

2023 Annual Partnership Consultation
Session 3: Accelerating climate action in fragile and vulnerable contexts
30 October 2023

T. Phiri, Spokesperson for Southern Africa Regional Bureau, WFP: Welcome back, and a very good afternoon to you all, colleagues that are in the room. Thanks for trooping back and making it back on time. And a warm welcome to colleagues that are joining us online. Welcome to Session 3, Accelerating climate action in fragile and vulnerable contexts. This session will be moderated by David Kaatrud, Director, Programme - Humanitarian and Development Division, WFP, who is in the room and is ready to roll. David, take it away.

D. Kaatrud, Director, Programme - Humanitarian and Development Division, WFP (Chairperson): It is great to be back with the APC, an annual fixture here, but they are always in different roles. I am very pleased that I could play this role today on such an important topic. Thank you to all of you for making the trek to the APC more generally and also for the time you are devoting to this session today, accelerating climate action in fragile and vulnerable contexts. We are all feeling it.

The climate crisis is becoming more prevalent in our lives, and as you heard from Arif Husain this morning, it is a major driver of food insecurity worldwide. Over the past decade, some 1.7 billion people have been affected by extreme weather and climate-related disasters. It is becoming clearer and clearer that the communities who contribute the least to the climate crisis are the bearer of the brunt of its impacts with limited means to cope.

We are also seeing that climate shocks affect three times as many people annually in fragile and vulnerable settings compared to those in non-fragile settings. These populations receive only a fraction of climate finance per capita - and some 80 times less - than those living in non-fragile settings. Given this and the fact that the world, sadly, is moving steadily towards the 1.5 degree limit on global warming, it is imperative that we look to accelerate climate action in the most fragile and vulnerable settings and ensure that the most vulnerable people and communities are prioritized in that effort.

As most of you will know, we are about four weeks out from COP 28, but maybe less of you might be aware that this will be the first COP to shine a spotlight on fragility, as it will feature both a dedicated relief, recovery and peace day and a historic climate, relief, recovery and peace declaration. As the ink dries on that particular declaration, we will want to mobilize to rapidly operationalize that declaration in everything that it could mean and in putting forward a package of financial and technical solutions, which could include early warning and anticipatory action, disaster risk finance and insurance, climate-adaptive infrastructure, and community-based adaptation.

At COP we will also have an opportunity to amplify each other's voices in a strong and unified call for action to scale up solutions which help communities avert, minimize and address loss and damage from climate change. We should also have the space to make the case that climate finance needs to be made more localized in order to work for the most vulnerable communities, that people living in fragile and conflict-affected settings need to be the first in line to access services for climate protection and prediction, and that the transformation of food systems is one of the most effective entry points for climate action. Those of you involved in food systems and food security also will take note that there is going to be a food systems declaration, the first time climate and food systems have been formally recognized by COP as well.



Turning to this session, it will present a timely opportunity for WFP and its partners how we can jointly advance the localization of climate action and climate justice in fragile contexts and strengthen the voices of the most vulnerable during COP 28 and certainly beyond.

To do this, we have assembled a great panel. I am looking forward to hearing them and so I will be shutting up shortly. But we have set up some great perspectives here with experts that are involved in this issue, have been thinking about this issue and will present their thoughts and then we will turn it out over to you for some interaction.

To my far left I have Mathew Truscott, who is the Head of Humanitarian Policy and Advocacy from Oxfam, and he will be speaking first. To my far right we have Gernot Laganda, Director, Climate and Disaster Risk Reduction Service, WFP. To my immediate left, Azmat Khan, the CEO of the Foundation for Rural Development in Pakistan. And, last but certainly not least, to my immediate right we have Lucia Pande, who is the Secretary General of Tanzania Red Cross.

And we will be speaking in that order. Brief statements from each. We will hear them out, all four panellists, and then we will orchestrate some interaction with all of you and try to stick to time. Mathew, if I can turn to you first, followed by Gernot, Azmat, and then Lucia.

