

Transboundary climate risks and adaptation in mountain areas: shaping the global agenda in 2024 and beyond

Recommendations for UNFCCC negotiators



1. The Global Goal on Adaptation and UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience

UAE–Belém Work Programme:

- Call for the development of four bespoke indicators to assess the extent to which transboundary climate risks are explicitly accounted for in each stage of the iterative adaptation cycle and thereby incorporated when measuring progress achieved towards the four dimensional targets¹.
- Call for the design of metrics and methodologies that ensure indicators developed to measure progress achieved towards the seven thematic targets are “data ready” to account for the effects of transboundary climate risks on their outcomes;² also invite Parties to consider the importance of developing one or more mountain indicators to accurately assess progress towards achieving the thematic target on ecosystems and biodiversity specifically.³
- Emphasize the important ability of indicators to measure progress achieved at regional and international scales (in addition to national and local) and levels of cooperation in adaptation towards “just resilience” accordingly.
- Raise the role that transformational adaptation could play in managing transboundary climate risks and strengthening just resilience at the global scale. This could draw on the 2023 [SBSTA Research Dialogue](#), which introduced the link between transboundary climate risks and transformational adaptation.⁴
- Invite the Adaptation Committee, in collaboration with the Consultative Group of Experts and the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, to support the implementation of the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience with specific technical guidance and training materials on effective adaptation in mountain ecosystems and resilience building for transboundary climate risks.



2. The Global Stocktake

- Closely follow agreed modalities of the dialogue on implementing the Global Stocktake outcomes to identify future opportunities to raise transboundary climate risks and adaptation in mountain areas within the dialogue.



3. Planning and reporting

NAP assessment:

- Call for the NAP assessment’s recommendations to include an explicit proposal for the stronger integration of transboundary climate risks and stronger recognition of global dependencies on adaptation in mountain areas in NAP processes.
- Raise the challenges associated with the integration of transboundary climate risks in NAPs in discussions related to the outcomes of the assessment. Call for increased support to Parties to strengthen their capacities to integrate transboundary climate risks in both the formulation and implementation of NAPs.
- Encourage Parties to ensure the outcomes of the assessment reflect key lessons drawn from national adaptation planning processes in mountain areas to date, such as the need for cross-sectoral and cross-jurisdictional collaboration to promote systemic adaptation, and the need for cohesion and alignment with domestic regulatory frameworks and sectoral policies.

Ad-hoc discussions related to NDCs:

- Encourage Parties to consider adaptation to transboundary climate risks in their updated NDCs, raising levels of ambition in adaptation in accordance with the new UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience.

The Enhanced Transparency Framework:

- Encourage Parties to account for transboundary climate risks in their BTRs (and/or national inventory reports) and argue for the inclusion of transboundary climate risks during the review of the guidelines for the Enhanced Transparency Framework in 2028.



4. Finance

The New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG):

- Raise transboundary climate risks and emphasize the need for financial support for adaptation to these risks, including for international cooperation, under discussions on adaptation effectiveness. In doing so, underscore that such steps reflect findings from the first Global Stocktake and the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience, that “climate change impacts are often transboundary in nature and may involve complex, cascading risks” and support will be required to enable the “climate-informed transboundary management and cooperation on global adaptation solutions” that benefits them.

Long-term climate finance:

- Raise the management of transboundary climate risks as an important element of climate-resilience development pathways – potentially as a topic at the 2026 high-level ministerial dialogue.
- Propose a request to the Standing Committee on Finance to prepare a report on financing for transboundary climate risks or include it as a topic under the existing Biennial Assessment and Overview of Climate Finance Flows.

Matters relating to the operating entities of the financial mechanism:

- Provide guidance to the Green Climate Fund and Global Environment Facility to include programming for adaptation to transboundary climate risks in their portfolios; recognize transboundary initiatives that the Adaptation Fund supports and call for their expansion, potentially via a specific window for pilot projects that build resilience to tele-connected risks propagating between non-neighbouring countries.



5. Loss and damage

The Santiago Network:

- Raise the links between transboundary climate risks and loss and damage (as articulated in the ‘Rationale for

recommendations’ below). Call for technical assistance for developing countries to better understand and assess transboundary climate risks that result in loss and damage and the implementation of relevant approaches for responding to them.

- Call for financial and technical assistance to strengthen the evidence base regarding the capacities of mountain communities to identify and quantify the socio-economic costs of the losses and damages they experience, as well as needs and activities to recover from them.

Loss and damage fund:

- Draw attention to transboundary climate risks that create loss and damage. Encourage Parties to consider vulnerability to transboundary climate risks in the criteria developed to select loss and damage recipients and in the design of local loss and damage needs assessments.
- Draw attention to transboundary climate risks that arise from loss and damage (including non-economic loss and damage) and corresponding transboundary opportunities that can arise from the provision of loss and damage funds.
- Call for a programmatic approach to the provision of loss and damage finance to allow for flexibility in the use of funds, enabling countries to better account for transboundary implications in finance implementation.

Endnotes

1. The four dimensions are: impact, vulnerability and risk assessment; planning; implementation; monitoring, evaluation and learning. The Adaptation Committee’s information note (published 5 September 2024) on “Information on adaptation indicators reported by Parties in their national reports and communications” suggests the consideration of transboundary climate risks across both dimensional and thematic targets is thus far limited.
2. The serious threat posed by transboundary climate risks to the majority of these thematic areas is elucidated in [The Global Transboundary Climate Risk Report](#). The seven themes are (in short): water security; food security; human health; ecosystems and biodiversity; infrastructure and human settlement; poverty eradication and livelihoods; and cultural heritage.
3. The new indicators proposed in the first and second recommendation should be included in the technical reports for consideration by SB62 (in June 2025).
4. The Secretariat was requested to examine how transformational adaptation is defined and understood at different spatial scales and sectors, and how progress in planning and implementing transformational adaptation approaches might be assessed at the global level, in Decision 7/CMA.3.

For more information and detailed descriptions of each track, read the full version of the brief:

