WHAT HAPPENED AT COP 27 ON LOSS AND DAMAGE AND WHAT COMES NEXT?
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INTRODUCTION

The outcome of the twenty-seventh session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 27) on Loss and Damage is significant and considered a win for developing countries and civil society who have been calling for action and support to address loss and damage for over 30 years. After the agenda item on Loss and Damage finance was agreed, developing countries demanded an outcome under the new agenda item at COP 27. Parties agreed to establish a fund on Loss and Damage as part of broader funding arrangements or “mosaic of solutions” both inside and outside the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), often referred to as the Convention. Separately, the modalities of the Santiago Network for Loss and Damage (Santiago Network) were established and a process for selecting the host organisation was determined. This means that the Santiago Network could be up and running next year. Conversely, efforts to integrate Loss and Damage into the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) were less successful. Further, although Loss and Damage was part of the second technical dialogue on the Global Stocktake (GST), it remains unclear how it will be included in the final assessment of collective progress towards achieving the global goals of the Paris Agreement. This brief unpacks these and other issues related to Loss and Damage at COP 27, reflecting on the expectations that were included in the previous brief.
The fight for Loss and Damage finance at COP 27 was two-fold: first, to get it on the agenda, and then to establish a fund or facility under that agenda item. It is remarkable that both of these things were achieved at COP 27 because there was no mandate for these outcomes before COP 27 and there is a history of inaction in this area. Parties also chose to elaborate the Glasgow Dialogue established at COP 26 to decide where it would fit in the framework for Loss and Damage finance.

In the lead up to COP 27 developing countries and civil society highlighted the need for a formal agenda item to negotiate finance for Loss and Damage. This came about after a proposal from the G77 and China\(^8\) to launch a loss and damage finance facility at COP 26 was rejected,\(^9\) and there was disappointment with the lack of a concrete outcome on the Glasgow Dialogue.\(^10\) At the meeting of the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs) - the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) - in June, the G77 and China proposed that the agenda item "matters relating to funding arrangements for addressing loss and damage" under "matters relating to finance" be put on both the COP and Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) agendas. Due to the rules of procedure, the sub-agenda item was reflected on the provisional agendas of both the COP and CMA. The issue was discussed in both formal and informal meetings amongst Parties after it was raised at the meetings of the SBs in June and at the heads of delegation consultations in September. However, it was uncertain whether the sub-agenda item would be included in the official agenda adopted at the start of COP 27.

“\(^*\) In the lead up to COP 27 developing countries and civil society highlighted the need for a formal agenda item to negotiate finance for Loss and Damage.”\(^*\)
In the days preceding the official start of COP 27 Parties worked through the night to reach an agreement on how the official agenda item would be framed. The agenda item under “8f. Matters relating to finance” was formally adopted on the first day of COP 27. The language of agenda item that was agreed is:

Matters relating to funding arrangements responding to loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including a focus on addressing loss and damage.

There is a caveat included in footnote:

This item and the outcomes thereof are without prejudice to the consideration of similar issues in the future.

Before the adoption of the agenda item, the COP 27 president read out the following:

It is understood that:

1. The outcomes of this agenda item are based on cooperation and facilitation and do not involve liability or compensation.

2. This agenda item includes the Glasgow Dialogue.

3. The agenda item will launch a process with a view to adopting a conclusive decision no later than 2024.

The key difference between the original proposal from the G77 and China and the adopted agenda item is the change of “addressing” to “responding” and the addition of “including a focus on addressing loss and damage”. The definition of responding is “to react in response”, for example, to “respond to a call for help”. The use of “responding” positions Parties as acting in solidarity to assist those suffering loss and damage and offer help. The definition of addressing is “to deal with: treat” which suggests a comprehensive remedy to a harm that has been caused. Therefore, the change in language is a weakening of the mandate for the scope of the outcome and the responsibilities it entails. The usual framing around “averting [mitigation], minimising [adaptation] and addressing” loss and damage has become highly politicised. Developing countries have continually stressed that actions must focus on addressing loss and damage. It is positive that “a focus on addressing” was included in the agenda item, however, it is in the context of “responding” to loss and damage.

Although there were compromises reached in the language, caveat and the read out, the framing of agenda items left the door open for any outcome Parties reached at COP 27. The agenda item may frame the discussion, however, in the multilateral process Parties are empowered to reach any agreement at any time. The read out does not have legal weight once the matter is adopted, it is merely used to provide context.
Developing countries and civil society reiterated their expectation to establish a new operating entity under the financial mechanism of the Convention at COP 27, while developed countries sought a process to be undertaken until COP 29 to identify a “mosaic of solutions”. When informal consultations began under this agenda item on days three and five of COP 27, there were stark differences of opinion in the interventions from the floor. Developing countries and civil society reiterated their expectation to establish a new operating entity under the financial mechanism of the Convention at COP 27, while developed countries sought a process to be undertaken until COP 29 to identify a “mosaic of solutions”.  

On Tuesday of week two of COP 27, the G77 and China submitted a proposal which included the following elements to be decided at COP 27:

1. To establish an operating entity under the financial mechanism of the Convention;
2. With a transitional committee to take the work forward intersessionally;
3. According to principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC), equity and historical responsibility.

