



Glasgow Climate Dialogues

Voices from the Global South

Appraisal of COP26 outcomes in light of the expectations from the Glasgow Climate Dialogues

This appraisal report was produced by Dr. Bimal Raj Regmi.

This is an independent appraisal. Panellists, moderators, and organisers of GCD have been consulted in the development of this report.



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

Foreword

Climate change is the greatest long-term threat facing the planet and its people, and we're already seeing the impact of it around the world. However, just as the causes of this crisis cannot be attributed equally across the world, the impacts of this crisis are also unfairly distributed. Countries in the Global South, mostly inhabiting tropic regions of the world, are disproportionately affected by extreme, unpredictable climate events and yet have done virtually nothing to contribute to it. This is not an accident of geography, but because of political and economic constructs which keep levels of poverty in these countries extremely high.

That is why, ahead of COP26 in Glasgow, the Scottish Government and Stop Climate Chaos Scotland collaborated to hold a series of dialogues with representatives of government and civil society in the Global South to understand their priorities for the conference. These discussions, the Glasgow Climate Dialogues, intended to be a platform for experts and people with lived experience of climate change to raise their voices and perspectives, and to come together in dialogue with global actors to identify solutions.

The communique from the Glasgow Climate Dialogues was used as a key tool to inform Scottish Government and Scottish Civil Society engagements at the COP. The dialogues helped Scottish actors play the role of a "bridge" at the conference, between those most impacted by climate change and yet who are too often frozen out at the talks, and the discussions happening inside the conference centre on the banks of the Clyde.

Crucial to these talks was recognition of the value in dialogue involving the Global South, to identify common solutions to the many unevenly spread injustices.

This report reviews the Glasgow Climate Dialogues process and compares the outcomes of COP26 with the communique. This report therefore cuts through the rhetoric on COP26 outcomes, seeking to shine a light on the perspectives of the Global South on Glasgow's successes and failures, again helping to promote the voices that need to be heard and yet are so often ignored.

Crucially, as this report highlights, these dialogues produced tangible recommendations which the Scottish Government were quick to adopt, most evidently in its landmark decision at COP26 to become the first developed country to pledge money to address Loss & Damage. Our First Minister called this "an act of reparations, not charity" and we welcome this commitment and her on-going pledge to continue to champion the issue of Loss and Damage at COP27 and beyond.

This report considers what needs to happen at COP27 through reflection on the perspectives of Global South actors on the outcomes of COP26. This document itself can therefore be considered a bridge between the two conferences, and should mark the continued support of the Scottish Government and Scottish Civil Society to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Global South, and all of the many people and organisations trying to affect positive change on the issue of climate change.

Mike Robinson

Chair of Stop Climate Chaos Scotland

Executive Summary

The Glasgow Climate Dialogues included four online sessions co-hosted by the Scottish Government and Scottish civil society in collaboration with representatives of Global South civil society. In addition, a communique was launched at the end of September and a side event was held on the outcomes of the dialogues at COP26 itself. These Dialogues were designed to engage with, learn from, and provide a platform for Global South stakeholders to share their perspectives on key climate change issues ahead of COP26 in Glasgow.

The major themes of the Dialogues were: i) Access, Participation, and Voice; ii) Adaptation and Resilience; iii) Loss and Damage, and iv) Just Transition. These four themes were identified by Stop Climate Chaos Scotland (SCCS) and the Scottish Government. The Dialogues were attended by leading climate experts on each of the respective topics. Global South experts made up the majority of speakers and facilitators, with some Global North experts invited to dialogue with them during each session. The conclusions reached in this appraisal are based upon a review of the products of the Dialogues such as video recordings, event reports, interviews, and focus group discussions.

The appraisal concludes that the Glasgow Climate Dialogues have been very effective in achieving its target in terms of providing platforms for the expression of voices of the Global South, engaging and building an understanding of the perspectives of those who experience the impacts of climate change first-hand and particularly of those countries and people facing the worst impacts and who have done the least to cause this climate crisis. The Scottish Government's role was very much appreciated in terms of taking leadership as well as demonstrating goodwill, solidarity, and robust commitments to address issues of the Global South, such as Loss and Damage.

Respondents to this appraisal process agreed that the Dialogues provided a forum for both the Global North and Global South to conduct more contextual, grounded, and reality-based discussions on emerging issues such as gender and social inclusion, climate governance, justice, fairness, and accountability. Although the Dialogues were primarily focused on the COP agenda, they stretched further and facilitated deep discussions on concerns as well as solutions that can be significant for the world's most vulnerable people.



Members of the Glasgow Climate Dialogues task force with a copy of the Communique at a COP26 side event.

Photo: Chris Hoskins

The Dialogues were an important platform for Global South actors to raise their expectations on some key themes and for these to be brought into the negotiations. As a parallel process to formal negotiations, the Dialogues can claim no causal relationship directly with COP outcomes. However, various expectations regarding access and participation, adaptation, Loss and Damage, and Just Transition were voiced. These expectations went beyond the formal agenda, and they were also a gesture to the developed nation negotiators about the limited nature of formal agenda issues and discussions' narrow emphases.

For many delegates from the Global South, the outcome of COP26 was a compromised agreement that was not founded on equity and fairness. The agreement on Article 6, Adaptation Financing Transparency, was viewed positively by some. On the contrary, the inability to address the need for a Glasgow Facility on Loss and Damage, the delays in reaching the obligations of 100 billion USD, and difficulties concerning fossil fuels phasing out and Nationally Determined Contributions/Long Term Strategies, amongst others, were viewed as COP26 shortcomings. Furthermore, COP26 had logistical obstacles that precluded some country representatives and made participation by the Global South difficult. These logistical obstacles were further exacerbated by COVID but pre-date it and so speak to a more fundamental need to make greater efforts to ensure fairer access and participation for those Global South countries, and particularly those from the Global South civil society groups, to be able to take part.

There are outstanding concerns that must be reviewed and resolved during COP27. Since COP27 is being hosted by Egypt, it is hoped that it will reach an agreement on Loss and Damage financing, ensuring access and participation of the Global South, and integrating issues related to human rights, justice, fairness, equity, inclusion, and adequate and efficient financing.

This assessment asserts that the process, substance, and general structure of the Glasgow Climate Dialogues have significant potential for replication for COP27 and beyond.

The views expressed in this report are those of the researchers and do not necessarily represent those of the Scottish Government or Scottish Ministers

1. Introduction

The “Glasgow Climate Dialogues” were a series of Scottish Government hosted online discussions of issues vital to climate action ambition with leading representatives of the Global South ahead of COP26. The Dialogues consisted of four thematic online events, with expert input and discussion, and were co-led by Scottish and Global South Civil Society Organisations (CSO) representatives as follows:

- Access, Participation & Voice – Scottish Catholic International Aid Fund (SCIAF) and Civil Society Network on Climate Change (CISONECC) – Malawi
- Adaptation – Oxfam Scotland and Oxfam Bangladesh
- Loss & Damage – International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD) – Bangladesh
- Just Transition – Friends of the Earth Scotland and International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) Africa

The Dialogues were hosted and funded by the Scottish Government, the delivery of the grant was managed by Stop Climate Chaos Scotland (SCCS) and the Dialogues were delivered by a task force comprising Scottish Government officials and Scottish and international CSO representatives.

The Dialogues sought to provide an opportunity for stakeholders from the Global South (including but not limited to representatives from Malawi, Zambia, Rwanda, and Pakistan as Scottish Government partner countries as well as Tanzania, Bangladesh, and Bhutan as Least Developed Country chairs) to garner support from the Global North stakeholders on key issues that needed consideration during the negotiations. Representatives from CSOs and government climate departments shared their positions on some of the key negotiating areas at COP26 to develop a shared understanding of the status of these key issues and to identify where collective action could advance UNFCCC goals and objectives.

This understanding and call for collective global action (from both party and non-party actors) were set out in the Dialogues communique¹ before COP26. It was anticipated that the Dialogues would provide a platform to add depth to existing Scottish Government commitments on climate and development.

More information about the Dialogues, including the communique, is available [here](#).

2. Purpose of the appraisal

The main purpose was to appraise COP26 outcomes in light of the expectations from the Glasgow Climate Dialogues. To achieve the research objectives, the documentary evidence generated by the Glasgow Climate Dialogues was analysed (including reports from Glasgow Climate Dialogues, the communique, and recordings of Dialogue sessions) alongside other secondary sources as required. In addition, key stakeholder interviews were undertaken, and one focus group was held (see Annex 3).

This appraisal has drawn its evidence from the existing publications of SCCS regarding the Glasgow Climate Dialogues, and consultations with selected people who were part of the dialogue. The conclusion drawn in this appraisal thus cannot be generalised for the COP26 related outcomes and implications are mostly related to the effectiveness of Glasgow Climate Dialogues.

¹ <https://www.stopclimatechaos.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Communique%CC%81--Glasgow-Climate-Dialogues.pdf>

3. COP26 expectations versus outcomes

a. Access, Participation and Voice

Expectations from the Dialogues

There was a realisation amongst the panellists, speakers, participants, and organisers that decisions made without the most impacted people would work against their interests, and therefore they need to be meaningfully represented. This Dialogue session urged the sharing of the groups whose participation is important but often difficult – people from Oceania, young people, women & girls, civil society (especially Global South CSOs), indigenous peoples, and Global South governments.

Another recognition was that climate change reflects global inequalities, such as in gender. Women and girls disproportionately suffer the impacts of climate change. These groups are also excluded from the process of addressing climate change in UNFCCC spaces. The exclusion is partly since technological solutions do not work for the participation of the Global South because of technological inequality. Another hindrance to the inclusion is the expensive travel, visa, and hotel costs are also excluding people from the Global South.

The Dialogue raised some expectations for COP26. One of the major expectations was around the participation and inclusion of the Global South when making decisions about who gets to attend COP physically or virtually. The suggestions to the UNFCCC from the Dialogues regarding access and participation were the following

- Make special provisions to engage with Global South civil society and elevate their contributions and increase quotas for CSOs from the Global South.
- Increase financial support to improve access and participation.
- Encourage government delegations to include young people to be part of their delegations. Also, ensure a greater number of women in official delegations.
- Ensure special arrangements to collect positions and recommendations of the most vulnerable communities and for them to be shared with negotiators. Also, the arrangement of virtual events targeting those who cannot attend
- Support in the easing of visa processing, lifting COVID restrictions, access to vaccines and tests, and travel arrangements within Glasgow.
- Use press conferences/other forms of media to highlight the impact of real people from climate change.

What was achieved at COP26?

Access and participation

According to the organisers, COP26 was the largest COP to date. There were 120 world leaders and 50,000 registered delegates. More than 38,000 participants attended COP26, representing 194 countries. The UK Government regarded the COP as very inclusive and successful in terms of ensuring wider participation from the parties². The respondent from the Scottish Government said that Glasgow COP was an opportunity for the Scottish government to demonstrate a history of solidarity and partnership. They further added that the host city had historical ties and friendly relationships with people around the world, including the Global South, which motivated the Scottish Government to prioritise participation from the Global South.

Many interviewed respondents agreed that it was incredibly challenging to accommodate and arrange logistics for the largest turnouts after two years since COP25 in Madrid. They also

2 <https://www.devex.com/news/just-how-inclusive-is-cop-26-102049>

appreciated the hospitality shown by the Scottish Government and residents of Glasgow to welcome such large numbers and offer generous support for travel, accommodation, and security.

While the UK Government said they were “working tirelessly” with the Scottish Government and the UN to “ensure an inclusive, accessible and safe summit ... with a comprehensive set of Covid mitigation measures”³ delegates from poorer and vulnerable countries, for example, Nepal and Bhutan, have denounced it as favouring developed and rich countries, and exclusionary. It was disclosed that the COVID-19 pandemic caused difficulty for many people and shed light on issues of equity, such as vaccine and travel discrepancies, which made delegates from the Global South concerned about their ability to participate in the COP effectively and safely.

There were constantly changing COVID-19 restrictions for those entering the UK, with travel banned from countries on the UK’s red list, which, until a short time before the COP, excluded many of the country’s worst hit by the climate crisis. One of the Least Developed Country (LDC) negotiators said a group of 15 Caribbean countries, some of which were initially on the red list, could not attend due to a last-minute decision by the UK Government to lift the restrictions. This left many to seek costly and complicated routes to Glasgow via third countries. In addition, one of the facilitators of the Dialogues said that some of the participants of Pacific Island nations could also not attend. Also, an accommodation crisis in the city made finding a safe place to stay difficult and expensive⁴.

The government respondents from the Global South mentioned that, in terms of the logistics in the venue, the organiser tried to accommodate all. It was found that although approximately 40,000 participants were registered, the Scottish Event Campus was only able to accommodate 10,000 because of pandemic-related constraints (and small hallways), forcing delegates to rely on the bespoke online platform to follow the proceedings. A few respondents also expressed their concerns about the long queues at the venue’s entrance and limited access to the negotiations prompted queries about why, since hybrid facilities were available, delegates were compelled to travel to Glasgow—a potentially life-threatening and expensive journey for some.

Another issue raised by respondents is the chaos created during the earlier days of the negotiations when restrictions were imposed on delegates. According to one of the respondents, the largest non-plenary rooms held 144 socially distanced seats, fewer than the number of parties to the Paris Agreement. Participation rules were enforced differently from one room and one day to the next, with two passes per country. Dissatisfaction was also expressed, for instance when some of the Global South coordinators were refused entry to a negotiating session.

According to respondents from the LDCs, the restrictions for the yellow badge (NGO) participants in the formal and informal sessions excluded the representation of the most vulnerable groups such as community-based organisations and CSOs in the negotiation process and limited their rights to listen and observe. The youth respondent from Nepal said ‘although the formal negotiations are represented by government, the stake of non-government is especially important to reflect not just inter but also intra and across scales.’

COP participation is mostly dominated by governments and CSOs from rich countries. Also, within the LDCs, Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), and other Global South blocs, the governments and CSOs who are operating at the national level and/or federal level get more exposure and opportunities. One of the local level CSOs from Nepal argued that they only know what is going on at the international level and there is no such practice to engage the grassroots level organisation that is bearing the brunt of climate change. The respondent further stressed that it is not guaranteed that the national delegates have the grounded experience and knowledge of what is going on at household and community levels. According to her, this is a dilemma in the governance of climate negotiations.

Inclusion and voice

The appraisal concludes that COP26 has set a certain level of expectations for the coming COP with regards to progressing the discussion on inclusion and voice of the Global South. Many respondents who were part of the Glasgow Climate Dialogues perceived that the Scottish Government in particular was very generous and accommodating in terms of forging an alliance with the Global South and ensuring that the CSOs, community-based organisations, and women and youth got exposure to COP and have spaces where they could express their concerns.

3 <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/oct/30/cop26-will-be-whitest-and-most-privileged-ever-warn-campaigners>

4 <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/oct/30/cop26-will-be-whitest-and-most-privileged-ever-warn-campaigners>

According to a respondent, “the proactiveness of the Scottish Government and Scottish CSOs is worth appreciating as they were very keen to provide platforms for the Global South participants to raise their voices, concerns, and demands on how COP26 can meet their expectations, this is something very encouraging to us”.

Some countries from the Global South were inclusive in terms of delegations. For example, the government of Nepal included all the participants who are attending COP26 in the government delegations. According to many, this move was very encouraging to allow CSOs, youth, women, and the private sector to participate in the event and allowed their access to formal sessions. Likewise, the respondents from Malawi also agreed that increasingly the government was being generous and accommodative to provide space to non-government stakeholders in the delegations.

However, according to some of the respondents, the expectations of Glasgow Climate Dialogues were not fully met. It was found that the format of COP and UNFCCC meetings always gives priority to the party delegates and a limited number of observers representing CSOs, media, the private sector, etc. It is countries and their representatives who are the key decision-makers in the negotiations. Although there are spaces and platforms for CSOs to raise their concerns, they have a limited role in informal negotiation. According to some respondents, this format is a bottleneck to ensure inclusion and the voices of the voiceless.

The interviews with respondents and review of COP26-related documents revealed that there were no such special arrangements or platforms to collect positions and recommendations of the most vulnerable communities and for them to be shared with negotiators. However, according to the respondents interviewed, the side events outside of the formal settings were instrumental in including the voices of the voiceless presented through videos, pictures, animations, and physical sharing. Some international and national non-government organisations sponsored the participation of a few community representatives.

During dialogues, it was found that the COP26 secretariat gave some room to women, indigenous peoples, and youth, but the formal platform for civil societies from the Global South was limited. There were presidency theme days on both Gender and Youth and Public Empowerment. Also, parties agreed on a new ten-year Work Programme on Action for Climate Empowerment to promote youth engagement, climate education, and public participation. Furthermore, parties agreed to a new three-year Work Programme on Local Communities and Indigenous People.

The review of COP26 related documents shows that there were twenty four female heads of state in total, revealing the gender disparity at the World Leaders Summit. Males made up the bulk of the delegates, and about 60% of the speakers were men. The plenary is primarily for party delegates, as well as government officials and leadership. The secretariat limited the number of party delegates in the early days of the COP, but this was changed after significant resistance from LDCs and poorer countries. Formal and plenary sessions, as well as the speakers, represent the formal sector, with a few exceptions.

The interaction with Global South participants revealed that indigenous people and community-based organisations attending COP26 faced difficulties due to language barriers and unfamiliarity with the UNFCCC process. For example, two female indigenous participants from the Mixteca region of Oaxaca in southern Mexico and one participant representing CSOs in Nepal were attending COP for the first time as accredited observers. When talking to them to get more insights about the experiences of Indigenous peoples at COP, they argued that it was a space designed for English speakers with few multilingual signs, and most many sides and panel events did not offer simultaneous translation, limiting their ability to take part. One of them noted the challenges with the process: “We faced so much stress in terms of finding a venue, the vaccination process, the accreditation, and following the events. I missed one of the sessions where I was a panellist because of language and unfamiliarity issues. I even tried to ask other participants, but it was difficult.”

In addition, there are also some issues with the inclusion and voice of youth and indigenous peoples from the Global South. The youth and indigenous people’s delegates from Nepal argued that although inclusion has improved in recent years, it is however inadequate. A youth activist who participated in COP26 from Nepal said that the Global North mostly dominates the youth forum and movement, and that the Global South youth are marginalised. Also, one of the facilitators agrees that the leadership of youth, women, and indigenous peoples needs to be enhanced in global forums.



Chief Executive of Oxfam GB Danny Sriskandarajah speaking at a Glasgow Climate Dialogues COP26 side event.

Recommendations based on review and interview

- At COP27, special efforts should be made to ensure that women, indigenous peoples, and young people have equal access to UNFCCC negotiations. Some of the practical solutions could be making the plenary rooms, and formal and informal consultation rooms large to accommodate as many as possible, and providing entry access to observers from CSOs.
- It is critical to interact with nations in the Global South to encourage them to increase women's, indigenous peoples', and youth engagement, primarily by including these groups as representatives in-country delegations.
- A series of discussions with the COP presidency is required to ensure that the accreditation process, and negotiations, particularly the formal and informal sessions, are open to civil society groups and that more spaces are provided for ensuring that the voices of women and girls, youth, civil society, people from mountains, AOSIS, people with disabilities, indigenous peoples, and communities on the frontlines of climate impacts are heard in the negotiations.
- Lobby with the presidency and secretariat to provide financial resources to support the participation of youth, women, and indigenous peoples from the Global South.
- Encourage the leadership of youth, women, and indigenous peoples from the Global South in the climate movement. This can be done through capacity building and working closely with the Global North.

b. Adaptation

Expectations from the Dialogues

Adaptation is the heart of negotiations for all Global South countries that are struggling with everyday issues and threats posed by climate change. People in the Global South must adapt to extreme weather and climatic conditions, the losses and damages from climate-induced disasters, and the rapid and slow onset threatening their food security, jobs, and livelihoods.

The Global South demanded that developed countries must meet their US\$100bn annual climate finance promise with the target of a 50:50 split between mitigation and adaptation finance achieved and funding provided as concessional grants, not loans. It was realised that a lot of work needs to be done to achieve that. It is clear from the [Fourth Biennial Assessment and Overview of Climate Finance Flows](#) that support for mitigation remains greater than support for adaptation; indeed, adaptation finance has remained at between 20 and 25% of committed concessional finance across all sources⁵. Also, recognising this is insufficient, the expectation was that COP26 would significantly increase climate finance and agree on a stretching new global public finance goal for adaptation for post-2025.

Many of the Global South respondents (listed in Annex 3) raised the issues of transparency and accountability of financing. They demanded that improved accounting mechanisms are in place to enhance scrutiny of the quantity and quality of climate finance with more funding committed via UNFCCC mandated channels and climate finance both new and additional to Official Development Assistance (ODA).

Access to most climate financing sources is an issue for the Global South. It is therefore one of the major agendas of the Global South to see a process that can enhance easy and fast access to climate finance for the LDCs and AOSIS, including by simplifying application procedures and overcoming capacity barriers.

Many of the LDC and AOSIS respondents perceived that climate financing is not yet reaching the local level and the vulnerable groups. It was expected that COP26 would reach an agreement on ensuring that climate finance will be fully accessible and responsive to the needs and rights of women, children and young people, indigenous peoples, people with disabilities, and other marginalised groups, with structural barriers removed. The expectation from the Dialogue was that the proportion of climate finance reaching local communities must be increased with monitoring enhanced to assess progress. They also demanded that the Principles for Locally Led Adaptation should be formally endorsed by all Parties to the UNFCCC with action to ensure climate funds facilitate increased local allocation, including strengthening local structures, processes, and institutions.

In addition, the Adaptation Dialogue demanded a new, progressively increasing global goal for climate finance reaching local levels. They also expected technology and knowledge must be shared with local communities whilst ensuring that local knowledge is harnessed. Likewise, the Dialogue participants expected that COP26 would ensure that the Global Stocktake embraced devolved and participatory decision-making, especially in evaluating progress on adaptation.

There were expectations that the support systems – protecting the rights to land, water, and natural resources – would be discussed at COP26 along with ensuring the necessary investments and rights are delivered through an inclusive decision-making process with natural sources of food – including fisheries and forests – managed in a participatory way. The Dialogue also expected that COP26 would focus on scaling up landscape-level adaptation and agroecological solutions as part of the successful climate-resilient models.

⁵ <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-glasgow-climate-pact/cop26-outcomes-finance-for-climate-adaptation>

What was achieved at COP26?

Many respondents, interviewed from the Global South, perceived the Glasgow Pact as business as usual, with some progress in a few areas but an underestimated response on adaptation.

The Glasgow – Sharm el-Sheikh work programme on the global goal of adaptation, established and launched at COP26, represents a turning point in the world's journey to both make and measure progress towards this global goal. According to the LDC negotiators from Nepal, this work programme will help enhance understanding of the global goal of adaptation and how to understand progress towards it. The respondent also added that it will further help equip communities and countries like Nepal with the knowledge and tools to ensure that the adaptation actions they take are indeed moving the world towards a more climate-resilient future.

COP26 urged developed nations to at least double their collective provision of adaptation finance from 2019 levels by 2025, to achieve this balance between adaptation and mitigation. Record amounts of adaptation finance have been pledged, including committing to doubling 2019 levels of adaptation finance by 2025. At COP26, Parties welcomed new financial pledges made to the Adaptation Fund (totaling over \$350 million) and to the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) (totaling over \$600 million) that will translate into helping vulnerable people bolster resilience to the worsening impacts of climate change.

Some of the respondents thought that the Glasgow Climate Dialogues, the side events, and discussion outside the formal venue enriched the discussion around cutting edge issues such as gender, inclusion, locally led adaptation, the rights of women and indigenous people, decentralised financing, and equity in terms of benefit sharing. The Green Zone, where exhibitions and open events were hosted, provided opportunities to civil society, the private sector, and others to highlight their innovations, share stories and display their achievements.

One of the panellists of the Dialogues said that there were encouraging achievements in terms of aligning governments, development agencies, and other actors on the principles of adaptation. She said that Locally Led Adaptation (LLA) was the heart of the adaptation discussion in the side events. According to her, by aligning their work with the Principles for LLA, these organisations acknowledge that business-as-usual approaches to planning and financing adaptation are not working for the people and communities at greatest risk. In addition to these game-changing commitments to locally-led adaptation, global leaders and funders mobilised more than [\\$450 million](#) for efforts specifically targeted at implementing locally-led approaches to building climate resilience.

Gender and social inclusion were other topics that drew attention at the COP26 side events and dialogues. During COP26 the leaders of Estonia, Tanzania, and Bangladesh were the first to sign the Glasgow Women's Leadership statement⁶, calling for countries to support the leadership of women and girls on climate action at all levels of society and politics. One of the panellists of the Dialogues said that the formal negotiation format makes it a bit difficult to deep dive into specific issues and bring both quantity and quality of interventions into the spotlight of discussions. However, there was progress compared to the past. She said in the climate financing discussion the inclusion issues were raised and became part of the discussion. According to the respondent, there was an opportunity in an ongoing discussion on the Gender Action Plan and Lima Action Plan which was missed in terms of discussion on inclusion.

For many respondents, COP26 was biased toward adaptation in terms of agenda-setting of the conference and formal discussions within it. Some even argued that adaptation did not receive enough attention because of the focus on Article 6 and Loss and Damage. One of the respondents interviewed said, "adaptation could not receive enough attention in the agenda and the agenda was skewed towards more general issues rather than agenda of inclusivity, decentralised financing, issues of targeting and benefit-sharing, and locally-led adaptation."

Nonetheless, it was found that the pledged sums remained far below the annual \$70 billion developing countries are thought to need now, an amount that could rise to \$300 billion a year by 2030, according to the UN⁷. This will not give all the finance that poorer nations need, which currently accounts for just approximately 25% of total climate finance (with 75% going towards green technologies to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions)⁸.

6 <https://www.gov.scot/publications/glasgow-womens-leadership-statement-gender-equality-climate-change/>

7 <https://www.reuters.com/business/cop/climate-loss-damage-earns-recognition-little-action-cop26-deal-2021-11-13/>

8 <https://www.reuters.com/business/cop/climate-loss-damage-earns-recognition-little-action-cop26-deal-2021-11-13/>

Even though a Global Goal for Adaptation was not established during COP26, there was some progress in this area with the beginning of the two-year Glasgow Sharm el-Sheikh Work Programme on the Global Goal for Adaptation. Another unresolved climate justice problem is whether this funding will be distributed in the form of loans or grants, a choice that would have a significant impact on climate-vulnerable nations' ability to adapt.

The respondents from Global South were also critical of the governance of existing climate finance, which was skewed toward poor countries with little resources. There has been no concrete agreement on the funding balance for adaptation and mitigation, including grant and loan components, as well as the simplification of compliance measures, the fast-tracking of climate finance, and the fund's adequacy to implement the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and other national adaptation priorities.

Although the UNFCCC secretariat has launched an UN-wide partnership, UN4NAPs⁹, to mobilise the whole UN system to support the most vulnerable countries in preparing and implementing their NAPs, according to the government negotiator from Nepal, the commitments in terms of supporting the implementation of NAPs is not fully included as a priority by Green Climate Fund (GCF) and other sources of funding.

Some respondents even showed their concern about the failure to reach any conclusion or agreement on a joint work programme on agriculture. The issues of agriculture and food security, according to the negotiator from LDC, are at the central heart of adaptation and resilience, particularly in LDCs where agriculture is the major source of livelihood. One of the respondents even said that 'the postponement of agenda and agreement on the Koronovia Joint Work Programme is gross ignorance of the severity of food security and nutritional crisis in developing countries.'

Another area of concern is the governance of global climate funds that are under the UNFCCC. Many of the participants in COP26 from the Global South perceived that the GCF, Global Environment Facility, and others have developed sophisticated and complex processes often discouraging countries and even limiting their access to grants in comparison to the loan. One of the respondents from Bangladesh said although the COP decided to double the fund for adaptation, it may not be implemented by GCF, and other funds have given their historical practice of inclining more towards the loan compared to the grant. Also, one of the panellists of the Dialogues said that GCF is now being captured mostly by big multilaterals and gradually shifting towards the financial institutions that are interested in loans.

Recommendations from review and interview

- Equity of access is critical. More country-level discussion is also required to facilitate implementation. When it comes to adaptation, the question of equity is critical to address. Despite this, the goal of a 50:50 split between mitigation and adaptation finance was met at COP26.
- Clarity on the additionality of adaptation financing: with increasing financing committed via UNFCCC required channels and climate finance both new and additional to ODA, it is critical to develop monitoring and accounting procedures to improve scrutiny of the quantity and quality of climate finance.
- It is essential to improve direct access to climate funds for LDCs and AOSIS, notably through the simplification of application procedures and the addressing of national capacity gaps in accessing and mobilising climate finance.
- Dedicated resources should be announced for Locally Led Adaptation to ensure accessible and responsive finance to the needs and rights of women, children and young people, indigenous peoples, people with disabilities, and other marginalised groups
- The Glasgow-Sharm El-Sheikh work programme on the Global Goal of Adaptation, which was one of the major good outcomes of COP26, is another significant outcome that must be carried through in COP27 to secure more commitments and agreement on adaptation.

9 <https://unfccc.int/UN4NAPs>

c. Loss and Damage¹⁰

Expectations on Loss and Damage from the Dialogues

Losses and damages are already happening, trapping people in poverty and threatening their human rights. By 2030, the economic costs in developing countries are expected to reach \$200–580 billion¹¹. Ugandan climate activist Vanessa Nakate, noted recently of COP26: “Finance for adaptation is critical, but for many of us in vulnerable countries, adapting to climate change is no longer enough. You cannot adapt to starvation. You cannot adapt to extinction. You cannot adapt to lost culture and heritage.”¹²

The appraisal shows that there was noticeably clear demand and expectations of the Glasgow Climate Dialogues on Loss and Damage backed with evidence, cases, and stories from the Global South. There is a realisation that loss and damage due to anthropogenic climate change is an intergenerational injustice issue and the failure to recognise this and address it timely will undermine the human security and rights of people to live in a secure, risk-free, and prosperous world.

- Parties to the UNFCCC should listen more to those who are experiencing Loss and Damage – particularly the young, women, and the marginalised – to be able to find ways to address this climate reality. Ways to document and record these experiences should be reported and assessed as part of the Global Stocktake.
- Acknowledgment of the shared global responsibility for Loss and Damage should be expressed through a solidarity fund that channels support (financial, moral, technical) to those who need it most. Scotland, as a world-renowned champion of climate justice, should convene discussions starting at COP26 to better address Loss and Damage as a part of the reality of climate injustice.
- Loss and Damage should be formalised under the UNFCCC as a third pillar area of negotiation and decisions. The UNFCCC needs to move on from trying to understand the complexity of climate Loss and Damage to the necessity of addressing it.
- National mechanisms to address Loss and Damage need to be built and supported. Governments should build knowledge and capacity where it is needed and have the political will necessary to address this reality.

What was achieved at COP26?

The negotiators from LDCs, AOSIS, and other country negotiators and activists saw COP26 as a [make-or-break point](#) for Loss and Damage. They pushed hard for a dedicated fund, but it was [ultimately excluded](#) from the negotiated outcome. Instead, the “Glasgow Dialogue”¹³ was established to explore ways to fund Loss and Damage. The process will run through 2024, so those in urgent need may still not get any help for several years. Yet this is the first time the need for dedicated Loss and Damage finance has been recognised in a COP decision. It is important to seize this opportunity.

Most of the Global South respondents interviewed in this appraisal perceived that the concept of Loss and Damage was in spirit of the global climate negotiations, after being on the back burner for some years. This to them is a major achievement. Saleem Huq, a scientist, and negotiation analyst, explained that the [increasing ability of science in attributing the specific responsibility](#) of climate change to any extreme weather event as well as a rapid surge of such events worldwide has facilitated the comeback of Loss and Damage issues in mainstream negotiation. He also said the events in Northern Europe had helped to focus more attention on L&D¹⁴.

10 Loss and Damage (with capitals) refers to the political aspects of the negotiations under the UNFCCC. The term losses and damages has been used more recently by the IPCC WGII to refer to past, current, and future adverse effects of climate change.

11 <https://www.sei.org/perspectives/glasgow-dialogue-loss-and-damage-finance/>

12 <https://www.npr.org/2021/11/09/1054032279/ugandas-vanessa-nakate-says-cop26-sidelines-nations-most-affected-by-climate-change?t=1653916634999>

13 See: [COP26 cover decision \(unfccc.int\)](https://unfccc.int/news/cop26-cover-decision)

14 <https://www.downtoearth.org.in/news/climate-change/cop26-not-on-official-agenda-but-loss-damage-comeback-gives-hope-say-experts-80467>

All the interview respondents believed that the Scottish Government's lead on Loss and Damage is worth appreciating. Also, it was found that the major success of Loss and Damage can be attributed to the partnership between the Scottish Government, Scottish CSOs, and the Global South. The respondent from the Scottish Government regarded the achievement of progress on Loss and Damage as a joint north and south collaboration. The first-of-its-kind financial contributions from Scotland and Wallonia (Belgium) to redress loss and damage – £2 million (\$2.6 million) and EUR 1 million (\$1.1 million), respectively – were very welcome, as was a similar commitment by different philanthropies. These helped cut through the political discussion and put financial responsibility for loss and damage.

According to the respondent from the Scottish CSOs involved in the Dialogues, the issues of Loss and Damage in the context of rights of the vulnerable countries came very strongly during COP26. He said that the Dialogues and other side events started a rich discussion on the process and content of making Loss and Damage a serious agenda for the parties to consider. This, according to him, has been possible through the collaboration of the Scottish Government, Scottish CSOs, Global South CSOs, and negotiators from the Global South.

This increased the focus on [finance for Loss and Damage](#) and put pressure on other developed countries to follow Scotland's lead as the first developed country to set aside funding specifically for that purpose. Subsequently, developing countries collectively called for the establishment of the Glasgow Loss and Damage Facility to mobilise and channel finance to vulnerable developing countries to support their efforts to address losses and damages.

Another major achievement, according to the facilitator of the Dialogue on Loss & Damage, is the progress in advancing the operationalisation of the Santiago Network on Loss and Damage (SNLD). According to him, at COP26 parties [elaborated on the functions of the SNLD](#), and a process was set out for developing its institutional arrangements, modalities, and structure in 2022 to fully operationalise the SNLD within the timeline agreed¹⁵.

According to the negotiator from Nepal at COP26, in addition to a robust SNLD, developing countries also called for the mobilisation of finance for Loss and Damage. Although the proposal of G77 and China was not accepted, parties were able to agree that the Santiago Network would be provided with finance to support technical assistance for the implementation of relevant approaches to avert, minimise and address loss and damage.

Developed countries were also urged to provide finance for both the operation of the Santiago Network and for the provision of technical assistance. [Germany pledged €10 million on the last day of the COP26](#) to support the Santiago Network, with Canada promising to also contribute. However, this outcome on Loss and Damage finance with a focus on funding technical assistance only, while welcome, is far from what is needed to mobilise finance at the scale of the needs. What is needed is finance for actions that address losses and damages in vulnerable developing countries.

Addressing the conceptual and financial gap will remain a key issue for COP27. Many LDCs, AOSIS, and developing country delegates, on the other hand, were enraged by the developed countries' treachery¹⁶. Bhutan, on behalf of the LDCs, stated that they left Glasgow with an acceptable package, although it did not secure their people's lives and livelihoods. Guinea, speaking on behalf of the developing country group, voiced "great displeasure" with the decision to start simply a "conversation" to discuss "arrangements for the finance of activities to avert, mitigate, and address Loss and Damage." Low-lying small island nations such as the Marshall Islands, Fiji, and Antigua and Barbuda, who fear losing most of their land to increasing sea levels, expressed disappointment that the fund they had requested had not been established¹⁷.

The outcome, according to CSO observers of COP26, is "an absolute betrayal" to the millions of people currently suffering from climate change. Vulnerable countries, on the other hand, chose to accept the package. "We can't go back to our country with nothing," the Marshall Islands said¹⁸. Political leaders failed the litmus test of providing compensation for loss and harm, according to the Climate Action Network, which advocated for a speedy and equitable "phase-out, not phase-down" of fossil fuels through a just transition, emphasising that incremental progress is insufficient.

15 <https://www.downtoearth.org.in/news/climate-change/cop26-not-on-official-agenda-but-loss-damage-comeback-gives-hope-say-experts-80467>

16 <https://odi.org/en/insights/our-thoughts-on-cop26-rolling-insight/>

17 <https://www.reuters.com/business/cop/climate-loss-damage-earns-recognition-little-action-cop26-deal-2021-11-13/>

18 <https://climatenetwork.org/2021/11/13/cop26-rich-nations-betray-vulnerable-people-of-the-world/>

Many respondents from the Global South criticised the developed countries for blocking the Glasgow Facility at the last moment in exchange for forging consensus on issues related to Article 6. Countries such as the US, Japan, and France blocked the establishment of funds proposed by the G77 and China to finance damage that has already occurred or that cannot be avoided (Loss and Damage), primarily out of fear of liability consequences and concern for not duplicating funding for humanitarian aid. One of the respondents further said that ‘negotiation has always been a ground for exercising the power of developed countries to divide and rule. The same thing happened. The rich developing countries traded Loss and Damage with agreement on phasing down all fossil fuels.’

The lack of convincing and quantifiable agreement on Loss and Damage is also concerning at the national level. One of the panellists in the Goboshona workshop¹⁹, said many climate policymakers, planners, and implementation organisations, including the public, were a little disappointed with the COP26 outcomes. Also, the public in Kathmandu who were following COP26 expressed their frustration. A journalist who works in Nepal said, “I was expecting that this time Loss and Damage would have some major achievement, but on the contrary, I did not find significant progress while reading the Glasgow Pact, what a shame.” Also, one of the CSOs who was asked about his reaction to the COP26 outcome said that more delays in decisions mean that poor people must sacrifice more for the luxury of rich nations.

Recommendations from review and interview

- The Glasgow Dialogue will need to move the conversation ahead quickly and address ideas and issues left hanging at COP26, particularly regarding finance for addressing losses and damages.
- Focus preliminary negotiations on ways to address losses and damages. At the time of this appraisal, a more mandated discussion is needed in the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs) meeting in June on the functions of the SNLD. There is also a need to have a connection between the SBs and COP agenda.
- If finance for Loss and Damage is to be a major expectation of COP27, this topic will need to be developed and worked on throughout 2022.
- It would be good to start engaging with the COP Presidency and like-minded developed countries to create grounds for negotiation on Loss and Damage, and in particular the creation of the financial facility.
- Highlight and support Scotland’s lead in giving financial support to addressing Loss and Damage – past, current, and future.
- Ratchet up financial commitments to build momentum leading up to COP27 and provide urgent support to frontline communities.
- Push the host nation (future hosts) to create a global Loss and Damage action involving the rich and the developing countries to prepare grounds for a bigger push for concluding the financial facility for Loss and Damage.
- Propose a special report, by the Santiago network and the secretariat, on global losses and damages caused due to climate change.

A top priority for many developing countries at COP26 was to secure finance for Loss and Damage – the cost of major climate change impacts that can no longer be avoided. With the first dialogue about such finance slated for June this year, it is important to seize this opportunity to get dedicated support for people on the front lines of climate impacts.

One of the major challenges leading up to the COP27 conference in Egypt this year is likely to be Loss and Damage. Many respondents argue that the approach of the Glasgow Climate Dialogues process will need to move the conversation ahead quickly by incorporating practical ideas on delivery and financing. Other countries should follow Scotland’s lead in giving financial support to alleviate the massive loss and damage that has already occurred.

19 <https://www.icccad.net/event/gambesons-global-conference-2/>



First Minister of Scotland Nicola Sturgeon speaking at a Glasgow Climate Dialogues event in the Blue Zone at COP26.

Photo: James Cave

d. Just Transition

The Paris Agreement preamble reflects a Just Transition, with parties to the Agreement “taking into account the imperatives of a just transition of the workforce and the creation of decent work and quality jobs following nationally defined development priorities.”²⁰ However, Just Transition issues within UNFCCC have been overshadowed in recent years particularly after the Paris Agreement when all parties were pushed towards having either mandatory or voluntary commitments on greenhouse gas emission reduction and the requirement of submission of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and related communications and reporting.

The Glasgow Climate Dialogues have been a good platform for the Global South to remind the negotiators of the UNFCCC principles of equity and historical responsibility, recognising the different circumstances of Global North and Global South, which requires countries to do their fair share of emissions reductions and repayment of their climate debt, transforming economies away from the historical and ongoing plunder of Global South resources by Global North.

The right to development was another important agenda discussed during the Dialogues which reinstated the respect for planetary limits, and radically rethinking how the right to development in the Global South can be realised on a finite planet, avoiding replicating the inequality and destruction caused by the path to development taken by the Global North.

Often the COP agenda is centred around key themes and the general aspects of it. The innovative issues and inner core issues of equity, fairness, and inclusion are often overshadowed. The Dialogue, however, provided a platform for both Global North and South practitioners, experts, communities, and decision-makers to take an intersectional approach, recognising class, gender, and racial dimensions and addressing the diverse ways people in the Global South experience climate impacts.

Also, there were worries regarding the approach and process adopted in the negotiations including the rights, access, and ownership of workers, households, and communities in the Global South, as well as ownership issues and changing patterns of consumption.

20 <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement>

Expectations for COP26 from the Dialogues

- Recognising the different circumstances of Global North and South, a Just Transition to meet the Paris Agreement goals must be based on the UNFCCC principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities and the right to development, requiring countries to do their fair share of emissions reductions and repay their climate debt, transforming economies away from the historical and ongoing plunder of Global South resources by the Global North.
- Respecting planetary limits, a radical rethink of how the right to development in the Global South can be realised on a finite planet is required for a Just Transition, avoiding replication of the inequality and destruction caused by the path to development taken by the Global North.
- An intersectional approach, recognising class, gender, and racial dimensions and addressing the different ways people in the Global South experience climate impacts, is essential to a Just Transition, which must be underpinned by a value system of solidarity and cooperation, human rights, and social dialogue, rejecting colonial approaches to environmental protection and centering the knowledge, experience, stewardship, solutions, and needs of women, indigenous people, peasants, and smallholder farmers.
- A Just Transition must uphold and advance workers' rights, ensuring that workers participate in decisions that affect them, providing social protection for workers and households, ensuring health and safety standards, recognising, and addressing both productive and reproductive work, expanding the conversation beyond organised workers, and centering the experience of women.
- Changing the energy system and energy sources is core to a Just Transition, ending reliance on fossil fuels and addressing the energy access crisis in the Global South, as well as ownership issues and changing patterns of consumption; state participation and leadership are essential to achieve this; we cannot rely on the market-based approach which caused the crisis to solve it.
- The provision of public finance free from conditionality for energy access and renewable energy is essential to delivering the Just Transition, taking a more equal approach to finance moving from aid to cooperation, and ensuring that finance reaches women, Indigenous peoples, peasants, and smallholder farmers who are already delivering solutions to the climate crisis on the ground.

What was achieved at COP26?

The main multilateral outcome of COP26, the [Glasgow Climate Pact](#), brings two references to Just Transition, focusing on low-emission energy systems and job creation²¹. According to one of the facilitators of the Dialogues, the Glasgow Pact includes text on Just Transition, which is a welcome development of the single sentence in the preamble to the Paris Agreement, broadening the concept to include plural "just transitions that promote sustainable development and eradication of poverty, and the creation of decent work and quality jobs, including through making financial flows consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emission and climate-resilient development, including through deployment and transfer of technology, and provision of support to developing country Parties"²².

With regards to the role of targeted groups, in section VIII on collaboration, the Glasgow Pact recognises and emphasises the importance of gender equality and the role of women, Indigenous people, and local communities in climate action (para 55). It also:

- Urges Parties to implement the Glasgow work programme on Action for Climate Empowerment (para 62).

