



# TWN

# 7

**BONN CLIMATE NEWS UPDATE**  
PUBLISHED BY THIRD WORLD NETWORK

24 June  
2025

## Global goal on adaptation advances work on indicators

Bonn, 24 June (Eqram Mustaqeem) - In contrast to the delayed start of the climate talks under the UNFCCC's Subsidiary Bodies (SBs) in Bonn, Germany, work on adaptation started off from the get go with the [mandated event of the Global Goal on Adaptation \(GGA\) workshop under the United Arab Emirates-Belém work programme](#) (UBWP), which took place for a full day on 16 June.

The UBWP is set to conclude work on the GGA indicators in time for COP 30 in Belem, Brazil, to be held in November this year.

During the informal consultations on the GGA agenda which began on 18 June, there were clear convergences among Parties on the need to drastically reduce the number of indicators from the current consolidated list of nearly 500 indicators, the need to have in person workshops with the experts in the upcoming months to further refine the indicators and structuring of the indicators into tiers of universally applicable "headline indicators" and a menu of optional "sub-indicators".

However, divergences continued between developed and developing countries with the most stark difference over the indicators on means of implementation (MOI). Developed countries

opposed any indicators on finance from developed to developing countries in line with Articles 9,10 and 11 of the Paris Agreement (PA) (in relation to finance, technology and capacity-building), whilst developing countries insisted that such indicators are of the essence and that the current framing of the MOI indicators must be refined. They also said that MOI indicators that measure national budgets on adaptation and the counting of official development assistance (ODA) should be removed as they are not in line with the Convention and the PA.

Apart from the GGA, informal consultations also began on National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP) and guidance relating to Adaptation Communications (AdComs).

On the NAPs agenda, not much progress was made as Parties could not agree on the mode of work. (See further details below).

### GLOBAL GOAL ON ADAPTATION

The workshop on 16 June on the GGA started with presentations by the respective expert groups on their work, highlighting their findings to date, remaining gaps, and challenges to be

**TWN**  
Third World Network

Third World Network is an independent non-profit international research and advocacy organization involved in bringing about a greater articulation of the needs, aspirations and rights of the peoples in the South and in promoting just, equitable and ecological development.  
Address 131, Jalan Macalister, 10400, Penang, MALAYSIA.  
Tel 60-4-2266728/2266159 Fax 60-4-2264505  
E-mail [twon@twonetwork.org](mailto:twon@twonetwork.org) Website <https://twon.my/>

overcome, which was then followed by questions and answer sessions from Parties to the experts. There were 8 presentations in total, covering the respective thematic areas as underlined in para 9 and the dimensional targets outlined in para 10 of [decision 2/CMA.5](#), [also known as the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience (UFGCR)] which are water; food and agriculture; health; ecosystems and biodiversity; infrastructure and human settlements; poverty eradication and livelihoods; culture heritage; while the dimensional targets of impact, vulnerability and risk assessment; planning; implementation; and monitoring, evaluation and learning.

The workshop followed with a structured discussion among participants, on the consolidated list of indicator options, and what further refinements are required to advance the work in order to agree a final list at CMA.7.

The GGA informal consultations which took place on June 18, and were co-facilitated by **Tina Kobilšek (Slovenia)** and **Zita Wilks (Gabon)**. The co-facilitators outlined the work that laid ahead, firstly to continue consideration of the UBWP on indicators, the modalities for work under the Baku Adaptation Roadmap (BAR) and to continue consideration of the technical paper on transformational adaptation prepared by the secretariat.

**Sri Lanka** for the **G77 and China**, stated that the indicators need to be aligned with the overall GGA, Article 7.1 of the PA and be consistent with the temperature goal of the PA. It proposed that indicators have to be modified where needed and noted the importance of qualitative as well as quantitative indicators, and also highlighted the widening adaptation finance gap and the urgent need to scale up MOI for adaptation in developing countries. It also stressed that the implementation of adaptation action requires MOI indicators to ensure that the critical purpose of addressing finance, technology transfer and capacity building, and that such indicators should reflect the gaps and needs of developing countries. It also stressed that there are many key aspects missing in the current list of indicators especially MOI indicators related to access and quality of finance. It also called for removal of indicators related to ODA and national budgets from the list of indicators.

**Botswana** for the **African Group** stated that the indicators must be guided by the following elements: be aligned with the purpose of the GGA to show collective progress towards achieving the purpose and objective of the PA; each indicator must have a clear rationale and must answer the fundamental question of how does the indicator reflect towards achieving the goals outlined in the GGA. The indicators must constitute a comprehensive framework that provides a holistic picture of adaptation progress by including indicators on climate hazards and impacts and MOI. It wanted the indicators to be aligned with Articles 9,10 and 11 of the PA and the Convention, adding that it is crucial for such MOI indicators to indicate the sufficiency of support, the direction of support and how such support is closing the adaptation gap. MOI indicators that fall outside of the PA such as internal resource mobilization and ODA must be removed, it said further. It also stressed that it prioritises quality over quantity, coherence over complexity and ambition over ambiguity when it comes to the indicators.