The European Union (EU)’s counter submission proposed a fund for the “most vulnerable” and made the establishment of a fund conditional on aligning their national plans to 1.5 degrees celsius targets, but without providing financial or technical support for developing countries to reach that goal. The EU also sought to broaden the contributor base of the fund to include the private sector. There was little convergence in the positions of developed and developing countries during the informal consultations and it was unclear where the landing zone would be.

After many long nights undertaking ministerial consultations and bilaterals, Parties agreed on text on Saturday, 19 November 2022. This was a historic decision after three decades of multilateral processes having failed to deliver a fund for loss and damage. This outcome was possible because there was some concern that point three meant that Parties had already decided that no conclusive decision would be reached at COP 27. However, the language “no later than 2024” was likely included to give assurance that the “process” under this agenda item which “includes the Glasgow Dialogue” is time bound and will provide a “conclusive decision.” It is probable that Parties wanted this included because of the disappointment that the Glasgow Dialogue did not involve a concrete outcome. The agenda fight made it clear that Parties had divergent expectations for what should be delivered under the agenda item.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FUND AND FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

“Developing countries and civil society reiterated their expectation to establish a new operating entity under the financial mechanism of the Convention at COP 27, while developed countries sought a process to be undertaken until COP 29 to identify a “mosaic of solutions”.”

“The EU’s counter submission proposed a fund for the “most vulnerable” and made the establishment of a fund conditional on aligning their national plans to 1.5 degrees celsius targets, but without providing financial or technical support for developing countries to reach that goal.”
because of the unity of the G77 and China’s position. The adopted decision under the new agenda item establishes:

1. New funding arrangements for assisting developing countries…in responding to loss and damage, including with a focus on addressing loss and damage;

2. A fund for responding to loss and damage whose mandate includes a focus on addressing loss and damage;

3. A Transitional Committee.

Arguably the value of this decision is in the political signal it sends to the world acknowledging the need for finance for Loss and Damage and establishing a fund for that purpose. In relation to the G77 and China’s proposal briefly outlined above, this decision does not explicitly provide all the aspects that they asked for, rather it leaves the door open for much to be decided in the coming years. In particular, although the fund is established, it does not specify where it is located: under the Convention or under the Paris Agreement. Further, it recalls the Convention but it does not explicitly note that the fund is subject to the principles of equity, CBDR-RC and historical responsibility. It is important to note that the read out from the adoption of the agenda item was not included in the adopted text. This is positive because many developing country Parties said it was not appropriate for those understandings to be reflected in the decision text.

The Transitional Committee was established to undertake work intersessionally and make recommendations for the operationalisation of the funding arrangements and the fund. The Transitional Committee will consider the “institutional arrangements, modalities, structure, governance and terms of reference of the fund”, and “elements of the new funding arrangements”, among other things. The Transitional Committee will make its report at COP 28 and it is expected that they will then decide on the operational modalities. The composition of the Transitional Committee is specified in the Annex to the decision. It will be important to ensure that the Transitional Committee is equipped with the necessary resources and expertise to undertake their work.

In the decision Parties have also enhanced the Glasgow Dialogue to ensure its work is complementary and informs the work of the Transitional Committee. It is specified that the second Dialogue in June 2023 “shall focus on the operationalisation of the new funding arrangements…and the fund…and that they will inform the work of the Transitional Committee.” Additionally, the Chair of the SBI was also requested to provide a summary report of each Glasgow Dialogue within four weeks. This is significant because the decision that established the Glasgow Dialogue did not mandate a report of its discussions and outcome.

“After many long nights undertaking ministerial consultations and bilaterals, Parties agreed on text on Saturday, 19 November 2022.”

Egypt COP27 President Sameh Shoukry gavels the decision on loss and damage under the COP.

“Arguably the value of this decision is in the political signal it sends to the world acknowledging the need for finance for Loss and Damage and establishing a fund for that purpose.”
The operationalisation of the Santiago Network required highly technical negotiations where Parties had the opportunity to decide on the institutional arrangements, including the advisory board, secretariat and host organisation, and network members. In the lead up to COP 27, these discussions were less politicised than the area of finance for loss and damage. It appeared that the outcome would be somewhat dependent on the time allowed and the impetus that Parties brought to the table to elaborate and agree on the details required. It was an achievement, therefore, when the decision text to operationalise the Santiago Network was agreed relatively early on the Wednesday of week two at COP 27.

There was broad agreement on the need for network members, a secretariat, a host organisation for the secretariat, and the roles and responsibilities of those entities. A key sticking point was the need for an advisory board to be established as a new entity. Some developed countries were not convinced of the need for an independent advisory board and argued that the Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) Executive Committee (ExCom) could undertake this role. The G77 and China along with other groups argued that the ExCom was already overburdened and was not well suited to serve as the advisory board. They advocated that an independent advisory board for the Santiago Network was required for it to be fully operational. Another issue that required attention was finance for the Santiago Network. At COP 26 Parties decided that the Santiago Network would be funded, however the arrangements for that funding were not elaborated.
In the adopted text, \(^{18}\) Parties decided that the Santiago Network will have the following structure:

a. A hosted secretariat that will facilitate work;

b. An Advisory Board to provide guidance and oversight;

c. A network of member organisations, bodies, networks and experts (OBNEs).

