budget indicators are very important
    - 10d04 -mainstreaming - critical
- Botswana obo AGN
    - Delete 10a05
    - 10b02 needs to reflect adaptation, 10b03 international public finance, delete 10b07-08, 10, national budgets
    - 10c via MoI
    - Support India on simplification of 10d indicators
- Marshall Islands obo AOSIS
    - 10c03-04 talk about how adaptation works, as a proportion of GNP
    - Distinct groups should be named in disaggregation, thus support 10b04
- India
    - 10d “hangs on a single reference”, metadata are sparse
- Australia
    - Most important part of work

    - 10a: all indicators are adaptation relevant
    - 10b: legislation and national budgets are informative, concern on 10b03 re bifurcation risk, 10b04 important
- Sri Lanka obo G77
    - MoI indicators do not reflect access, quality, adaptation finance (SB62 criteria)
    - Domestic finance is a clear departure from PA

Observers

- RINGOs
    - Urges Parties to
        - Ensure that a critical mass of indicators for each thematic target survives "deletion spree"
        - Not reject indicators because data are not yet available
        - Retain indicators that allow to assess adaptation effectiveness over time and not discard them as "L&D indicators"
- Water Convention
    - Transboundary water management is referred in 36% of NAPs
- UN Human Rights
    - Tiers of indicators under SDG – allowed improvement over time
    - Centralized database with harmonized templates and submission protocols
    - Human rights to be considered in all indicator via diaggregation
- Women and Gender
    - Commends 10b04 and 10b05
    - Cross-cutting consideration requires locally-led adaptation
    - Women access to climate finance
- YOUNGO
    - Vulnerable groups (children) across all thematic target areas
    - Disaggregation level is key
    - 9a05-6, 9, 9b08,9 9c01, 8, 10a07, absence of specific indicator on education
    - Need specific indicator on education (9e01 – reference)
    - New indicator % of education facilities (parallel to 9c06)
    - Start use of indicators directly after COP30
    - New mandate for metadata development and support to generate capacity
- IISD (Emilie Beauchamp)
    - National MEL systems are critical
    - 100% of NAPs mention MEL, 73% include a MEL framework
    - Supports Women and Gender
    - ETF review 2028 as anchor for improvement
- ENGOs
    - MoI backbone for achieving GGA
    - Insufficient MoI indicators
    - Shift away from harmful finance, eg from agrochemical to eco-agriculture

    - Delete private sector indicators 10c08 and national budget
    - Need clear process for way forward
- UNICEF
    - Disaggregation by age, sex and disability in all relevant indicators
    - Continuation of technical work desired
- IUCN
    - Keep 9d07 and 08, NBS
    - Integrate EbA in NAPs

Expert responses

- Implication of deletions
    - Interlinkages between targets
    - Disaggregation captures specific situations
    - Combination of different indicators is important
    - Components could be lost through deletions
    - **Time series of indicator, its change, shows adaptation effectiveness** (see column F)
    - Targets link outputs and outcomes – indicators are set covering both
    - There are no pure "L&D" indicators. All are critical to assess effectiveness of adaptation over time.
    - Ecosystems – 9d: red list are highly accepted
    - Settlements – 9e: look at rationales for each indicator. Consensus that all indicators are necessary.
    - Poverty - 9f: all indicators are intertwined. 9f01-03 allow tiered information on vulnerabilities according to national circumstances. 9f07 is important for agriculture and infrastructure -> decision to centralize this under 9f
    - Cultural heritage – 9g: little data currently available. UNESCO now starts collecting data
    - EWS – 10a: 4 pillars of multihazard early warning system include: information, monitoring, dissemination, action – 100 countries have adopted the "Common Alerting Protocol"
    - Planning – 10b: ambition difficult to measure. Already almost all countries have some adaptation planning instrument
    - 10b01-02, national planning instrument different ways of showing indicator foto
    - Implementation - 10c: Reduction of social and economic impacts – key for adaptation
    - MEL – 10d: indicator guided by the target, 10d06 wanted to assess financial resources
    - 10d05 originally 2 indicators, but 101 indicators – merged

