



Work on the Global Goal on Adaptation advances with negotiations on draft text

Belem, 14 November (Eqram Mustaqeem) – Parties at the Belem climate talks on the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) agenda item under the UNFCCC's Subsidiary Bodies [SBs], delivered a strong start on the first day of informal consultations held on 11 Nov, culminating with a mandate given to the co-facilitators to produce a draft text. Since then, Parties have been engaging in providing inputs to the draft. [See further details below].

[There are three mandates that Parties have to deliver under the GGA. First, is the two-year 'UAE-Belém Work Programme (UBWP) on indicators' as per decision [2/CMA.5](#); second, is to develop the modalities for the Baku Adaptation Roadmap (BAR) as per decision [3/CMA.6](#); and lastly to continue consideration on 'transformational adaptation' as per decision 2/CMA.5.]

The focus of the informal consultations is largely on the work on indicators in the UBWP as the two-year work programme will end here in Belém and Parties have to come to a decision on the adoption of the indicators, which is critical in understanding what progress Parties are making on the adaptation front.

At the very start of the consultations, the message from the Presidency and SB Chairs were

conveyed by the co-facilitators **Tina Kobilšek (Slovenia)** and **Gao Xiang (China)**, who made clear that the GGA agenda item is a priority for the CMA [Meeting of Parties to the Paris Agreement]. They said a decision has to be reached with an early preparation of a draft text as being important. Parties in their response all provided the mandate to the co-facilitators to come to a solid list of indicators.

During the consultations, there were both strong points of convergence and divergence. On the former, it was agreed among the indicators should be voluntary and not constitute a basis of comparison among countries and should serve the purpose of assessing progress towards the GGA targets and to the global stocktake (GST) process to assess the collective progress on adaptation. While it was agreed that the list of indicators are not perfect and require further work, in issue is what to do with the final list of indicators and the modalities of further work where there were significant differences. Political differences also arose on how certain indicators are framed particularly on the means of implementation [MOI] indicators and methodological differences on the mode of further work.

[The [list of indicators](#) was published on

September 11 and a 2 day [workshop on indicators](#) between technical experts and Parties was held on 3 to 4 October, where Parties had their first opportunity to engage and share reflections on the final list of indicators to the technical experts who developed them.]

[The GGA thematic targets cover water, food and agriculture, health, ecosystems and biodiversity, infrastructure and human settlements, poverty eradication and livelihoods and protection of cultural heritage, while the dimensional targets are impact, vulnerability and risk assessment, planning, implementation and monitoring, evaluation and learning.]

Apart from the GGA, informal consultations also began on National Adaptation Plans (NAPs).

GLOBAL GOAL ON ADAPTATION

Sri Lanka, speaking for the **G77 and China** set the tone for the discussions, stating the need to address hard realities of access, quality and provision of adaptation finance in light of evolving needs of developing countries and called for developed countries to deliver on such finance. The Group expressed its concern that the current list of indicators are not fully aligned with the guidance provided by Parties at SB62, particularly regarding the MOI indicators.

The Group reiterated that MOI indicators are a core component of the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience, and are non-negotiable and must be aligned with Articles 9.1, 10, and 11 of the Paris Agreement [PA] and to track international support flows from developed to developing countries. It also stressed that indicators should remain focused on the core objectives of Article 7.1 of the PA and on measuring clear adaptation progress and implementation without merging with loss and damage or other metrics, while avoiding duplication with other processes under the Convention and its PA.

Uruguay for **Groupo Sur** made clear that the adoption of the indicators would be their priority here at COP30. The group called for focus on indicators of finance, technology and capacity building with a particular emphasis on the finance indicators as they are not aligned with guidance given on MOI indicators. It also called for the

deletion of indicators that are not aligned with the Convention and its PA and emphasised that MOI indicators should apply to all targets. It believed that the Biennial Transparency Reports (BTR) should be the main vehicle to report on indicators with reporting to begin in 2026.

The group proposed a “Belém Climate Pact”, that urges developed countries to triple the provision of adaptation finance to developing countries from 2025 level by 2030, reaching at least USD 120 billion by 2030.

Botswana, for the **African Group (AG)**, stated that indicators must be outcome-oriented and contextually disaggregated to allow for the collective assessment of progress. It said that some indicators were inconsistent with guidance provided since SB60 and the Convention and the PA. It said that some indicators effectively amount to rewriting the legal treaties by shifting obligations to those least responsible for the climate crisis such as the indicators on the “Proportion of government budget allocated to climate adaptation and resilience” and on “annual adaptation finance expenditure”

The AG emphasised that these types of indicators risk normalising expectations that developing countries who are already managing debt and fiscal stress are to finance adaptation from their own resources. It said further that some indicators intrude upon sovereign decision making and policy space such as the indicator for considering climate risk in public procurement.