The Advisory Board includes representatives from three constituencies: the Women and Gender, Youth, and Indigenous Peoples constituencies “who may actively participate in the deliberations of the Advisory Board”. \(^{19}\) It has been noted that Environmental NGOs \(^{20}\) were not included in the Advisory Board in the same way, although it was decided that the meetings of the Advisory Board will be open to observers. \(^{21}\) In practice, this means that the three constituencies given a formal seat at the table will have access to documents before the meeting and will have a better platform to provide inputs. It is unclear why other constituencies were not included, however, it can be assumed that the three constituencies were chosen because they are groups that are systematically marginalised because of their inherent characteristics. It is positive that these constituencies were included because it is vital that their perspectives inform technical assistance delivered to address loss and damage.

The adopted decision text recalls that it was agreed that the Santiago Network will be funded \(^{22}\) and decides that Santiago Network Secretariat will develop “guidelines for managing funding provided for technical assistance” and thereafter it will manage and direct the disbursement of funds. \(^{23}\) The Secretariat is also empowered to undertake an independent review of the Santiago Network including the “sustainability and sources of funding, adequacy of funding levels relative to technical assistance requests”. \(^{24}\) Although it is positive that there is a process for funding arrangements to be elaborated, there remains no mechanism to ensure that the funds for the Santiago Network will be adequate and predictable.

Delegates celebrate the reaching agreement on the draft decision to operationalize the Santiago Network for Loss and Damage on the 16th of November at COP27.

“Although it is positive that there is a process for funding arrangements to be elaborated, there remains no mechanism to ensure that the funds for the Santiago Network will be adequate and predictable.”
The governance of the WIM is a question that remains unanswered after COP 27. The COP 27 Presidency held a consultation with Parties and after they did not reach agreement, it was proposed that the question of governance be deferred to future COPs and that there would be mirror decisions at COP 27.

The essential question is whether the WIM is subject to the guidance and authority of both the COP and the CMA (dual governance) or whether it is only governed by the CMA (sole governance). Developing countries have consistently argued that the WIM is subject to dual governance. The WIM was established under the COP and it was decided that it would function under the guidance of, and be accountable to, the COP which would guide the implementation of its functions. While Article 8 of the Paris Agreement added that the WIM is also subject to the guidance of the CMA, it did not change the mandate of the COP or exclude existing governance arrangements. Developed countries argue that the WIM is subject to the authority and guidance of the CMA and that their understanding is that this is a sole governance arrangement.

The arguments in relation to the governance of the WIM are illustrative of a broader trend to remove references to the Convention across all thematic areas and leave the Convention in the past. This is because the principles and mandates under the Paris Agreement are weaker than under the Convention. By shifting thematic areas to sole governance under the Paris Agreement, developed country Parties responsibilities are diluted. In particular, under the Convention, Parties agree to protect the climate system “on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.” These principles are not explicitly laid out in the Paris Agreement and therefore under sole governance it may be argued that they should not apply. Further, in paragraph 51 of decision 1/CP.21, the decision adopting the Paris Agreement, Parties agreed “that Article 8 of the Agreement does not involve or provide a basis for any liability or compensation.” This takes us further away from the foundational principles of equity and CBDR-RC.
The second technical dialogue of global stocktake of the Paris Agreement (GST) was commenced during SB 57 in the first week of COP 27. The GST is being undertaken between 2021 and 2023, with three phases: (1) information collection, (2) technical assessment, and (3) output consideration. The technical assessment phase includes technical dialogues held in three meetings in conjunction with SB 56, 57, and 58. At the end of the first technical dialogue at SB 56, participants expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of focus on loss and damage. At SB 57, participants expected a greater emphasis on Loss and Damage discussions. The GST does not currently include an assessment for Loss and Damage, and as a result there are no processes for systematically collecting, recording, and reporting information on loss and damage, and related financial needs by countries under the UNFCCC.

The GST roundtable for “Adaptation including loss and damage” was well attended by both Parties and civil society, leading to the session being moved to a larger room in order to accommodate all participants. The facilitators presented two questions to guided the discussions on the Loss and Damage:

1. What tangible opportunities exist to improve the capacities of vulnerable communities and countries to access technical, finance, and other necessary support and implement concrete actions to enhance comprehensive risk management to reduce and respond to loss and damage?

2. How can planning processes and support providers better integrate the capacities, finance, and actions needed to reduce vulnerability, increase resilience, and strengthen response and recovery from climate extremes and the impacts of slow-onset events, and thereby enhance understanding, action and support, to avert, minimise and address loss and damage?

Participants from developing countries and civil society stressed the importance of addressing both economic and non-economic loss and damage, as well as the critical need for new and additional funds. Participants from developing countries and civil society stressed the importance of addressing both economic and non-economic loss and damage, as well as the critical need for new and additional funds.
need for new and additional funds. They noted that loss and damage is increasing in both developed and developing countries, and that it is vital to acknowledge science and understand the hard and soft limitations to adaptation. They also highlighted a gap in taking concrete actions to address loss and damage. A notable intervention asked for a Loss and Damage finance gap report to be requested by the COP and delivered at least bi-annually or every alternate year. The draft conclusions published at the end of the second technical dialogue are largely procedural in nature. It is expected that there will be a summary from the facilitators of the second technical dialogue which should highlight the attention that was given to loss and damage in the second technical dialogue.