M. Truscott, Head, Humanitarian Policy and Advocacy, Oxfam: I am going to start with the fairly depressing side of things and then I hope move from there to some of the more positive or optimistic approaches to fragile states. But I think it is important that we have in mind just how serious the crisis is that we are facing.

Arif has already laid out and, honestly, he had much better slides than I did, some of the statistics in terms of the impact of the climate crisis this morning. And to me, this is potentially the largest crisis we have ever faced as a sector. The numbers are quite small behind me, but you can see the trend of those graphs and where the trends we want to be going up are going down and the trends we want to be going down are going up.

Oxfam's research estimates that funding requirements for United Nations humanitarian appeals linked to extreme weather events are eight times higher now than they were 20 years ago. Over the last decade, humanitarian appeals have secured, on average, about 59 percent of the funds required, but the number of people in need since 2012 has risen from 76 million to over 400 million. Nearly three-quarters of those are facing a combination of risks, and that includes conflict, economic fragility, and climate vulnerability.

I was having a conversation with a colleague from South Sudan last week, and he was saying that they were implementing a project to try and strengthen roofs ahead of the rainy season. And the people they spoke to said, yes, please do, we need roofs to keep the rain out, but while you are at it, can you also add stronger doors and locks? Because they are not just facing the climate crisis, they are also facing a conflict, and we have to be able to respond to both.

Obviously, we need new and additional finance, but we also need for the finance from climate sector and the humanitarian sector to work better together. How do we make those funding streams come together and integrate new funding that I hope, and maybe too optimistically, will be coming through from COP?

I must admit that as Oxfam, the answers to many of those questions are somewhat unclear. In one of the papers that will be sent around there is an attempt to answer that. When I was speaking to some colleagues while writing this paper from the climate sector it was fairly obvious that we were not working well together. We have different approaches. We use the same words for different things and different words for the same things. And even in terms of humanitarian principles, there is not always agreement. Should humanitarian finance actually be used to adapt to climate change? All that overstretch already scarce resources. Should climate finance be used at all for humanitarian needs? All that means that we are only responding to crisis and never actually preventing and mitigating them.



Then where do anticipatory action and adaptation meet? When funds are limited, should we be building a large dam to help an urban population in water stress? Or should you be building a series of small wells and doing water trucking to get water to remote areas where there are far less people, but perhaps more urgent needs?

When I wrote this paper, speaking to some of the colleagues in the climate team, they told me in no uncertain terms that actually we should not be taking climate finance at all for humanitarian programmes because climate finance should be meeting climate needs.

And they made quite a strong point. The climate crisis will not and cannot be solved by humanitarian aid. And I agree with them. What I did not tell them at the time was that most of our country programmes are already taking climate finance and implementing programmes using that for their humanitarian responses.

And speaking just at lunch with Lucia and Azmat today, I think it became clear that these divisions we talk about of climate finance or development finance or humanitarian finance, those big pockets that we talk about in meeting rooms like this, when it comes down to the NGOs actually implementing those programmes, do not really matter that much.

How do we fix this disconnect between what we are talking about here in climate and humanitarian action with the reality we are seeing from the communities? Whatever solutions we come up with for these issues and whatever is decided later in COP this year, we have to make it practical for people who are actually going to be implementing those funds.

I know the loss and damage discussions are incredibly political. We have seen the fallout from TC 4 just a few weeks ago, but we have to find a way to drive these discussions from the local up, from the ground up. We have to start with how to make it work practically and then sort out the politics, not the other way around. Otherwise, we are simply going to wait too long.

My colleagues are right, the climate crisis will not be solved by humanitarian action, but for hundreds and millions of people adapting to climate change and reducing their humanitarian needs will look very similar.

How do we do that? Well, I think the answer has already been mentioned several times in different panels today: we start with local humanitarian action. For me, it is about a woman in a village who knows that the rains have been poor and needs desperately to start building wells to get her village through the next dry season.

I do not have the answers for how we fix climate action in fragile states, but I do know that any answers we come up with that do not get money quickly, easily and simply to that woman is setting us up for failure, and we simply cannot afford to fail.