It also said that technical experts have completed their work and now this work must be complemented by the consideration by Parties to align it with obligations and provisions of the Convention and PA.

It outlined several elements moving forward; affirming the distinction and elaboration of the use of thematic targets and dimensional targets; thematic indicators should be a menu of options from which countries select based on national priorities, whereas dimensional targets represent a set of minimum information reported by all countries to enable collective assessment. It also proposed the launch of a two-year policy process to consider the indicators and align them with the obligations and provisions of the UNFCCC and PA

and ensure policy relevance. This process would allow for further considerations of the indicators with the aim of recommending a decision and adoption at CMA9 in 2027.

Sudan for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), raised similar concerns that the indicators are not aligned with the Convention and the PA. In relation to the technical experts, it said that given the huge institutional memory and familiarity with the process, it requested the Secretariat to create a roster of experts and that this roster should be made available on the UNFCCC website and be a resource that Parties can draw on to further understand the indicators in the list. In terms of the next stage of work, the group believed that it should focus on deepening the technical foundation of the indicators to ensure usability and consistency between Parties.

It requested the Adaptation Committee (AC) in collaboration with the UNFCCC's Consultative Group of Experts (CGE) to lead the next stage of technical refinement including through the establishment of technical task forces for each GGA target. These taskforces should be mandated to develop a workplan over an agreed timeline to deliver strengthened methodology, improve metadata and enhance overall robustness of the indicators by CMA9.

It also suggested that the AC draw upon the aforementioned roster of experts and call on international organisations, and UN agencies to support the refinement process. It also requested that the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) to provide additional guidance on integrating the indicators into NAPs.

On adaptation finance, the group supported the proposal of the tripling of provision of climate finance for adaptation from 2025 levels by 2030.

China for the Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDC), stated that the MOI indicators should encompass all targets under the GGA, with particular language of provision from developed to developing countries. It opposed how certain MOI indicators are currently framed in the list such as those touching on national budgets and national expenditures as these are nationally determined and are not under the purview of the Convention and the PA, and should be removed. Instead, it

called for all MOI indicators to align with Articles 9, 10, and 11 of the PA, with the common but differentiated responsibilities and respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC) as the crucial guiding principle for GGA implementation. [Articles 9 refers to the finance obligations, 10 on technology transfer and 11 on capacity-building.]

On the metadata availability and readiness, China said that that Parties, particularly developing countries may not be able to provide all the data needed for reporting on the indicators. Hence, the indicators need to be revised to ensure that they accommodate the challenges, needs, and gaps for the implementation of the GGA for developing countries.

On the BAR, the LMDC believed that it is a crucial mechanism for the way forward for the implementation of the GGA in general as there has only been a short two-year span for the development of the indicators. The BAR can focus on the further testing of the indicators through the practitioners and relevant stakeholders and be a platform for further reflection by Parties for further the refinement of the indicators, it added further.

Chile for the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC) said that the lack of metadata should not be a reason to exclude indicators, and it is important to retain indicators that have never been measured before as this would enable Parties to generate relevant data in the future to better assess adaptation needs. It wanted a decision at CMA7 that would both enable the adoption of the list of indicators and incorporate additional elements that allow for further work to refine and address current gaps.

On the implementation of the GGA framework, it said MOI indicators are fundamental and that the current set of MOI indicators contradict with the CBDR-RC principle and dilutes the responsibility of developed countries to provide adaptation finance and places disproportionate emphasis on domestic and local efforts. For developing countries, the ability to implement indicators depends directly on the support they receive, and without measurable and robust MOI, the GGA cannot fulfill its purpose.

Further, it said that reporting on indicators requires technical and financial support which

must be provided to developing countries in order to properly implement the indicators. It added that the credibility of this process depends on our ability to deliver meaningful progress on adaptation.

Saudi Arabia for the Arab Group, said that the indicators shall be subject to Parties interpretation, refinement and adjustment to align with their national context and should be considered as knowledge products from experts. It believed that due to the “work-in-progress” nature of the indicators, it must undergo a full review after the second GST, including the option to refine, replace or remove them.