“...A notable intervention asked for a Loss and Damage finance gap report to be requested by the COP and delivered at least bi-annually or every alternate year.”

THE NEW COLLECTIVE QUANTIFIED GOAL ON CLIMATE FINANCE

At COP 26 Parties agreed to establish an ad hoc work programme to start deliberation on the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG), beginning in early 2022 and ending in late 2024 at COP 29. The ideal outcome at COP 27 was for Loss and Damage to be considered as a third pillar alongside adaptation and mitigation, and for there to be early deliberation on the quantity of NCQG instead of delaying it until 2024. During the two weeks of the negotiations developing countries emphasised the need to have a substantive decision text that would inform the NCQG and avoid a political decision, as was the case for the USD 100 billion goal. The suggestion from developing countries included:

1. A clear work roadmap for 2023 and 2024;

2. The goal to address loss and damage;

3. Restructuring the Technical Expert Dialogue and High-level Ministerial Dialogue to allow for a targeted outcome which includes references to the quantity and the need for trillions, based on the principle of CBDR-RC, and the needs and priorities of developing countries; and,

4. A timeframe for the goal.

“The ideal outcome at COP 27 was for Loss and Damage to be considered as a third pillar alongside adaptation and mitigation, and for there to be early deliberation on the quantity of NCQG instead of delaying it until 2024.”
Developed countries argue, however, that a decision on the NCQG should not be made until the process is concluded at COP 29, and that discussion on the quantum should wait until that conclusion in 2024. Developed countries’ interventions emphasised the role private finance could play, broadening the donor base and favoring a procedural decision to a substantive one. At COP 27 developed countries refused to expand the scope of NCQG to include loss and damage finance. As such, the adopted decision text is procedural in nature. It will be important to continue to advocate for the inclusion of Loss and Damage in the NCQG throughout the remaining technical expert dialogues before the NCQG is set in 2024.

“At COP 27 developed countries refused to expand the scope of NCQG to include loss and damage finance.”

LOSS AND DAMAGE RELATED ADVOCACY, PLEDGES, LITIGATION AND REPORTING

Outside of the negotiations, in the lead up to, and at COP27, there was significant civil society advocacy and campaigning on Loss and Damage, numerous pledges of finance for Loss and Damage by Parties, non-Party governments and regional governments, developments in Loss and Damage related litigation, and unprecedented media coverage of Loss and Damage.

CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT

In the lead up to and at COP 27 civil society focused considerable time and energy on the establishment of a Loss and Damage finance facility at COP 27. Although the effect of the efforts made by civil society organisations cannot be measured, it is indisputable that it made a difference and notable mentions by Parties and the COP 27 Presidency attest to this. During the opening plenary of COP 27 when the agenda item for Loss and Damage finance was adopted, COP 27 President, Sameh Shoukry said that we owe a “debt of gratitude” for many years of dedicated work to get loss and damage on the agenda and for constant pressure to act on addressing loss and damage. In the informal

“Although the effect of the efforts made by civil society organisations cannot be measured, it is indisputable that it made a difference and notable mentions by Parties and the COP 27 Presidency attest to this.”
consultations under this agenda item, the G77 and China noted that “there is a strong voice from observers and we are happy to have them in the room.”

Civil society made it clear that Loss and Damage finance was important in the daily actions that they organised and the press conferences they held, as well as their presence in numbers in the negotiating rooms. Each session that was open to observers was full which led to overflow rooms being organised and holding some sessions in the largest plenary room. When Parties were close to reaching a decision, observers were encouraged to stay late to maintain a physical presence outside the closed consultations in order to demonstrate that the world was still watching. Civil society provided a sense of momentum that began before COP and carried through the negotiations until the final texts were gavelled in at the closing plenary. During the closing plenary of COP 27, Kathy Jetnil-Kijiner, Climate Envoy for the Republic of the Marshall Islands, thanked the voices of civil society from around the world who had worked alongside communities and countries on the front lines of the climate crisis to spotlight the issue of Loss and Damage.

**PLEDGES OF FINANCE FOR LOSS AND DAMAGE**

In the run up to and at COP 27 pledges of finance for Loss and Damage were made by Parties including Denmark, New Zealand, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Ireland, and Canada, non-Party government Scotland, and regional government Wallonia of Belgium. While all of these pledges are welcome acknowledgments of the urgent need to address loss and damage, not all of them were new and additional finance, and much of the funds (over 70%) were pledged to the Global Shield Against Climate Risk (Global Shield). Where Loss and Damage pledges comprised re-allocated funds, not new and additional funds, they likely took money away from mitigation and adaptation. This is concerning because adaptation, in particular, is severely underfunded, leading to more loss and damage.

Before the launch of the Global Shield civil society critique was strong and it remains so following the launch at COP 27. The principal criticisms of the Global Shield, based upon what little is known about it, include its focus on subsidising climate risk insurance. The role of insurance in addressing loss and damage is limited because it covers a fraction of the cost of loss and damage, and it is ill-suited to address non-economic loss and damage and loss and damage arising from slow onset climatic processes. Furthermore, insurance based “solutions” tend to be designed in a manner that burdens those in developing countries with premiums they cannot afford. The Global Shield must not distract from the urgent provision of finance to the institutions set up under the UNFCCC to address loss and damage.

