

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland's submission to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change on the UAE – Belém work programme on indicators for measuring progress achieved towards the targets established in the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience

provided in line with the mandate given in December 2023.¹



¹ FCCC/PA/CMA/2023/L.18

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK) is pleased to submit its views on the two-year work programme on indicators for measuring progress achieved towards the targets referred to in paragraphs 9-10 of decision 2/CMA.5. This is in line with the mandate given in December 2023 (document FCCC/PA/CMA/2023/L.18).

1. Context

The UK welcomes the adoption of the new UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience (the Framework). The Framework is a key outcome of COP28 and reflects the central achievement of the two-year Glasgow-Sharm el Sheikh work programme on the global goal on adaptation (GlaSS), which was adopted in Glasgow at COP26. We are pleased to see this vital progress made on adaptation, whilst also recognising that this needs to translate into more and better implementation on the ground to adapt to, and thrive in, a changing climate.

We have established a framework for all, with agreed targets that we must now make progress against. The Framework targets can help drive political support through their focus on key priority systems and sectors and the iterative adaptation cycle, as well as promoting quality action on the ground and the mainstreaming of adaptation across systems and sectors and at different levels.

The UK recognises the importance of implementing the Framework straight away. We have a key opportunity this year, with the first Biennial Transparency Reports due at the end of the year, to consider how the Framework targets apply in national and sub-national contexts, and how key elements of the Framework can be integrated in national planning and reporting instruments as they apply to national circumstances.

Alongside this, the UAE – Belém work programme will help us identify indicators for measuring progress against the targets.

2. Lessons learned from the GlaSS

Throughout the GlaSS workshops the **importance of the best available science, data, evidence and traditional knowledge** for adaptation action and solutions was highlighted. The IPCC is clear that there is **no ‘one size fits all’ approach for adaptation**. Adaptation is and will continue to remain context specific, and both action and any assessment of progress needs to be based on national and local circumstances.

We heard through the GlaSS the need to **avoid additional reporting burden**. It is essential that we **build on what already exists**, both in terms of existing reporting information, data collection and indicators, and relevant bodies that are already established and have relevant expertise, such as the Adaptation Committee (AC) and the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG). We should capitalise on this knowledge, including through utilising and building on existing products, such as the LEG guidelines on NAPs, the AC’s technical paper on approaches to reviewing the overall progress made in achieving the global goal on adaptation, and the UNFCCC secretariat’s compilation and synthesis of indicators, approaches, targets and metrics for reviewing overall progress in achieving the global goal on adaptation. It is important that we don’t lose time, and the UK sees value in utilising existing constituted bodies in the new work programme on indicators, which will allow technical work to begin as soon as possible and at significant pace.

The GlaSS process also highlighted the benefit of **inclusive participation** throughout the work programme, including virtual participation. This was optimised when small breakout groups were used, facilitating constructive discussions. However, this format was not always utilised, and the workshops as a whole could have benefitted from more structure and specific direction. It is necessary to ensure that the right modalities are in place to create an environment conducive to rich and focused discussion, including through effective guiding questions and constructive moderation. The breadth of systems covered alongside the four steps of the iterative adaptation cycle in the Framework targets will require a broad range of expertise from across different fields and institutions, including non-governmental organisations (NGOs), academia and other institutions to participate in the work programme on indicators. Discussions under the work programme are not, and should not be, negotiations. While previous workshops were primarily attended by negotiators, it is essential that **technical experts** on indicators are heavily involved in the upcoming work programme discussions to ensure that the identification of indicators and any future work is technically sound and grounded in evidence.

3. Views on the two-year work programme on indicators

General considerations on assessing progress against the Framework targets:

- The Framework provides a lens for viewing adaptation action and guiding and assessing progress towards achieving the GGA, including in the context of the Global Stocktake (GST). This lens can add value and complementarity to the existing reports that are produced by the constituted bodies and the UNFCCC secretariat on adaptation progress. The work programme on indicators can further contribute towards having a clear and structured approach in place for future GSTs to assess progress towards achieving the GGA. Parties will be able to report against the targets and indicators as relevant in their national contexts.
- The UK supports utilising existing data collection systems and indicators from other frameworks and processes where appropriate, to streamline reporting and ensure coherence and complementarity across frameworks. The specific requirements for indicators will differ target by target. For the thematic targets established in the Framework, it will be important to understand what it is relevant and useful to assess, and relevant indicators that already exist through other frameworks and their applicability to the Framework targets. Where custodians of data already exist, for example for the SDG targets, the gathering of any relevant data can also be utilised where applicable for assessing progress against the Framework targets.
- Parties have also agreed four process-based targets around the dimensions of the iterative adaptation cycle. It is helpful to have targets that set out how to ‘do’ effective adaptation. In some instances, given the process-based nature of these targets, significant elements of a target can be replicated or mirrored in indicator format with slight adjustments to account for tracking progress.

Indicators and metrics:

- As outlined above, adaptation is highly context specific. Any single indicator will not provide a complete picture of progress - and using more than one tool to assess progress can provide a fuller picture of change. The process of understanding what it is important to measure, and the theory of change that links what is measured to the desired outcomes, are critical elements in the design of interventions. The

determination of the most appropriate indicators and metrics to report against at the national and local level should be led by those with the most relevant expertise, who will be reporting against them.

- It is also important that potential indicators are assessed to ensure they don't lead to unintended consequences, such as supporting short-term action that might be detrimental to longer-term objectives, or that might lead to maladaptive practices or lock-ins. This is particularly important when looking at indicators developed in a non-climate context.
- In addition to assessing progress, indicators should also allow for learning. Triangulation of data should be used to help to understand the explanatory power (or lack thereof) of metrics in any particular situation, informing learning about transferability across different contexts. Reporting on indicators should also be conducive to building better understanding of climate risks and how they change over time, and strengthening adaptive capacity. Flexibility should also be integrated to respond to learnings as well as accommodate a shifting climate and broader societal contexts.

Modalities of the work programme:

A. Organisation of work:

- We would like to see work progressing as soon as possible and we believe that utilising the AC would be the most efficient way to ensure progress at pace. The UK sees a role for the AC to coordinate experts' work and guide the work programme, in collaboration with the LEG and the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP), and under the guidance of the SB Chairs and with significant input from experts.

B. Inputs:

- It is important to be clear on what we are trying to achieve at each step within the work programme, to ensure the most efficient and appropriate modalities are in place.
- The UK is supportive of expert meetings taking place under the work programme to bring together relevant expertise to have technical discussions on indicators for the Framework targets, with clear objectives and outputs for each meeting. This should initially focus on existing indicators from various frameworks and reporting processes, and a discussion around their relevance and appropriateness for measuring progress against the Framework targets. Following meetings could be designed and organised by thematic area, to allow for in depth, focused discussions and so that relevant practitioners and subject experts can contribute at different stages, as appropriate.
- These expert meetings should take place in conjunction with other events to enable inclusive and efficient hybrid participation, including by non-Party stakeholders. These expert meetings could be convened in conjunction with the AC meetings to maximise efficiency, especially if the AC were to take a leading role in the coordination of the work programme. We would encourage small, interactive breakout group discussions.
- The UK would also support an invitation for submissions on indicators and guiding questions ahead of, and as an input to, each expert meeting based on the topic(s) to be considered. The AC could compile these submissions for discussion at the

expert meetings. This would facilitate the consideration of a broad range of views on relevant indicators in each field and in different regions and local contexts.

C. Involvement of stakeholders:

- All modalities of the work programme, including workshops and expert meetings should be open to Parties and non-Party stakeholders. However, as mentioned above, we see a particular need for relevant expert input throughout the work programme, including encompassing **diverse knowledge and perspectives** from Indigenous Peoples, women, and other marginalised groups, and representing outcomes for ecological and social systems.
- There should be expert representation across regions and at all levels, including from practitioners of **locally-led adaptation**, where those at the local level understand locally appropriate indicators and metrics for assessing adaptation action and desired outcomes in the local context.
- The UNFCCC secretariat should identify relevant organisations and institutions such as UN agencies, NGOs, international organisations, academia and others, based on the thematic topics of each meeting, and invite experts to participate. The NWP also holds a wealth of information, including through its thematic expert groups, across thematic areas and should be utilised, and NWP partners can offer valuable knowledge across sectors and systems. Relevant practitioners working on adaptation projects and programmes on the ground should also be invited to participate to ensure that a variety of experience is shared.

D. Outputs:

- To the extent possible, we should use data collection systems and indicators that already exist and can be applied to the Framework targets to avoid additional reporting burden. The UK would propose that the AC, under the guidance of the SB Chairs and with the support of the LEG, the NWP and the UNFCCC secretariat, should conduct a mapping of existing and relevant indicators against the targets in the Framework by CMA6. This should take into account expert meeting discussions and will provide a technical basis on which we can build.

E. Timeline – milestones & key moments