The group said that the BAR should be the engine that drives implementation of the GGA aligned, with article 7.1 of the PA and proposed the establishment of a work programme with four workshops annually, designed to support countries in their adaptation implementation aligned with their national circumstances to ensure adequate adaptation response in the context of the temperature goal of Article 2.1 of the P in a two phase approach; Phase I (2025–2028) on implementation and; Phase II (2028–2029) on review and recalibration of the BAR. It added that the BAR can engage the AC, LEG, CGE, the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP) and the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) to deliver targeted support and knowledge products that help countries plan for the temperatures the world is heading towards in the context of the temperature goal and should focus on adaptation implementation as a whole and not be limited to the work on indicators.

On adaptation approaches, the group believed that no single adaptation approach shall be presented as superior or universally applicable, and that all approaches remain valid and be respected, reflecting national realities and priorities. On adaptation finance, it emphasised that without a transformational increase in adaptation finance, there will be no adequate adaptation response.

The **European Union [EU]** stated that CMA7 is important in delivering on enhanced policy coherence to link GGA and the UAE framework to national and subnational level action via NAPs and other strategies. The group provided proposals for the GGA decision in CMA7; the adoption of the

indicator list captured as an annex in the decision text; elaborated on the use of the indicators and; outlined a two-phase post Belém agenda, a shorter term phase with limited further technical work on indicators and a longer term vision to strengthen adaptation efforts and implementation

On the list of indicators, the EU said it does not support a two-tier list that creates hierarchy amongst indicators, instead preferring to adopt a single list of indicators that sees no bifurcation between indicators and wanted MOI to come from all sources. Further, it does not support the two-year policy process, but on the delivery and adoption of indicators here in Belém. On the use of indicators, it believed that it should be reported by Parties in their BTRs whilst sending strong and clear invitations to national and subnational entities to utilise the indicators.

The EU proposed a shorter term post-Belém to still allow for further tweaks on indicators, but further technical work on indicators can be parallel to the adoption of indicators. It added that the process would be overseen by the SB Chairs and will conclude in SB65; there will be limited technical work that will focus on identifying responsible agencies or custodians for each indicator; developing methodologies and standardisation including disaggregation; compiling data and metadata including disaggregation; and addressing other concerns on individual indicators. This, it said will not be an extension of work but a new phase post-adoption of indicators.

On the longer term post-Belém agenda, the EU said it wants to enable implementation at the national level including via NAPS and strategies and a longer-term vision to guide implementation of the GGA until 2030. It added that the BAR’s purpose is to conclude work derived from paragraph 38 of decision 2/CMA.5.

[Paragraph 38 of the UAE Framework outlines five key areas of focus: exchanging knowledge and experience on implementing the UAE Framework; identifying potential inputs for future global stocktakes related to achieving the GGA; enhancing understanding of risks and impacts from different temperature increases across different regions; collaborating with scientific bodies to support the implementation of the UAE Framework; and developing terms and a timeline for reviewing the

framework.]

Japan said it is against opening the indicator list and does not support any proposal to establish new policy processes, and instead proposed that Parties address technical issues under the UAE framework review after the second GST. It wanted to adopt the indicator list here Belém and on MOI indicators, it said Japan cannot accept bifurcation, and called for all overall adaptation finance flows to be captured, which means public finance, domestic budgets and private finance. On follow up work post-adoption of indicators, it proposed the following timeline: (i) 2026 to 2027, decide terms of reference (ToR) for UAE Framework review, including how the review will refine the indicator list; (ii) 2028, second GST is conducted; (iii) 2029, review of UAE Framework to take place based on agreed ToR and could include review of technical issues; (iv) 2030, BAR work on supporting the implementation of the UAE Framework is concluded; (v) 2031, take stock of progress, review and identify possible next steps beyond 2030.

On the BAR, it believed that it can be a roadmap for efforts to support the implementation of paragraph 38 of 2/CMA.5, whilst also saying that ‘transformational adaptation’ should be discussed continuously under the GGA agenda item.

In response to call by Parties to provide a draft text for consideration, on 12 Nov, the first iteration of the draft was provided by the co-facilitators and was deliberated on by Parties. However, due to lack of time, deliberations on the draft text continued on Nov 13.

NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS

The NAP informal consultations, co-facilitated by **Antwi-Boasiako Amoah (Ghana)** and **Cassandra Moll (New Zealand)**, revolved around the preferred mode of work for Parties. Despite initial slow progress, consensus was reached to begin work on financial and technical support, building directly on the [draft text from SB62](#).