

Approach & Key Messages

Design of the Session

The session was moderated by Nathalie Doswald from the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). The session employed a hand-raised voting system to gauge participants' awareness and views on GGA-related topics. Approximately 50% of the audience were aware of the Global Goal on Adaptation, 20% were following GGA discussions under the UNFCCC, and 70% recognized the value of including EbA in global targets and indicators.

A panel discussion with introductory presentations was subsequently held. Sandeep Chamling Rai from the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) gave a presentation on the GGA in the UNFCCC Landscape. Cordula Epple from the United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) reflected on how EbA/NbS can be reflected in the GGA targets/indicators. Finally, Harisoa Rakotondrzafy/Alice Estelle from WWF gave a reality check on the actual implementation of EbA/NbS by outlining some of the challenges and opportunities from the African experience and what this means for the GGA. Discussion with the audience followed.

Summary of Interventions & Key Findings

The following key messages came out of the presentations and discussions:

1. **The Global Goal on Adaptation needs to be ambitious**

The GGA was a welcome addition to the UNFCCC discussions because it places adaptation on par and in balance with mitigation, with an aim to advance adaptation ambition. However, the conceptualization of adaptation creates key challenges in terms of definitions (e.g. sometimes there are unclear boundaries between adaptation and development), in terms of methodological guidance (since adaptation encompasses many approaches) and in terms of formulating universal targets (as adaptation is locally specific), and finally the development of the framework that helps to measure the achievement of the GGA.

knowledge and priorities, to direct action and finance towards effective locally led adaptation that contributes to national objectives.

The needs of the most vulnerable should also be given more attention at the international level. An IFRC analysis demonstrated that finance flows so far are not prioritizing the countries with the highest risk and lowest capacity, particularly when funding is assessed on a per-person basis. None of the 30 countries most vulnerable to climate- and weather-related disasters were among the 30 highest recipients of adaptation funding on a per capita basis.¹

A reflection was made during the discussion that the Loss and Damage discussions and the GGA probably intersect when it comes to the people and countries most vulnerable to climate change. Indeed, the high end of the vulnerability spectrum is where loss and damage will occur.

Capacity building and technology transfer were also discussed during the session. However, it was reflected that those are ongoing processes and in some cases, it shouldn't be just science-based, but in climate adaptation, we need to acknowledge the local and traditional knowledge as well as technology transfer from south to south, south to north, and north to south.

3. The GGA needs to be informed by bottom-up learning from national and local level measures and experiences

The importance of contextualizing global targets at the national level was stressed. A balance between top-down and bottom-up approaches to target-setting was recommended, utilizing experiences and best practices from the ground level. The global targets could inform and guide national priority setting and overall level of ambition. Examples of such an approach already exist in other international policy frameworks (e.g. CBD).

Questions were asked about how we can ensure coherence in bottom-up and top-down approaches to target setting, and how information from monitoring the targets can meaningfully be aggregated from the ground level up. Ensuring coherence can be a two-way process, with experience and best practices from the ground level informing adjustments at the global level, and the global overview yielding insights on where efforts need to be strengthened. Aggregating information from ground level up will always be challenging when targets and indicators have been made locally or nationally specific. However, it can be done as long as there is some guidance for the setting of targets and indicators and one accepts the unavoidable loss of granularity at each level of aggregation (e.g. aggregate figures can be produced as to the percenguin-5(f)-22(thare6-5(f)-22)4(u)2rArom65(f)-22f rtaiwn h(z)4arc

Currently, there is no explicit reference to either EbA or NbS in the list of potential targets that have been proposed for the GGA framework. Ecosystems are referenced in some of the targets, but only as an asset to be preserved or as a sector in which to support adaptation. They are not recognized as the source of ecosystem services that can help to achieve adaptation within other sectors.

An explicit reference to NbS/EbA will ensure that these approaches are used to their full potential and not overlooked. Furthermore, doing so would support synergies with other international agreements, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity or the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

When thinking about ways to integrate EbA/NbS in the GGA framework, it is important to bear in mind some quality criteria that ensure a target is fit for purpose. A good target needs to be pertinent, measurable, and have a direct link to success. That is to say, reaching a target should mean that the problem is sufficiently addressed. This is sometimes not ensured with generic targets such as 'increase adaptive capacity', 'reduce risks from climate change' or 'take action for XX% of people'. Where ethical considerations make it difficult to define an 'acceptable' endpoint for adaptation success (e.g. there cannot be an 'acceptable' number of deaths from extreme events), wordings linked to thresholds can be used, e.g. 'reduce risks from flooding to the level of 2000-2010 or below'.

A few possible targets including EbA/NbS were presented (both process- and outcome-oriented targets):

- Vulnerability and risk assessments identify critical climate risks to ecosystems and ecosystem services, and the role of ecosystems in adaptation (by considering both current and future needs for ecosystem services)

- National Adaptation Plans make use of EbA/NbSA approaches

appropriately in its global targets and indicators, and so that there is