²¹ <https://www.iass-potsdam.de/en/blog/2021/12/was-cop26-just-transition-conference>

²² <https://www.downtoearth.org.in/news/world/a-third-draft-still-undecided-cop-26-might-not-deliver-what-is-expected-80192>

- Urges Parties “to actively involve Indigenous peoples and local communities in designing and implementing climate action and to engage with the second three-year work plan for implementing the functions of the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform, for 2022–2024” (para 66),
- Encourages Parties “to increase the full, meaningful and equal participation of women in climate action and to ensure gender-responsive implementation and means of implementation, which are vital for raising ambition and achieving climate goals;” (para 68), and
- Calls upon Parties to strengthen their implementation of the enhanced Lima work programme on gender and its gender action plan (para 69)

The interview with the Glasgow Climate Dialogue facilitators also revealed that days before the summit began, COP26 President Alok Sharma presented a delivery plan to meet the inadequate missed target of \$100 bn per year (set in 2009) only by 2023²³.

In addition, the Statement on Just Transition²⁴, signed by 16 developed countries and the European Union, highlights explicitly adopting a holistic approach to Just Transition. It goes beyond the impacts on workers in the fossil industry by acknowledging the broader socio-territorial dynamics of Just Transition and its supply chain implications. However, the text simply ‘recognises the need’ and provides nothing in terms of requirements.

Many of the respondents agreed that COP26 did not meet their expectations of Just Transition. According to them, the spirit of the UNFCCC was not recognised at COP26 or in the events that followed. Although the Glasgow Climate Pact included Just Transition, according to one of the facilitators, these points appear almost as if footnotes to the text and fail to put “an intersectional approach recognising class, gender, and racial dimensions and addressing the different ways people in the Global South experience climate impacts....underpinned by a value system of solidarity and cooperation, human rights and social dialogue, rejecting colonial approaches to environmental protection and centering the knowledge, experience, stewardship, solutions, and needs of women, indigenous people, peasants, and smallholder farmers,”²⁵ at the centre of Just Transition to the Paris Agreement goals, as outlined in section 4.3 of the Glasgow Climate Dialogues Communiqué²⁶.

After the Paris Agreement, moral pressure was increased on poor and vulnerable countries to raise their aspirations and commitments. Many LDCs and developing countries, for example, were enticed to make aggressive mitigation commitments and join various coalitions at the COP side events. The developed and rich emerging countries, on the other hand, pushed the accord to their benefit. One example is the failure to press for the complete phase-out of all fossil fuels. According to the respondent from Bangladesh (see Annex), UNFCCC negotiations and agreements are all biased towards poor countries undermining their right to develop and creating more economic pressure leading to unrest.

According to one of the facilitators of the Dialogues, while a single reference to Common but Differentiated Responsibilities made it into the final draft of the Glasgow Climate Pact, the COP26 outcomes do nothing to require “countries do their fair share of emissions reductions and repay their climate debt”, as per section 4.1 of the Glasgow Climate Dialogues Communiqué²⁷. What is worse is that the elements of the Glasgow Climate Pact further shift responsibility for tackling the climate crisis onto the shoulders of those who have done the least to cause it.

Discussions with some of the LDC negotiators revealed that overall, the Glasgow Climate Pact does not get the world on track for keeping global temperature rises below 1.5 degrees, neither delivering the emission cut ambitions from Global North countries, nor the finance needed for Global South countries to do the same and allowing for huge loopholes. The Glasgow Climate Pact ‘recognises’ that keeping temperatures below 1.5 degrees will require actions including ‘net zero’ by ‘around mid-century.’ This is not in line with a 1.5 pathway and allows rich countries and corporations to keep polluting for decades, based on the fantasy of balancing out their emissions with offsets, carbon markets, and other dangerous distractions.

23 <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/oct/25/climate-finance-poor-countries-hit-100bn-target-by-2023-says-report>

24 <https://ukcop26.org/supporting-the-conditions-for-a-just-transition-internationally/>

25 <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-glasgow-climate-pact-key-outcomes-from-cop26>

26 <https://www.stopclimatechaos.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Communique%CC%81- -Glasgow-Climate-Dialogues.pdf>

27 <https://www.stopclimatechaos.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Communique%CC%81- -Glasgow-Climate-Dialogues.pdf>

According to one of the respondents, wealthy countries have also failed to meet the needs of the most vulnerable countries by failing to support adaptation or devote financial resources to compensate for the loss and harm that these countries have already suffered. They have yet to fulfil their promise to offer \$100 billion in climate funding to impoverished countries each year. Keeping this promise was seen as a key test ahead of COP26, and it was seen as critical to restoring trust and goodwill between developed and developing countries in the context of climate negotiations, especially when the latter group feels like they are being asked to make sacrifices while dealing with a problem they did not create, while not receiving adequate support. One of the facilitators of the Dialogues said that COP26 was one of the most exclusive COPs in the UNFCCC's history.

The UN climate accords are based on the notion of shared but differentiated responsibilities. However, in the recent debate, that premise appears to have been forgotten, with the Global South being accused of lacking climate ambition and wealthier countries being accused of not paying up. These claims, however, have not always been accurate. According to most of the respondents from the Global South, there are fundamental differences in per capita emissions that must be considered. Given their widespread poverty and low carbon footprint, some developing countries are entitled to a larger portion of their remaining carbon budget, as well as more time and support to achieve net-zero status. Human development and biodiversity were treated as sideshows in Glasgow. Glasgow was engrossed in a communal delusion and obsession, focusing on a net-zero goal rather than a fair path.

Although there was some acknowledgment in the backdrop of the Glasgow Climate Pact, the issues of human rights, equity, and inclusion were not seriously considered in the decision accord. Feminists, indigenous peoples, and grassroots women came to COP26 with solutions that embody a holistic understanding of our relationships to the land and ecosystems, but governments prioritised large corporations producing nothing but hot air, according to women and gender groups. They said net-zero pledges without concrete emissions reduction plans and adequate legally binding commitments to protect human rights are simply "greenwashing."²⁸

Way forward for COP27

- Persistent advocacy and pushes are needed from the Global South to ensure that the major emitters ramp up their 2030 emissions reduction targets to align with 1.5 degrees. More robust approaches to hold all actors accountable for the many commitments made in Glasgow. All countries need to step up on reducing emissions. The G20 middle-income countries are critical to closing the emissions gap and need to show leadership.
- Poor and vulnerable developing countries must begin campaigning for solutions to meet the urgent requirements of climate-vulnerable countries to assist them in dealing with climate consequences and transitioning to net-zero economies. All of this will necessitate some level of responsibility. CSOs around the world must hold governments, investors, and corporations accountable for all claims made at COP26 – and press for higher commitments.
- To avoid global temperature rises of more than 1.5 degrees, each country, particularly the largest emitters, must adopt and implement more aggressive 2030 targets in line with their fair share of reductions. One potential redeeming feature of the Glasgow Climate Pact is that countries are required to submit updated targets one year ahead of schedule, rather than the usual five years. This may keep pressure on countries such as Australia to update their near-term climate targets.
- The negotiating blocks such as LDC, G77, China, the African Union, and AOSIS must push for ensuring the key principles of UNFCCC be the centre of any further discussion in terms of compliance, commitment, pledges, and responsibilities. The right to development, the principle of differentiated responsibility, and human rights are fully recognised and integrated into practice.