“The Global Shield must not distract from the urgent provision of finance to the institutions set up under the UNFCCC to address loss and damage.”

Members of The UK Youth Climate Coalition, the Global Campaign to Demand Climate Justice, The Official Youth Constituency of UNFCCC and Loss and Damage Youth Coalition hold an action to demand that polluters #PayUp4LossAndDamage, on the 15th of November at COP27.

First Minister of Scotland Nicola Sturgeon, announces a further £5m for Loss and Damage, with a focus on addressing slow-onset climatic processes, gender and Non-Economic Loss and Damage (NELD).
up under the UNFCCC to address loss and damage including the Santiago Network and the newly established fund and funding arrangements for loss and damage.\textsuperscript{46} It is important that finance for Loss and Damage is delivered within the multilateral process under the Convention, in accordance with the enshrined principles of equity and CBDR-RC.

\section*{International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion on Human Rights and Climate Change}

In September 2021, Vanuatu announced at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) that it was building a coalition of states to request an advisory opinion on climate change from the International Court of Justice (ICJ). The Vanuatu ICJ Initiative\textsuperscript{47} is already supported by states from both the global North and South and it is seeking a resolution by the ICJ on the “obligations of States under international law to protect the rights of present and future generations against the adverse effects of climate change.”\textsuperscript{48} The Initiative is also supported by a range of civil society organisations including several youth groups such as Pacific Island Students Fighting Climate Change\textsuperscript{49} and World’s Youth for Climate Justice,\textsuperscript{50} which argue that climate change threatens the rights of present and future generations.

At COP 27 the Initiative was profiled in several events including by Ralph Regenvanu, Member of Parliament for Port Vila and a Minister from Vanuatu and Christopher Bartlett, Special Advisor to the Prime Minister for Vanuatu, both reporting on the progress of seeking the ICJ advisory opinion and its potential implications for addressing loss and damage. The draft General Assembly resolution text was officially announced on 18 November 2022 during a press conference.\textsuperscript{51} It is expected that the official text will be published after COP 27. As of 9 November 2022, 86 countries support the campaign with 18 core members driving the initiative.\textsuperscript{52} UNGA resolutions usually require a simple majority (50 percent of all votes plus one) to pass, meaning that Vanuatu must find another 11 votes to pass the resolution to instruct the ICJ to provide the advisory opinion. The UNGA vote will take place on 14 December 2022.\textsuperscript{53}

\section*{Media Coverage of Loss and Damage}

The media coverage of Loss and Damage in the lead up to and at COP 27 was broader than ever before with Loss and Damage being featured in publications across...
the globe in more than 200 articles between 31 October and 20 November 2022.54

In the lead up to COP 27 media coverage on Loss and Damage focused on the costs of loss and damage55 and the calls made by researchers and civil society to establish a Loss and Damage finance facility at COP 27.56 There were several explainer pieces released following the rise in visibility of the issue at COP 26 and the work done by civil society to keep it in the spotlight.57 When the new agenda item for Loss and Damage finance was adopted on 7 November 2022, media coverage focused on this new development and the ongoing battle for negotiators from the global South to achieve an outcome.58

Throughout the first week coverage focused on developed countries blocking progress in establishing a Loss and Damage fund59 and pledges for Loss and Damage finance.60 In the second week coverage included several articles profiling the launch of the Global Shield Against Climate Risk as well as criticism that it detracts from Loss and Damage finance.61 As the second week continued coverage focused on what failure to agree on a Loss and Damage fund at COP 27 would mean for the UNFCCC process.62 With the announcement of the EU’s Loss and Damage fund proposal, coverage continued to highlight the unity of the G77 and China63 and the pressure mounting on the EU and the United States to move towards the G77 and China’s proposal.64

When negotiations ran into overtime, loss and damage was dominating talks,65 and coverage highlighted the narrative favoured by developed countries that China and Saudi Arabia must contribute to loss and damage finance.66 As news of the tentative agreement to establish a fund spread most media outlets were quick to report that a loss and damage fund would be established at COP 27,67 whilst others were more cautious.68 With the adoption of the decision establishing a loss and damage fund and funding arrangements on the morning of 20 November 2022, coverage hailed the outcome as “historic”69 and a “new dawn for climate justice”70 even against the disappointing outcome on mitigation. Following COP 27 coverage has shifted to asking whether developed countries will indeed pay into the Loss and Damage71 fund once it is operationalised with continuing focus on China and other large developing economies making contributions.72

“The media coverage of Loss and Damage in the lead up to and at COP 27 was broader than ever before with Loss and Damage being featured in publications across the globe in more than 200 articles.”

“The Global Shield is another way for governments to weasel their way out of the Loss and Damage finance discussion... If somebody owed you money and they paid you back in ‘protection’ you would be pissed off!” says Jefferson Estela of Loss and Damage Youth Coalition during a youth action on the 15th of November at COP27.