Session on MoI and enablers

- Botswana obo AGN

    - Implementation – 10c: 10c01 disaggregated by level of implementation (started, under implementation, completed), 10c06 Option 4 preferred, delete 10c07-08 as not aligned with Art. 9 PA, 10c09 Option 1, 10c10-11 should become real capacity building indicator
- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - 2 approaches to MoI 1) MoI included in finance etc 2) mixed approach: included and separated, eg 9b05
    - Capacity building – 9g06 as example – clarify the source, 10c09 delete "including" – else not entirely MoI
    - 10a10 as anchor – language from 5/CMA.3 tabular format for ETF, "financial support provided, mobilized through public interventions , by developed countries and other countries that provide support … and financial support received by developing countries .." same language for all four dimensions (10b03, …, new indicator for 10d)
    - Add indicators for access – e.g. average time between proposal and first disbursement, etc.
- China obo LMDC
    - MoI Important umbrella, should be aligned w/ PA
    - Support AGN on 10c06 option 4, 10c08 both options to be deleted, 10c09 Option 1 supported, use language of 10c06 Option 4 for all other MoI indicators
- Marshall Islands obo AOSIS
    - Support G77
    - Oppose private sector or national funding indicators
    - Need indicators for quality, quantity, access, CB and tech support
- Sudan obo LDCs
    - Support G77 and Grupo Sur
    - Support 10c06 option 4, delete 10c07 NAP not relevant to PA
    - Support AGN on CB indicators
- Australia
    - MoI indicators should allow all parties to respond
    - Access and provision is not purely developing country issue
    - Indicators need to provide global picture, resources from all sources, explore national resources by disaggregation, else not consistent w/ Art 7!
- EU
    - No bifurcation
    - No duplication of ETF process
    - 10c06-08 as well as MEL speaking to quality and access; some options not acceptable
- Japan
    - No bifurcation
    - Art. 9 not applicable to UAE Framework
    - 10c06 Option 3 and 4 opposed
    - 10c07-8 Option 2 supported

    - Thematic MoI indicators to be maintained
- India
    - Support LMDC, Art 9.1 adaptation should not be distinct from Art 7
- Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group
    - Support G77, CBDR-RC
    - Alignment with Art. 9.1, … clearly differentiate between developing countries
    - Oppose reference to other countries
    - Support Option 3 and 4 of 10c06
    - 10c07 support LDCs,
    - Option 2 of 10c08
    - Option 1 of 10c09
    - Remove all references to policy instruments and taxonomies across indicators
    - Other columns in excel are purely expert opinions and not endorsed by Parties, misaligned w/ GGA Art 9
- UK
    - Global view
    - Public and private finance both to be counted
    - Private finance needs to be measured as precondition for its increase
    - Domestic finance reporting is not easy, but critical
    - Alignment with NCQG – reporting on voluntary basis
    - 10c06 support Option 1, 10c09 support Option 2
- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - Not reinterpret PA, bifurcation is in Art. 7 PA, cross-reference to art 9-11
    - Disaggregation levels are critical – cross-cutting considerations need to brought in
- Bhutan
    - Retain 9a04

Session on way forward

- Chair
    - Mandatory reporting in art 9
    - No Party opposed the list as a basis of negotiation
    - Indicator-by-indicator negotiation will not get to a decision at COP30
    - Only formal action before COP30: summary report of the workshop
    - Way forward, how to categorize indicators, full package w/o all columns, indicators ready to go, further development of indicators…
    - Summary of workshop (tentative, inclusion later opposed by India):
        - Thematic: 3 indicators had no comments, 17 to be modified, 15 deleted, 2 moved, 28 had conflicting comments
        - Dimensional: 6 indicators no comment, 10 modified, 24 conflicting
- Australia
    - Deletion category should go in conflicting category

    - No mandate allows work by experts between now and Belem
    - Parties to define **red lines**
    - Australia very flexible for those indicators outside its red lines
    - Voluntary use for better informed GST2
    - **Iterative** improvement trajectory!
- Brazil (Presidency view)
    - Crossing bridge from technical to political process in this WS
    - Adaptation is daily reality for millions
    - At COP30 lay ground for long term vision on adaptation
    - Momentum for adaptation strong already today, indicators may help to keep momentum
    - Voluntary nature of the entire framework
    - Integrating of cross-cutting considerations, mutirao of all groups
    - COP outcome: **Clear, workable and fair** indicators – instructions to shape adaptation actions and support
- India
    - Not to present the Secretariat's piechart on number of agreed etc. indicators in the report (unbalanced counting)
    - Agreement on **100 indicators not feasible**
    - Room for agreement on a **basic set of indicators (n=22), minimum text**
    - **Further work** on those indicators where data are not yet available within 6 months after Belem (collaborative parties-experts) OR Parties only??
    - Throw out **generally opposed indicators,** others consultations on way to COP30
    - Comprehensiveness cannot be achieved, but process to drive GGA and GST2
- UK
    - Indicators: **clustered** approach, specific criteria for minimum set- thematic, data availability, helping countries in BTR reporting…
    - Implementation of framework: define **rules and responsibilities** – AC, PCCB,TCCN, align with GST cycle, reviews, iterative process
- Uruguay obo Grupo Sur
    - Ambitious and **balanced** list needs to be achieved regarding subcomponents, cross-cutting issues, readiness criteria problematic
    - Additional **methodological work** by "somebody" needed for all indicators (data readiness, CB)
    - Avoid additional burden
    - Potential clusters: MoI, L&D/impacts, disaggregation, mitigation-related, transboundary issues, NBS
    - Approaches: Delete, merge, adjust language
- Costa Rica obo AILAC
    - Need a Decision at CMA7: adoption of minimum list indicators is only one component, common denominator for reporting, further advance GGA in future
    - MoI: support G77 – support provided and access

    - Reporting: establishment of **minimum set** of indicators, but not 22 indicators with data as they are not sufficiently balanced
    - Full list: **further refine** those indicators that could be adopted in the near future
    - No explicit agreement on those indicators on which AILAC did not comment!
    - Invitation to custodian agencies to be expressed by COP30
    - Efforts towards targets voluntary, Comparison of vulnerability of countries is not in line with para 11 dec. 2/CMA.5, just **measure collective progress** to GGA!
- Botswana obo AGN
    - Prescriptiveness, lack of adaptation specificity, concepts outside PA characterize some indicators
    - MoI, link art 7 to art 9-11
    - All indicators have an MoI implication (columns NOP) remove empty columns
    - Next steps, report will capture **views of parties**, expert only to inform Parties
    - No clustering on readiness (no clear methodology), or thematic groups
- Chair
    - data availability not criteria, take that into account which are ready to go, w/o restriction to those
- EU
    - collective starting point, as a set, all targets
    - Reflect offline how we can move forward, report to include views of experts, that some countries had no deep dive yet
    - Belem agenda, make use of existing mechanisms, deadline towards GST2, be realistic,
- Sudan obo LDC
    - report to be balanced of views of all the groups,
    - Minimum threshold of success, package of aspiration
    - How to move forward with not-ready indicators
    - Strong MoI indicator are key
- Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group
    - Serious concerns with several indicators – needs clarity in the summary report, adaptation relevance, indicators for deletion, no comments, expert views may be mentioned,
    - Focused consultation process launched by Presidency or SBI secretariat
    - Develop minimum for a coherent list
    1. Flexible menu of options for selection
    2. reaffirm voluntary nature
    3. indicators must inform countries on progress towards GGA
    4. avoid any additional burden of reporting
    5. parties should be able to report according to their national specifics
    6. developed countries to provide support
    7. pilot phase (role of secretariat?), how long

8. may include indicators in NAPs
9. review of indicators after GST2
    - Will provide all inputs in writing to facilitate life of chairs

- Marshall Islands
    - What criteria (not readiness)
    - Room for refinement of MoI indicators
    - How technical work should continue after Belem
- Morocco
    - aligns with AGN
    - Matter of urgency (after 4 yrs form start), ambitions and feasibility
    - Adaptation is a global emergency, countries are financing their own adaptation on cost of development
- Korea
    - Current list should be workable
- China
    - Clear rationale for deletion, proposals for amendments etc in report to inform further negotiations
    - Indicator acceptance in Belem is not end, but start
    - Guidance for use of indicators important
    - Minimum set to avoid additional burden
    - Voluntary based on national circumstances
    - MoI important, from developed to developing countries
    - NAP closely related to GGA; NDC have also role
- India
    - still big divide, welcome engagement
    - realistically prepared for hard achievements, don't have too high expectations, lower expectation,
    - not trapped in comprehensiveness, but also not only 22, balanced across thematic targets
- Australia
    - suggested deletions only a subset,
    - all columns useful, particularly disaggregation, country specificity
    - New indicators at Belem highly problematic
    - Skeptical on pick and choose, next to none remaining, approximate a package of 100, disaggregated, columns to resolve sensitive issues
- Norway,
    - come to Belem w/ flexibility
    - After Belem gain more insights with voluntary reporting
- Chair
    - reassurance of factual report, initial reflections, not final decisions, no mandate to make changes to technical report or xls sheet,
    - Clustered approach, staged approach, for use right away, but readiness not only criteria, strong desire to come to an agreement
    - Presidency consultation, and pre-COP meeting in 2 weeks