Framing like that – too big to fail – probably reminds some of the Grand Bargain, and that is exactly why Oxfam is now talking about the Green Bargain. Humanitarian aid has gotten quite a lot wrong over the years, and Oxfam has written a few papers criticizing us for it, but we have also learned some key lessons in those Grand Bargain commitments. What we are calling for here is to use the lessons that we have taken from the Grand Bargain and apply that to humanitarian action.

ICVA members have started talking about the four quite convenient As of climate finances: access, adequacy, additionality, and accountability.

It needs to be accessible in all countries. And this has two aspects. Firstly, it has to actually get to those countries even where those governments may be unwilling or unable to implement those projects. And secondly, not just to those countries, but to the communities in line with the Grand Bargain commitments and localization. And this is particularly important in fragile states, but I will try circle back to that in a moment.



Secondly, it has to be adequate. And I know we are always talking about there is no more money in the system and donors are unable to fund more, but if those countries had met their 0.7 percent commitments to ODA in the 1970s, there would have been USD 6.5 trillion more aid in the system.

Can you imagine what we would have done with that? Can you imagine if those graphs behind me, if that red line did not exist, if we met all of those goals, what the world would have looked like? And what we would be able to do with the climate finance, if the trillions of dollars that are still being given in fossil fuel subsidies, were instead put towards meeting those climate needs? The money is there, how we prioritize it is the question.

But there is a fundamental inequality that underlies all of this. I am afraid the G8 countries are responsible for 41 percent of global carbon emissions, and it is the countries in fragile states who have contributed almost nothing to that carbon debt that are now facing those challenges. For the money to be adequate, it has to be additional. Double-counting, relabelling funds from one priority to another or providing funding in the form of loans is the real enemy here.

In Oxfam's recent climate finance shadow report, we found the contributions aiming to get to USD 100 billion by 2020, the contributors said they had gotten to USD 83 billion. But when you actually look at that, the real value of that spending was closer to USD 24 billion. Of the climate finance provided to fragile states in 2019, over half of it was given in the form of debt creating instruments, and nearly 10 percent of that was non-concessional loans.

The problem is climate events are not just a one-off. They are cyclical. A loan now to meet yesterday's climate crisis means that you are even poorer for the next climate crisis coming in a year or two, and that just traps you into a debt spiral. All we are making with these loans is the next response to be more expensive. Loans to fragile states are not going to get the money to the people who need it, and they are certainly not going to reduce the overheads and the costs that we have talked about in the Grand Bargain of trying to get that finance to where it needs to be.

We simply can no longer afford a system that has this level of inequality where countries and companies amass billions of dollars and poor states are forced into debt cycles to keep borrowing, to pay for a climate crisis that they did not cause.

And that brings me to the last A of accountability. For funding to be accountable, and this gets a little bit of the technical, less fun part, it has to be tracked and reported accurately to achieve those collective outcomes. This is something as a system we have been trying to do for years, but now as climate finance comes in, it is going to be even more important that we know what money is coming and where to work together. Local organizations in particular often have to pull together a patchwork of different funding instruments to make their projects work.

But if climate finance is going to have any relevance beyond that negotiating table in COP, it is crucial that we design it in a way that meets the needs of those local NGOs, that we can track it, that we can see where it comes in, how it moves through the system, and what needs it is meeting.

Again, I come back to that example of a woman trying to build a well. How do we design a system that gets her the funding she needs as directly as possible without the maze of complications? How do we as an international community design a climate finance system that is accountable to her instead of her making fill out forms to be accountable to us?

I have said I would come back to fragile states and I will do that quickly with the last minute or two I have, because for me, that is where the real challenge is. By 2030 two-thirds of the world's poor will live in fragile states. Yet between 2014 and 2021, the multilateral climate funds to extremely fragile and fragile states were USD 2 and USD 10 per capita respectively. In contrast, for the 19 non-fragile states, it was USD 161 per capita. Tuvalu



received over a USD 1,000 per person. Venezuela received USD 0.13, Nigeria and Myanmar received over 20 percent of the climate finance going to fragile states. This is a global problem and we have to address it globally. We cannot afford to only respond where it is easy or in states where donors like. We have to be able to get that finance to the places where it is hard.

