

IISD Submission on Existing Indicators for Measuring Progress Towards the Targets of the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience

31 July 2024

Mandate

The SBSTA and the SBI invited Parties and non-Party stakeholders, including relevant constituted bodies, United Nations organizations and specialized agencies, and other relevant organizations from all geographical regions, to submit information on existing indicators for measuring progress towards the targets referred to in paragraphs 9–10 of decision 2/CMA.5 in use at the local, national, regional and global level, including, if available, information on associated methodologies and data readiness for such indicators, as well as identified gaps and areas for which the development of new indicators may be needed.

CONTACT: Inquiries related to this submission should be directed to **Emilie Beauchamp**, Lead, MEL for Climate Change Adaptation, IISD Resilience Program, at ebeauchamp@iisd.org.

Context and Aim of the Submission

The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) is pleased to provide its views on:

1. Areas and sources for the mapping of indicators under the UAE-Belém work programme;
2. Key gaps in indicators to inform the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience (UAE FGRC);
3. Recommendations on content and modalities for the addressing these gaps during the UAE-Belém work programme.

At COP28, Decision 2/CMA5 established the UAE FGCR with seven thematic targets, and four dimensional targets following the iterative adaptation cycle (IAC). The UAE-Belém work programme aims to identify and, as needed, develop indicators and potential quantified elements – such as methodologies – for those targets. Conclusion from SB60 have led to the initiation of work on mapping indicators to be completed by COP29, along with the convening of experts by the SBSTA and the SBI co-chairs.

This submission is based on the IISD and the NAP Global Network's long-standing research expertise, and its experience of working with countries to develop, implement and strengthen national and sub-national monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems for the national adaptation plan process, and other adaptation planning processes. With a decade of experience in supporting countries in strengthening their national adaptation plan (NAP) processes, including on MEL systems, IISD – as the secretariat of the NAP Global Network - will focus on its expertise and

DISCLAIMER

This submission is made without prejudice to further submissions from the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). The views and inputs stated in this submission do not necessarily reflect the views, inputs, policies or opinions of the funders, partners and participants of IISD initiatives and programs.

No liability is assumed for the accuracy or uses of the information provided. Please note that this submission neither aims to reinterpret any existing decisions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change nor does it intend to pre-empt any potential future decisions under the Convention. As a technical submission, the exact language used should not be understood to change or reinterpret anything contained in relevant decisions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and other relevant international treaties and laws.

comment primarily on the iterative adaptation cycle dimensions under the UAE FGRC. Despite our thematic expertise, we recognize that multiple thematic agencies and organizations will contribute to content under the thematic targets. IISD is looking forward to further contributing research and evidence during the duration of the UAE-Belém work programme, as convened experts and/or as contributing organization.

Mapping of indicators under the UAE-Belém Work Programme

This submission will not provide lists or examples of indicators to measure progress towards the targets of the UAE FGCR. However, **we strongly recommend for the mapping to include the compilation of indicators found in NAP documents as the basis for indicators under the 11 targets – and especially the IAC dimensions.**

We stress the importance of building on existing systems, and the fact that [58% \(33/57\) submitted NAP documents include indicators](#) (NAP Global Network, 2024). Furthermore, [a recent study from IISD comparing the national MEL systems for adaptation across nine countries](#) has outlined that all countries have the basis of a partially functional MEL framework for adaptation, including indicators from other sectors that can be leveraged for adaptation (Njuguna et al., 2024).

We strongly suggest for this work to be conducted by the experts during the compilation process, based on the submitted NAP documents on [NAP Central](#) and a request to countries to share relevant national adaptation plans for the compilation. It is critical that the UAE FGCR builds on and from existing system to facilitate its uptake and alignment with national systems.

Key gaps in current indicators

We identify to three overarching gaps from existing indicators to inform the UAE FGRC. The work of the Secretariat, the SBs and convened experts should **address the following gaps:**

No global-level indicators along the iterative adaptation cycle

While existing indicators that could help inform the seven themes of the UAE FGCR at the global level are more prevalent, there is no clear global indicators for the iterative adaptation cycle (Adaptation Committee, 2021; Beauchamp & Jozefiak, 2023). This is a clear gap that will need to be address by the UAE-Belém work programme. Notably, we highlight the **need for key global indicators to unpack the aspects describing the necessary quality of the IAC dimensions and processes** included in the UAE FGRC.