**China** for the **Like-minded developing countries (LMDC)** stated that whilst it concurred that the indicators should be globally applicable, it is crucial that there must be differentiation between developed and developing countries. It also said that the MOI indicators be aligned to Articles 9,10,11 and 13 of the PA and should address the needs and gaps of developing countries and must cut across the whole thematic and dimensional targets outline in the GGA. It further said that any indicators on measuring finance should be public finance and anything on private sector financing should be excluded, including indicators measuring national budgets and ODA.

As some indicators come directly from international frameworks and Conventions outside the UNFCCC, it requested the experts to refine such indicators to be adaptation relevant and in line with the Convention and its PA and that any indicators on mitigation should be removed as the indicators should have an adaptation focus.

On transformational adaptation, it called for a more diverse and varied approach towards adaptation and to not limit discussion on one specific adaptation approach.

**Sudan** for the **Least Developed Countries (LDC)**, reiterated the call to reduce the number of indicators to 100 and provided guidance to such effect, adding that there should be a structure distinguishing headline indicators from sub-indicators. The headline indicators would be the ones globally applicable and the sub-indicators will be the menu of options to be chosen by Parties on their relevance. On MOI indicators, it also called for MOI indicators to be aligned with Article 9,10 and 11 of the PA and rejected the inclusion of indicators tracking national budgets and ODA as it unfairly shifts responsibility from developing countries to developed countries and obscure the real issue which is the accessibility of adaptation finance.

**Maldives** for the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)** started out by agreeing there should be headline indicators and sub-indicators. It also emphasised that there should be qualitative narratives alongside the quantitative statistical indicators to provide better context and explanation. It also wanted to prioritize the utilisation of existing indicators and to modify them where necessary to be adaptation relevant as it can allow for Parties to draw from already existing data and reporting. It stressed that it is not opposed to the creation of new indicators but emphasised that it is important to avoid additional reporting burden and that developing countries would need adequate support and capacity building to report on the new indicators. On MOI indicators, it expressed the need to have indicators that express developing countries needs and access to MOI whilst rejecting any indicators on national budgets and ODA.

**Saudi Arabia** for the **Arab Group** emphasised that adaptation efforts should be nationally driven, inclusive of all adaptation approaches, respectful of national circumstances, priorities and needs and supported by adequate MOI from developed countries as per Article 9 and 10 of the PA. Indicators that are borrowed from other international Conventions and frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals and the Sendai Framework should be reevaluated and refined to be adaptation specific. The indicators must reflect the adaptation responses towards different warming scenarios in the context of the temperature goal of the PA, it said further.

It also said that indicators measuring greenhouse gas emissions and emissions reduction should be excluded as they do not reflect adaptation progress. On MOI, it said indicators should measure support needs and gaps of developing countries and did not support domestic or national budgeting or ODA indicators.

On transformational adaptation, it stressed the conclusion to reflect that no single adaptation approach should be presented as a default, superior or a universally applicable pathway and that recognition must be made to the role of diverse, locally led, context specific adaptation approaches that reflect national priorities and needs.

**Uruguay** for **Grupo Sur** said that there should be 2 sets of indicators: one that is globally aligned with para 28 of [decision 3/CMA.6](#) and the other should be a menu of options as referred to para 20 (b) of the same decision. The list of global indicators should include a maximum of 9 to 10 headline indicators for each target outlined in paras 9 and 10 of [decision 2/CMA.5](#) which would result in a range of between 99 to 110 indicators. The list of global indicators should include a balance between action and MOI indicators; the menu of options indicators should allow for vertical disaggregation.

On the concept of transformational adaptation, they were of the view that the discussion on this both in the UNFCCC and the scientific community is not mature enough for a substantive outcome this year.

**Panama** for the **Independent Alliance of Latin American and the Caribbean Nations (AILAC)** said that the indicators should have adaptation relevance and directly respond to the GGA targets. It requested that the indicators be clustered according to data availability and that limited data availability should not preclude the inclusion of indicators and the list of indicators need to be disaggregated according to demographics, economic characteristics and vulnerability, gender, disability, socioeconomic and indigenous status and highlighted the importance of systemic analysis of cross-cutting aspects of the indicators.

It also said that MOI indicators on ODA and national budgets should be considered inappropriate and

hence should be removed, stressing that MOI indicators are crucial for developing countries and should assess the provision, access and quality of finance whilst addressing the adaptation finance gap. It agreed on the call to have 2 sets of indicators: one that is globally applicable and that every Party will be invited to report on and a second set of optional sub-indicators which countries may include in their reports depending on their national circumstances and priorities.