That does not mean by any means that all climate finance should go to fragile states, and it certainly does not mean that climate finance is just another way to plug the gaps in humanitarian aid. They are separate problems and they are going to need separate funding solutions. For many good reasons the climate finance system is largely state-centric. Adaptation and mitigation are going to need large-scale state leadership. Oxfam works a lot on water, and what we desperately need is the states to step up and develop those large-scale climate resilient water systems.

We cannot address cyclical floods and cyclical droughts by going in every few years with water trucks and sandbags. It is not going to meet the level of needs that is there on that graph. This is a challenge to a number of countries because when they receive funding, we simply cannot be sure that it is going to get to people in need.

In almost all states, there are regions and communities which are outside of government power structures or beyond political interests. And even though they desperately need the funding there, it might not arrive. We have to design a system that can implement both those large-scale projects but is also flexible enough to get funding to those communities and to local actors.

And that is the nexus, all over again. We need, as a colleague of mine said to me last week, a system which enables us both to have satellites in space and sandbags on the ground to respond to the climate crisis. This again is why we are talking about the Green Bargain and the Grand Bargain. We need to get money to those places in ways that we have learned through the Grand Bargain.

We need to get it to local actors as directly as possible. We need to improve transparency, we need to reduce management costs, and we need to build on what we have already learned in the nexus to not make those same mistakes again. It is about access, it is about adequacy, it is about additionality, and it is about accountability.

Chairperson: Mathew, well done in getting us started and energized. As usual, the depth of the research from Oxfam has really been distilled and conveyed in a very effective manner. And thank you for underline why it is important we are having this discussion now, pre-COP as we advocate climate finance to start to flow into fragile settings, areas we are working that have not been recipients to date of that type of finance.

And we have this opportunity just to underscore the point that we can put some principles in place, people centred, local, practical and the four As for sure. And thank you for giving us a potential advocacy tool in the Green Bargain to potentially mobilize behind. Let us get a different perspective now and turn to Gernot.

G. Laganda, Director, Climate and Disaster Risk Reduction Service, WFP: Welcome to a very, very timely and important conversation. We are three weeks away from COP 28, and as David mentioned, it is probably the first COP that provides some very, very good space to put climate action in vulnerable and fragile contexts on a very high place in the agenda. If you have followed the climate change negotiations over the past now almost three decades, you will have realized the conversation was always taking place on two parallel rails.

That was climate change mitigation on the one side, which was dealing around reducing greenhouse gas emissions, slowing the degree of global heating and, in parallel, there was a somewhat slower stream of discussions on climate change adaptation, which is preparing for the impacts that we are already committed to.



And now, three decades later, we are at the global warming threshold of around 1.15/1.2 degrees, but we have already breached the 1.5 degree limit that is enshrined in the Paris Agreement for at least 38 days just until October this year. From January to October, we had 38 days that were above the 1.5 degree threshold.

We are in what climate scientists call the overshoot territory already. And in this overshoot territory, we see basically impacts that are unprecedented, that for humanitarian organizations present this very permanent crisis. There is no humanitarian relief cycle anymore where you could catch your breath and build back better. We are basically running with very protracted crisis, and we are dealing with loss and damage.

The little contribution that I want to make today is to introduce this loss and damage conversation a little bit to you and showcase how we will, in COP 28 in Dubai, communicate about this. This is a slide that we keep using in communicating the issue. You can see here it is very colourful, but there are essentially four lines of defence that stand between people who are going to be impacted by climate-induced loss and damage, and the different financing sources that are currently in the system. The very first line of defence on the very top is climate change mitigation.