“With the adoption of the decision establishing a loss and damage fund and funding arrangements on the morning of 20 November 2022, coverage hailed the outcome as “historic” and a “new dawn for climate justice” even against the disappointing outcome on mitigation.”
COP 27 produced landmark outcomes on Loss and Damage within the technical negotiations. In the lead up to COP 27, Loss and Damage finance was pronounced the litmus test for the success of the COP and for the multilateral process in general. A new agenda item for Loss and Damage funding arrangements was adopted in the opening plenary and developing countries, supported by civil society, fought to see a fund for loss and damage established at COP 27. After three decades of inaction it is important to recognise this progress and the political message it sends to the world that loss and damage is happening and developed countries must pay for it.

There was also important progress on the operationalisation of the Santiago Network including the establishment of an independent advisory board, provision for a hosted secretariat and network members. However, the Santiago Network remains under-resourced with inadequate funding for both the day to day operations of the Network and the provision of technical assistance. This is a concern particularly as many developed countries committed funding to the Global Shield: a scheme based on insurance with limited applicability. It will be important to remind developed countries that these commitments are not wholly deliverable on their obligations to pay for loss and damage.

Over the next two years and beyond it will be more important than ever for civil society to be aligned with the demands of developing countries and for work on the ground to address those needs. The outcome of COP 27 provides many opportunities for engagement, which is essential to ensure that the outcome of COP 27 is operationalised in a way that meets the needs and fulfils the demands of developing countries. The areas of focus include:

- **Loss and Damage fund and funding arrangements:** It will be important to engage with and support the Transitional Committee and its members. The fund must be operationalised according to what is equitable in terms of who pays, who benefits and how it is governed. It will be critical to learn lessons from the processes within the Green Climate Fund (GCF), particularly in relation to

\[
\text{After three decades of inaction it is important to recognise this progress and the political message it sends to the world that loss and damage is happening and developed countries must pay for it.}
\]

\[
\text{The Santiago Network remains under-resourced with inadequate funding for both the day to day operations of the Network and the provision of technical assistance.}
\]

\[
\text{The fund must be operationalised according to what is equitable in terms of who pays, who benefits and how it is governed.}
\]
direct access and country contact points. It is essential that civil society align with the demands of vulnerable developing countries and coordinate with each other to build on and complement each others’ work.

- **Santiago Network:** The process to select a host for the secretariat of the Santiago Network is being launched by the end of 2022, with a view to a selection being made in 2023. It is important that the host for the secretariat is located in the global South in order to ensure that the Network takes into account the experiences of those on the frontlines of the climate crisis and helps build capacity within impacted countries. Although Environmental NGOs were not explicitly included in the Advisory Board of the Santiago Network, perhaps the way forward is to better equip the three constituencies that were included to actively and meaningfully participate.

- **Governance of the WIM:** It will be important to keep an eye on governance issues and the worrying trend to move away from the Convention in the context of the governance of the WIM, as well as across all thematic areas. The principles enshrined in the Convention of CBDR-RC, equity and historical responsibility must inform climate action in all areas for climate justice to be achieved.

- **New collective goal on climate finance:** It is essential that civil society continue to advocate for Loss and Damage to be included in the work under the NCQG to support the demand of developing countries. Developing countries have called for sub-goals on Loss and Damage alongside mitigation and adaptation. The extent to which needs related to addressing loss and damage will be integrated into the NCQG remains unclear. Focus should be directed towards mobilising finance at the scale of the needs to address loss and damage. There is a possibility that this will garner more attention now that the Loss and Damage fund has been established because there is a lot of work to be done to ensure it is fit for purpose.

- **Global stocktake:** It is also important that civil society continue to advocate for Loss and Damage to be included in the GST to support the demands of developing countries. Vulnerable developing countries will need support to include information relevant to Loss and Damage in their Nationally Determined Contributions and other communication and reporting documents. In addition, the global community must respond to the call from the Climate Vulnerable Forum and other vulnerable developing country groups and Parties — and echoed by the UN Special Rapporteur on Climate Change— to develop a Loss and Damage finance gap report. This could be undertaken by UN agencies like the United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, World Meteorological Organization or by the Intergovernmental Panel on

> “It is important that the host for the secretariat is located in the global South in order to ensure that the Network takes into account the experiences of those on the frontlines of the climate crisis and helps build capacity within impacted countries.”

> “The principles enshrined in the Convention of CBDR-RC, equity and historical responsibility must inform climate action in all areas for climate justice to be achieved.”

> “Focus should be directed towards mobilising finance at the scale of the needs to address loss and damage.”

> “The global community must respond to the call from the Climate Vulnerable Forum and other vulnerable developing country groups and Parties — and echoed by the UN Special Rapporteur on Climate Change— to develop a Loss and Damage finance gap report.”
Change. A regular report could inform progress on the extent to which loss and damage is being addressed worldwide and could be an input into the next GST.

- **Advocating for mitigation ambition to avoid future loss and damage:** The lack of progress on keeping the 1.5°C goal alive, including the failure to agree to phase out all fossil fuels is extremely concerning. Mitigation is the best way to avoid future loss and damage. It is critical to make the link between mitigation, adaptation and Loss and Damage and to stress that evidence of loss and damage should inspire ambitious mitigation action and scaled up adaptation finance alongside action and support to address loss and damage. Further work should be done on shaping this narrative and aligning with and coordinating with those working on mitigation and adaptation to ensure that there are not trade-offs but synergies between the three aspects of climate action.