There are existing indicators from other frameworks such as the SDGs and the Sendai Framework that could serve to inform IAC targets under the UAE FGRC. However, these indicators are not specific to climate change adaptation. As such, these existing indicators do not represent the quality of resilience processes needed to be tracked and assessed – as captured in the UAE FGCR targets. For example, the UAE FGRC’s planning target could be partly informed by SDG indicator 13.2.1 “Number of countries with NDCs, long-term strategies, NAPs, and AdComs, as reported to the secretariat of the UNFCCC by 2030”, and by Sendai framework indicator G-4 “Percentage of local governments having a plan to act on early warnings by 2030”. However, this would not help informing the quality of the resilient planning processes required to lead to resilient outcomes, namely:

- How to capture country-drivenness?
- How to capture gender-responsiveness?
- How to capture participatory and fully transparent?
- What is considered as “appropriate”?
- What is considered mainstreamed?
- How will consideration of people and vulnerable communities be captured?

It is important for these considerations, already embedded in the UAE FGCR’s targets, to be unpacked and addressed with appropriate indicators in the frame of the UAE-Belém work programme (Table 1).

We emphasize that indicators under the UAE-Belém work programme should be realistic and provide incentives for countries to implement MEL systems and report. Good practices in setting targets and indicators as part of MEL systems points to the need to be pragmatic and embrace simplicity, with realistic and achievable targets to incentivise action (Bours at al, 2014; Dekens, 2021; Leiter et al, 2019). One target may hold several indicators pertaining to different facets for its achievement. When possible, indicators should link or complement indicators from other agreements and frameworks, to reduce reporting burden.

Table 1. Considerations for defining the indicators under each dimension target of the UAE FGCR

Dimension	Indicators to be defined
<p>Impact, vulnerability and risk assessment: by 2030 all Parties have conducted up-to-date assessments of climate hazards, climate change impacts and exposure to risks and vulnerabilities and have used the outcomes of these assessments to inform their formulation of national adaptation plans, policy instruments, and planning processes and/or strategies, and by 2027 all Parties have established multi-hazard early warning systems, climate information services for risk reduction and systematic observation to support improved climate-related data, information and services;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is considered up to date? • How to capture assessment of differential vulnerability within countries based on gender and social inequalities? • How to define or capture how the outcomes have been used in plan, policies [...]? • What types of multi-hazard systems, climate information services, and systematic observations are included? • How to capture improvements in climate-related data information and services? • How to capture relevant Mol considerations?
<p>Planning: by 2030 all Parties have in place country-driven, gender-responsive, participatory and fully transparent national adaptation plans, policy instruments, and planning processes and/or strategies, covering, as appropriate, ecosystems, sectors, people and vulnerable communities, and have mainstreamed adaptation in all relevant strategies and plans;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to capture country-drivenness? • How to capture gender-responsiveness? • How to capture participatory and fully transparent? • What is considered as “appropriate”? • What is considered mainstreamed? • How will consideration of people and vulnerable communities be captured? • How to capture relevant Mol considerations?

<p>Implementation: by 2030 all Parties have progressed in implementing their national adaptation plans, policies and strategies and, as a result, have reduced the social and economic impacts of the key climate hazards identified in the assessments referred to in paragraph 10(a) above;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is progression being captured? Which elements of progression (results, finance, processes?) • How to capture the performance in reduction of impacts? • How to capture gender and social equity in benefits resulting from adaptation progress? • How to capture relevant Mol considerations?
<p>Monitoring, evaluation and learning: by 2030 all Parties have designed, established and operationalized a system for monitoring, evaluation and learning for their national adaptation efforts and have built the required institutional capacity to fully implement the system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which components of MEL systems are considered? • What is considered as operationalised? • How to capture institutional capacity? • How to capture integration of gender and social dimensions within MEL systems? • How to capture relevant Mol considerations?

The importance of integrating gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) considerations

While it is positive that the UAE FGRC’s planning target recognizes the need for plans, policies, strategies, and processes to be gender-responsive and to consider that people and vulnerable communities, this may distract from the need for GESI considerations to be integrated throughout both the IAC and thematic targets. This can be done by including the use of disaggregated data (by gender, age, ability, ethnicity, etc.) when relevant, in combination with GESI specific indicators, which will be particularly important for the IAC dimensions. The need for this was illustrated by the first Global Stocktake (GST), where there were data gaps that limited the assessment of progress on climate action that is gender-responsive and fully respects human rights.

The UAE FGCR can play an important role in ensuring that the necessary data and evidence is in place to enhance these aspects in the second GST. This is also important for tracking genuine progress on adaptation, noting that the IPCC stated with high confidence that “inclusive governance that prioritises equity and justice in adaptation planning and implementation leads to more effective and sustainable adaptation outcomes” (IPCC, 2022, p. 28).

It’s also critical that the outputs of the UAE-Belém work programme systematically integrate GESI considerations across the indicators to drive the integration of both GESI specific indicators and disaggregated data collection and analysis in national, sectoral, sub-national and other MEL systems. Recent IISD research finds that despite progress on the development and implementation of MEL systems for adaptation globally over the past 10 years, the integration of GESI considerations is significantly lacking. Out of nine countries reviewed, only two (Kenya and Vietnam) had a limited number of GESI specific and GESI disaggregated indicators as part of their MEL system for adaptation (Njuguna et al., 2024). The UAE FGCR will play a key normative role on MEL of adaptation; it is therefore essential that the work of the UAE-Belem work programme sends a signal on the importance of tracking GESI considerations in adaptation processes and outcomes.

The need to include components to inform Means of Implementations under each dimension

While the UAE FGRC mentions the importance of Means of Implementation (MoI) for progressing adaptation, tracking progress on MoI was not include in the framework as such. There is now an opportunity to signal to countries the importance of tracking and reporting on MoI, as a set of critical enabling factors to move from adaptation planning to implementation.

Including MoI-specific indicators can help identifying, quantifying and removing barriers to adaptation progress, and ultimately achieving the Global Goal on Adaptation. It is also needed to provide critical, complementary evidence to the GST’s assessment of the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation (Art. 7.14). The [Sendai framework’s target F](#) exemplifies how specific MoI indicators could be defined under the UAE-Belém work programme: “*Substantially enhance international cooperation to developing countries through adequate and sustainable support to complement their national actions for implementation of this framework by 2030*”.

Recommendation for addressing gaps in indicators

The mapping should confirm a basis for starting work on the development and the selection of indicators under the UAE-Belém work programme. However, further mapping may be needed (e.g.: mapping of existing indicators in NAP documents), along with further research. This should be led by the experts convened and with the support of the Secretariat.

We point to our [previous submission in March 2024](#) which expands on the need for clear roles and responsibility for the selection of final indicators and outcomes for the UAE-Belém work programme. This should be addressed, along with the review of the mapping, in the second workshop of the work programme that has been announced for October 2024. Addressing the organization of work and potential outcomes of the work programme in September will help reach a comprehensive and positive outcome that will clearly outline timelines and activities for the work programme in 2025.

There is a need to clarify who will have the function of **organising outcomes from work across dimensions and themes into a coherent indicator framework**; to create linkages between different experts/ groups of experts, and who will refine and suggest [global/core and/or voluntary] set(s) of indicators. Being mindful of time and resources in the organisation of this work is critical. One option could include having a set of global or core indicators under the IAC, as the overarching processes and framings for adaptation. Thematic indicators would be outlined under each /and across dimensions, thus creating a matrix of indicators between the IAC dimensions and themes.

Table 2. Suggestions for the outcomes of the UAE-Belém work programme (see IISD’s March 2024 submission for more information)

Indicators	A set of 5-10 indicators under each dimensional targets with dedicated methodologies to be developed.	Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration for the inclusion of indicator(s) related to adaptation mainstreaming. • Consideration for gender responsiveness and social inclusion (GESI) across the indicators through the possibility of
-------------------	---	---

		<p>disaggregation of data, and GESI specific indicators (see Table 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration for the inclusion of indicator(s) related to assessing progress on means of implementation under each dimension.
Repository	A repository including long or shortlists of examples of existing indicators for each theme, and the sub-themes included under thematic targets.	<p>This could also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources, datasets and methodologies for these existing indicators, accessible through an online portal (e.g. the Adaptation Knowledge Portal).
Further guidance and training materials	Further guidance and training materials for Parties to strengthen their MEL systems to inform the set of indicators under dimensional targets. This could include further mandates and invitations for UNFCCC constituted bodies.	