**Australia** expressed its clear dislike on the MOI indicators that bifurcates the framework between developing and developed countries as the indicators should be the same for all and any attempt to divide it is contrary to the decisions adopted in CMA.5 and CMA.6. It supported the inclusion of indicators that measure national budgets and encouraged all experts to consider having such indicators in their respective contexts and groups. Whilst saying it is also important to discuss the BAR and transformational adaptation to have a complete picture of the GGA, it emphasised that the focus for the time being should be on the work on indicators.

The **European Union (EU)** stated that the indicators on enablers of implementation action, including MOI should be separated into different categories and should be treated in a balanced manner with all indicators and consider all sorts of finance. It also agreed there should be two components to the indicators - the headline indicators and sub-indicators that countries can choose and that can provide more context and disaggregation.

After hearing the views of all Parties, the co-facilitators indicated that they will be drafting a draft text before the next informal consultation. On the session on 20 June, the co-facilitators said that the first iteration of text was drafted in a way that maintains balance and covered the views from all Parties. On divergent views, they said that where there were clear objections, text options were put forward for Parties to choose from.

On June 21, Parties engaged in a 4 hour informal-informal (closed to observers) to resolve differences on the text. Informal consultations on the matter are continuing on the matter on June 23.

## NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS

The informal consultations were co-facilitated by **Antwi-Boasiako Amoah (Ghana)** and **Oliver Gales (Australia)** and started off with the co-facilitators recalling that the work is to assess progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs which was initiated at SB60, continued at SB61 which coincided with COP29 and will continue here at SB62. At COP29 Parties requested to continue the consideration of this assessment on the basis of a [draft text](#) with a view for recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption at COP30. The co-facilitators stated that the journey has been long and has been back and forth, and invited Parties to start the discussions on the basis of the text.

**Fiji** on behalf of the **G77 and China** emphasised that since [decision 9/CP.27](#) no COP has adopted a standalone NAP decision and welcomed the first global stocktake (GST1) and called to embed NAP indicators in the GGA but expressed concerns over the lack of guidance since COP27 and iterated that at COP29, Parties requested the SB62 continued working on NAP on the basis of the draft text and to recommend a decision for COP30 later in 2025. This instruction is the mandate and should be the agreed upon starting point and called upon the developed countries to engage in the draft text in drafting mode paragraph by paragraph.

Developed countries such as the **EU** and **Japan** expressed their desire and the importance to conclude NAP negotiations at COP30 this year. However, though these Parties together with **Australia** and the **UK** indicated their readiness to engage with the draft text, preferred that the text be discussed section by section instead of the para by para method as proposed by the **G77**.

These developed countries emphasised the need and importance of private sector language in the text, and the **UK** wanted the language on finance not to be exclusively on private finance but instead a mobilisation of finance from a wide range of sources, including both public and private finance and acknowledged that means of implementation is an important enabler of the adaptation cycle.

Despite making progress this time where all Parties agreed to continue work on the basis of the

draft text compared to previous SBs where developed country Parties often refused to engage in any previous draft text, Parties could not agree on how that mode of work on the text would look like and the session ended on a stalemate. The co-facilitators encouraged Parties to meet up and discuss a possible way forward that would work for both Parties before the next NAP informal consultation scheduled on the next day (19 June).

At the informal consultations on 19 June, the co-facilitators inquired on the outcome of the discussion between Parties on the way forward, **Fiji** for the **G77 & China** reiterated the same previous view of wanting to work on the draft text directly on the screen. The **UK** expressed confusion on the G77's request and called for a combined huddle to discuss and understand it better.

Instead of a huddle, **Fiji** for the **G77 & China** in the spirit of moving work forward, submitted to the secretariat a [Conference Room Paper \(CRP\)](#) and proposed the document to be projected on the screen for discussion. (The CRP is essentially the

original NAP draft text out of Baku but is clustered into sections under different headings).

The **EU** requested the secretariat to ensure that the CRP is circulated to all Parties before formal engagement and projection on screen. The rest of the session was then spent by the secretariat trying to get the CRP officially published on the SB62 page and be circulated to all Parties.

On 21 June, at the 3<sup>rd</sup> informal consultations, the **EU**, **UK** and **Norway** indicated their readiness to engage with the CRP with the co-facilitators. However, stark differences started to appear between developed and developing countries. The co-facilitators, recommended to organise informal-informals to allow Parties to further engage with each other.

However, informal consultations on NAPs in the first week ended without addressing the suggestions due to time constraints and the next round of informal consultations in the 2nd week set to be on Tuesday 24 June.