28 <https://enb.iisd.org/glasgow-climate-change-conference-cop26/summary-report>

e. Overall feedback on the Glasgow Climate Dialogues process

According to the Scottish Government and the organisers, the Glasgow Climate Dialogues were designed to engage with, learn from and platform key Global South stakeholders on climate change ahead of COP26. The Dialogues were hosted in recognition of the fact that the Global South is disproportionately affected by the adverse impacts of climate change and that to have a successful summit, it is essential to elevate and support the representation of people from the Global South.

One of the facilitators of the Dialogues said that there were peculiarities about this COP. The geographical host – the Scottish Government – was not an international host. This provided leverage to bring the issues forward and bridge the communication gap between the Global South and North. Respondents from the Scottish Government said that the Dialogues were a platform for providing space to the Global South and North to discuss specific issues of interest and find ways to influence the decision-making. We, the Global South partners, were cautious at the beginning about the Global North dominating the process, but the Global South proactively partnered in the events. He further said that although the Dialogues have directly or indirectly provided input and influence on the agenda, there is no causal link between the event and the COP 26 outcome.

All the respondents interviewed expressed their huge appreciation and satisfaction with the design, process, and outcome of the Glasgow Climate Dialogues. One of the facilitators from the Global South said the Dialogues were a unique and valuable platform designed by the Scottish Government and organisations to forge partnership and solidarity with the Global South and issues faced by the vulnerable nations. The respondent from the Scottish Government regarded the Dialogue as a movement that created momentum for collaboration among like-minded organisations from the Global North and Global South. The Global North involvement was important to create a platform and package messages and help in dissemination, whereas the Global South CSOs provided evidence and stories to justify the case and enrich the rationale for the expectations and demand. According to many respondents, the Scottish Government leadership in terms of bridging between the developed and least developed nations in terms of influencing agenda is worth appreciating.

The critical issues on adaptation, Just Transition, Loss and Damage, and inclusion were discussed in detail during the Glasgow Climate Dialogues. Looking at the Communique, reading the outcome of the discussions on all the major four themes, and interacting with the organisers and panellists revealed that the content was rich as it investigated the emerging issues, challenges of the past, issues that are faced by the Global South, and mostly the practical and grounded issues that largely represented the reality and aspirations of the Global South.

It was found that the Dialogues further re-inspired the organisers, facilitators, panellists, and participants to deep dive into the cutting edge, intersectionality, socio-structural complexities, and core issues facing the Global South in terms of benefit sharing, increasing access to financial resources, addressing issues of gender and social inclusion, trickling down financial resources. One of the panellists said the recommendations in each of the four themes had informed and shaped their discussions at COP26 and in doing so, supported agreement at COP26 on the ambition, the inclusion, and the relevance of the global action that is so urgently required.

However, there were also a few lapses in the Dialogue as shared by the engaged actors. One of the challenges was that it was a one-time event and had to accommodate the diverse agenda and expectations of people. One of the facilitators said the nature of the discussion and the time were a mismatch but she said organisers tried their best to maximise the time and resources. Other respondents mentioned the constraint of virtual events and practical issues of internet speed and connectivity. The language barrier is also cited by a few respondents as a bottleneck to conveying a message and particularly ensuring the southern voices.

Overall feedback for the process

- Scale up the modality and concept of Glasgow Climate Dialogues to COP27. Initiate the dialogue with Egyptian and African CSOs to share lessons learned from the outcome of the Dialogues, appraisal, and relevant materials.
- Adopt a more disaggregated climate dialogue focused on sub-region and regions, given the contextual nature of the issues, to give an opportunity for them to collectively discuss their common issues.
- Organise a learning event to take stock of where we are, how far we want to move, what success looks like for achieving climate justice, and what we want to achieve in the future.
- Broaden the scope of the Dialogues. It is important to become more pragmatic and practical about the objective of the Dialogues. The Dialogues should not be too formal to focus on the main agenda item of COP. It should also provide a platform and opportunity on issues that are related to climate change but not yet part of the formal negotiations such as decentralising climate financing at the national and sub-national level, exclusion, and issues of intersectionality within communities and how it impacts trickling down climate finance, issues of climate governance at the local level.
- Diversify the language of the Communique and report. It may be good to encourage Global South partners to translate the Communique and reports into their native language so that the civil society, community-based organisations, and Indigenous peoples will observe what was discussed and what was recommended.

4. Acknowledgment

I would like to acknowledge the support provided by Simon Anderson, Line Christensen, Ben Wilson, and the whole team at SCCS. Truly fortunate to get insights from all the facilitators, panellist, a few COP26 delegates from the Global South, the Scottish Government, and FCDO representatives.

Annex 1.

Useful references

Reports On Glasgow Climate Dialogues

- Communique: <https://www.stopclimatechaos.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Communique%CC%81--Glasgow-Climate-Dialogues.pdf>
- Access, Participation, and Voice: <https://www.stopclimatechaos.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Access-Participation-and-Voice-Report-Glasgow-Climate-Dialogues.pdf>
- Adaptation and Resilience: <https://www.stopclimatechaos.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Adaptation-Resilience-Report-Glasgow-Climate-Dialogues.pdf>
- Loss and Damage: <https://www.stopclimatechaos.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Loss-and-Damage-Report-Glasgow-Climate-Dialogues.pdf>
- Just Transition: <https://www.stopclimatechaos.scot/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Just-Transition-Report-Glasgow-Climate-Dialogues.pdf>

Annex 2:

Glasgow Pact on Climate Change: COP 26 outcome

- <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-glasgow-climate-pact-key-outcomes-from-cop26>

Annex 3: List of Respondents

3.1. Scottish Government

Gerard Howe

3.2. Glasgow Climate Dialogue Taskforce members

Line Christensen
Lucy Ssendi
Anne Callaghan

3.3: Panellists and Facilitators of the Glasgow Climate Dialogues

Access, Participation and Voice

Ben Wilson, Partner Advocacy Officer, Scottish Catholic International Aid Fund
Stella Gama, Less Developed Countries Group and Advisor in Malawi's Ministry of Forestry and Natural Resources (Malawi)
Augustine Njamnshi, Chairperson, Technical and Political Affairs of the Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (Cameroon)
Julius Ng'Oma, National Coordinator, Civil Society Network on Climate Change (Malawi)

Adaptation

Jamie Livingstone, Head of Oxfam Scotland
Enamul Mazid Khan Siddique, Head of Climate Justice and Natural Resource Rights, Oxfam (Bangladesh)
Liane Schalatek, Associate Director of The Heinrich Böll Foundation (USA)
Tamara Coger, Senior Associate in World Resources Institute's Climate Resilience Practice (USA)

Loss and Damage

Simon Anderson, Senior Fellow, International Institute of Environment and Development (Scotland)
Istiakh Ahmed, Advisor - Climate Adaptation, GIZ (Bangladesh)
Ineza Grace, Co-Director of The Loss and Damage Youth Coalition (Rwanda)
Prof Saleemul Huq, Director of the International Centre for Climate Change and Development (Bangladesh)

Just Transition

Mary Church, Head of Campaigns, Friends of the Earth Scotland
Rhoda Boateng, Programme Coordinator, International Trade Union Congress Africa (Togo)

3.4. Representation from LDCs

Government delegates

Raju Sapkota
Raju Pandit Chhetri
Raja Thapa:
Shreya KC
Prakriti Koirala

CSOs and other delegates

Biraj Gautam
Binod Prasad Parajuli
Mukesh Pokhrel



Glasgow Climate Dialogues

Voices from the Global South
September 2021