Other Works from IISD

We are here outlining relevant work ongoing and forthcoming work at IISD that are relevant to the UAE-Belem work programme. The IISD is open and keen to discuss modalities for further contributing the UAE-Belem work programme until its completion at COP30.

- We are currently working on a review of NAP documents to assess the effectiveness of NAP processes. This will be published as part of the UNEP Adaptation Gap Report 2024.
- The NAP Global Network is in the process of developing the fourth in its series of synthesis reports that track progress on integrating gender and social considerations in NAP processes. The previous report can be found [here](#).
- IISD is further working on several Nature-based solutions of climate change adaptation projects, namely:
 - [Scaling Urban Nature-based Solutions \(NbS\) for Climate Adaptation in Sub-Saharan Africa \(SUNCASA\)](#)
 - [Climate Adaptation and Protected Areas \(CAPA\) Initiative](#)

We look forward to contributing our experience with the UAE-Belem work programme.

Relevant IISD resources

- [National Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Systems for Climate Change Adaptation: A comparative analysis of nine countries](#). July 2024.
- [Toolkit for Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning for National Adaptation Plan Processes](#). May 2024.
- [Next Steps for Defining a Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Systems for the Global Goal on Adaptation by COP28](#). June 2023.
- [Reporting on Progress in National Adaptation Plan Processes](#). September 2023.
- [Toolkit for a Gender-Responsive Process to Formulate and Implement National Adaptation Plans \(NAPs\)](#). December 2019.

- [Repository of Adaptation Indicators: Real case examples from national Monitoring and Evaluation Systems](#). 2014.

References

- Adaptation Committee. (2021). Approaches to reviewing the overall progress made in achieving the Global Goal on Adaptation (AC/2021/TP/GGA). United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/AC_TP_GlobalGoalOnAdaptation.pdf
- Beauchamp, E., & Józefiak, I. (2023). Next steps for defining a monitoring, evaluation, and learning system for the global goal on adaptation. International Institute for Sustainable Development. <https://www.iisd.org/publications/report/global-goal-on-adaptationmonitoring-evaluation-learning-framework-cop-28>
- Bours, D., McGinn, C., and Pringle, P. (2014) Guidance note 2: Selecting indicators for climate change adaptation programming. SEA Change Community of Practice and UKCIP. <https://www.ukcip.org.uk/wp-content/PDFs/MandE-Guidance-Note2.pdf>
- Dekens, J. (2021). Simplicity in crafting effective monitoring, evaluation, and learning systems for national climate adaptation. NAP Global Network. <https://napglobalnetwork.org/2021/12/crafting-effective-monitoring-evaluation-systems/>
- Hammill, A., & Dekens, J. (2014). Monitoring and evaluating adaptation at aggregated levels: A comparative analysis of ten systems. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit. https://www.adaptationcommunity.net/download/me/me-guidesmanuals-reports/GIZ_2014-Comparative_analysis_of_national_adaptation_M&E.pdf
- IPCC, 2022: Summary for Policymakers [H.-O. Pörtner, D.C. Roberts, E.S. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, M. Tignor, A. Alegría, M. Craig, S. Langsdorf, S. Löschke, V. Möller, A. Okem (eds.)]. In: Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [H.-O. Pörtner, D.C. Roberts, M. Tignor, E.S. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, A. Alegría, M. Craig, S. Langsdorf, S. Löschke, V. Möller, A. Okem, B. Rama (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, pp. 3–33, doi:10.1017/9781009325844.001.
- Leiter, T., Olhoff, A., Al Azar, R., Barmby, V., Bours, D., Clement, V.W.C., Dale, T.W., Davies, C., and Jacobs, H. 2019. “Adaptation metrics: current landscape and evolving practices”. Rotterdam and Washington, DC. www.gca.org
- NAP Global Network. (2024). NAP trends. <https://trends.napglobalnetwork.org/>
- Njuguna, L., Uri, I., & Beauchamp, E. (2024). National monitoring, evaluation, and learning systems for adaptation: A comparative analysis of nine countries. International Institute for Sustainable Development.