“It is critical to make the link between mitigation, adaptation and Loss and Damage and to stress that evidence of loss and damage should inspire ambitious mitigation action.”

**ANNEX IX**

1. **NOTABLE LOSS AND DAMAGE CAMPAIGNS BEFORE COP 27:**

   a. Oxfam and Elizabeth Wathuti’s petition to Alok Sharma and Sameh Shoukry to deliver Loss and Damage finance;

   b. Christian Aid’s petition to call on the UK Prime Minister to back the creation of an international fund;

   c. The Loss and Damage Youth Coalition #LossAndDamageFinanceNow! Campaign;

   d. The Climate Vulnerable Forum’s campaign “Payment Overdue”.

2. **DAYS OF ACTION FOR LOSS AND DAMAGE BEFORE COP 27:**

   a. Loss and Damage Action Day, 22 September 2022: Which saw civil society around the world demand that Polluters “#PayUp4LossAndDamage” with actions taking place on social media, including photos being posted on Twitter and Instagram, Twitter space conversations, and in the UK in London in person actions led by Make Polluters Pay including a march, silent vigil and roster of speakers including Green Party Member of Parliament of the United Kingdom Caroline Lucas.

   b. Global Strike for Climate Reparations, 23 September 2022: Which saw the Fridays For Future movement organise strikes “for climate reparations and justice” across 450 locations worldwide.

3. **NOTABLE BRIEFS ON LOSS AND DAMAGE BEFORE COP 27:**

   a. The Danish Institute for International Studies: Making headway on Loss and Damage;

   b. Swedish Environmental Institute: Operationalizing finance for loss and damage: from principles to modalities;

   c. The Centre For Disaster Protection: Contributions And Challenges Of Disaster Risk Financing as a Response to Climate Change Induced Losses And Damages;

   d. Climate Action Network International: The debt and climate crises: Why climate justice must include debt justice;
4. NOTABLE LOSS AND DAMAGE ACTIONS AT COP 27:

Friday, 11 November 2022: The UK Youth Climate Coalition\(^\text{106}\) (UKYCC), the Global Campaign to Demand Climate Justice\(^\text{107}\) (DCJ), The Official Youth Constituency of UNFCCC\(^\text{108}\) (YOUNGO) and Loss and Damage Youth Coalition\(^\text{109}\) (LDYC) held an action to demand that polluters #PayUp4LossAndDamage, during which LDYC read their COP 27 demands.\(^\text{110}\) After the youth action, youth climate justice activists Vanessa Nakate, Mitzi Jonelle Tan, Dominika Lasota, and Precious Kalombwana urged US President Joe Biden to “Show Us The Money” for adaptation and Loss and Damage ahead of his arrival at COP 27.\(^\text{111}\) Later that day, women from the Global South brought the floods that are affecting their homelands to COP 27 for the “#FloodTheCOP 27” Action. Led by Harjeet Singh of Climate Action Network International\(^\text{112}\) (CAN), the action included performances and speeches on the need to deliver a loss and damage fund at COP 27. The action also coincided with the arrival of US President Joe Biden’s team, including speaker Nancy Pelosi, which saw the participants turn to address the US delegation with calls of “pay up, pay up, pay up for loss and damage”.

Saturday, 12 November 2022: Civil society came together for the “Global Day of Action: We Are Not Yet Defeated” action to demand that polluters #PayUp4LossAndDamage, that fossil fuels are “phased out”, that all political prisoners including Alaa Abd el-Fattah are released, that fossil fuel lobbyists are banned from the COP, and that all decisions take into account Indigenous and human rights. Led by The UNFCCC recognised constituencies including Environmental NGOs, The Women and Gender constituency, Indigenous Peoples Organisations, Trade Union NGOs, and YUNGO. The action began with a march down the central road way of the COP 27 venue. During the speeches we heard from Hindou Oumarou Ibrahim for the Indigenous peoples organisations, Nnimmo Bassey, Tasneem Essop of CAN, Mitzi Jonelle Tan for Fridays For Future MAPA\(^\text{113}\), Asad Rehman who read a statement on behalf of Alaa Abd el-Fattah sister Sanaa Seif, Jason Boberg who made the case for a disabled persons constituency with the UNFCCC and many more.

Tuesday, 15 November 2022: The UKYCC, DCJ, YOUNGO and LDYC held another action to demand that polluters #PayUp4LossAndDamage which included speeches that highlighted that the Global Shield Against Climate Risk is not deliverable on the call for a loss and damage fund.\(^\text{114}\)

Friday, 18 November 2022: On the official last day of COP 27, the Climate Justice movement came together to close COP 27 with their demands, songs and stories. They reiterated their demands from the peoples’ plenary contained in the COP 27 Peoples’ Declaration for Climate Justice.\(^\text{115}\)

Saturday, 19 November 2022: Youth climate activists including Luisa Neubauer of Fridays for Future\(^\text{116}\) and Patience Nabukalu of Fridays for Future Mapa\(^\text{117}\) held an action to demand that leaders phase out fossil fuels to keep 1.5 alive and deliver a loss and damage fund.
5. NOTABLE ADVOCACY FOR LOSS AND DAMAGE AT COP 27:

a. CAN International: Letter to the Heads of Delegation: Agree on the Loss and Damage Finance Agenda Item for the COP 27 Climate Conference;¹¹⁸

b. A joint letter from 143 U.S. organisations to Special Envoy for Climate, John Kerry calling on the U.S. government to commit to meaningful advances in addressing climate-related Loss and Damage, including an agreement to establish a Finance Facility under the UNFCCC at COP 27.¹¹⁹

c. A letter from 13 members of US Congress, led by Representative Ilhan Omar (D-MN) and Jamaal Bowman (D-NY), to Special Envoy John Kerry urging the U.S. to support loss and damage funding to help developing countries recover from climate disasters.¹²⁰

6. NOTABLE PRESS CONFERENCES HIGHLIGHTING LOSS AND DAMAGE AT COP 27:

a. The G77 and China, AOSIS, AILAC, and LDC’s state of play press conference on 17 November 2022 on Loss and Damage Finance Inaction with H.E Sherry Rehan, Climate Envoy of Pakistan on behalf of the G77, H.M Molwyn Joseph of Antigau and Barbuda on behalf of AOSIS, H.E Alioune Ndoye of Senegal on behalf of the LDC group and Francisco Javier Canal Albán of Colombia and Malcom Stufkens of Honduras on behalf of AILAC.¹²¹

b. Climate Action Network’s Loss and Damage fund state of play press conferences on 17 November 2022 which included Ralph Regenvanu Member of Parliament of Vanuatu, Nabeel Munir, Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Republic of Korean behalf of the G77 and China, Màiri McAllan, Minister for Environment and Land Reform for the Scottish Government;¹²²

c. Climate Action Network’s second Loss and Damage fund state of play press conference on 19 November 2022 with Tasneem Essop of CAN International, Eddy Perrez of CAN RAC Canada, Rachel Cleetus of the Union of Concerned Scientists, Mohamed Adow of Power Shift Africa and Li Shuo of Greenpeace East Asia.¹²³

7. LIST OF PLEDGES FOR LOSS AND DAMAGE FINANCE AT COP 27:

a. Denmark became the first UNFCCC party to commit €13m finance for Loss and Damage on 20 September 2022.¹²⁴ This commitment is a package - some funds will go to the Global Shield Against Climate Risk, some to bilateral support for NGOs to do Loss and Damage projects, and some are still to be allocated. Crucially, all of this money is new and on top of Denmark’s 0.7% commitment to Official Development Assistance.

b. Belgium committed €2.5 million to Loss and Damage on 7 November 2022.¹²⁵ This money will be a contribution to a portfolio of projects in Mozambique which will focus on capacity building for officials on Loss and Damage, Disaster Risk Reduction and research. However, this is not new money but rather a pledge based on existing climate finance commitments, therefore in-effect a diversion of cash from mitigation and adaptation to Loss and Damage. It is also worth noting that the extent to which this programme can be called addressing Loss and Damage is also highly questionable due to its focus on capacity building, risk reduction and research.

c. Germany committed €170m to Loss and Damage at COP 27 on 7 November 2022.¹²⁶ These funds are new and additional but all of this money will go to the Global Shield Against Climate Risk.

d. Ireland committed €10m to Loss and Damage at COP 27, but the funds were not new and additional and will go to the Global Shield Against Climate Risk.¹²⁷

e. Canada committed $7m (CAN) to the Global Shield Against Climate Risk, alongside $1.25m (CAN) for the Santiago Network for Loss and Damage. However neither were new and additional funds.¹²⁸
f. **New Zealand** pledged NZ$20 million (US$12 million) for Loss and Damage at the start of COP 27 on 9 November 2022. This funding will be focused on the Pacific region on rebuilding livelihoods after disasters, dignified migration and the preservation of language and culture. However, this is not new and additional money as it is a reallocation from a climate finance commitment that New Zealand made ahead of COP26.

g. **Austria** pledged €50 from 2023 to 2026 at COP 27 on 9 November 2022. The money, which is being labelled as Loss and Damage finance, will go towards the Santiago Network for Loss and Damage and climate risk and early warning systems (“amongst other possible instruments”). However, this is not new money, but a re-allocation of funds previously pledged.

h. **Scotland** became the first developed country to pledge finance for Loss and Damage at COP 26 in Glasgow, and was heralded as “breaking the taboo” on this issue. At the start of COP 27 on 8 November 2022, First Minister Nicola Sturgeon announced a further £5m for Loss and Damage, focusing on slow-onset climatic processes, gender and Non-Economic Loss and Damage (NELD). However, this money is not new, but is an allocation of the funds pledged to the Climate Justice Fund at COP 26 by the First Minister. It is also worth noting that the UK Government counts all Scottish aid towards its 0.5% ODA target, though Scotland is said not to be able to stop them from counting like this. Nevertheless, the First Minister’s leadership on Loss and Damage is still very impressive and welcome, especially her affirmation again at COP 27 that this issue is about reparations - repaying a climate debt owed to developing countries - not charity.

i. **Wallonia** committed an initial €1m to address Loss and Damage at COP 26. This money was channelled to the CVF/V20 Joint-Multi Donor Fund for Loss and Damage. Wallonia has pledged a further €2m at COP 27, though the funds have yet to be allocated and further information is needed to assess this pledge.

---
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