This is where essentially a lot of the work around greening supply chains goes in greening operations, greening our fleet and buildings, making sure we have energy-efficient offices. But there are no projects that WFP does that have only a climate change mitigation objective. Climate change mitigation for us is a side benefit. And sometimes we make the mistake of not quantifying the big public goods, the carbon benefits that the most vulnerable people on this planet are achieving by regreening landscapes, by regenerating soils, regenerating degraded forests.

But this is, I think, a very important line of defence that needs to be sustained, even though we, as a humanitarian organization, are not working on this directly. As we all know, climate change mitigation is not sufficient because at the moment when we take all the commitments of countries together, we would be at 2.8 degrees of global warming. We need to prepare for these impacts.

The second line of defence – climate change adaptation – encompasses a number of projects and interventions that many of you will know because you are also doing them in the field. Ecosystem rehabilitation, soil and water conservation, working with nature to provide these buffer capabilities, post-harvest storage systems, climate information services. A whole range of projects that are usually financed more with development or climate finance. But as we also know, investments in climate change adaptation have been too little, too late.

These international commitments, the targets for climate finance of USD 100 billion per year by 2020 have not been met. We are now at around USD 80 billion per year. The big part of this is for climate change mitigation. Only around 30 percent is for adaptation and when then you look under the hood of what that adaptation financing looks like, then you realize a lot is also loan-based, which then provides this stepped burden that is so devastating for many developing countries.

A third line of defence is necessary which has a much more immediate protective function. It is a little bit what we could call the renaissance of disaster risk reduction. Those are those investments that we can make now in order to protect people next year, not like climate change adaptation in 5 or 10 years' time, but something that we can do now, for example, contingency planning, emergency preparedness, working with early warning systems, which even when you do not have observational networks, can also be built with the downscaling of global or regional models. We can buy climate risk insurance protection. We can work with social protection systems to make them more shock responsive.

Basically the third line of defence for us is what we would call disaster protection. And if everything else fails, then we have the conversation about humanitarian aid, where we



have already seen a very dire outlook with a 40/50 percent financing gap, which is only set to increase as the global warming keeps progressing.

This is in a nutshell, in one visual a little bit the way we see the job of the international aid systems building all these lines of defence together. Different organizations have different advantages or a collective offer that fits maybe under one or two of these lines of defence and not all of them, but together, I think we have a very strong collective offer to make, which we would like to bring into also COP 28.

And this brings me to the conclusion of my short intervention. I want to share three priorities that we would like to take into COP 28 and beyond. The first one already mentioned, we want to search those types of projects that deliver short-term protective benefits, because if we do not do this now, then in five years, when we have permanently breached that 1.5 degree threshold and we are in this tipping point territory, it will be too late. There is a really strong ask about a renewed focus on emergency preparedness, early warning, anticipatory action, and climate risk insurance.

Second, we would like to strengthen partnerships at the nexus between humanitarian, development and climate action. I think the contributions of the humanitarian sector to climate action are not always well understood in the larger humanitarian and development space. But there is substantive experience here in the room on things like risk and vulnerability mapping, emergency preparedness, contingency planning, early warning, financial protection. All these things can be brought to bear also to the climate change debate.

And lastly, I think we need to have a very strong solution-focused approach to the climate crisis. Our humanitarian work is rooted in the breakdown of social structures and food systems and this comes with a very strong exposure to human suffering. But at the same time, when it comes to the climate crisis, there is a lot of pessimism and people tend to be overwhelmed by the sheer size and complexity of the problem.

Going into COP 28, we therefore want to make sure that people can shift the conversation from admiring the problem from various different angles, which we have seen over the past 30 years and shifting into a conversation that is really solutions focused. I think such a shift in thinking is long overdue in the climate change negotiations, but we can only make it happen if we advocate together.

Chairperson: I was taking interest to see how that slide, which I have been watching over the last year or so, is evolving. It is getting very sophisticated and very appropriate.

Thank you Gernot for putting your humanitarian action in a wider context of development actions, climate action and so on. And a theme running throughout there, just to underscore, is risk management. This is what we are doing, climate risk management, and particularly from the point of view of affected communities and people.

Thank you for bringing that and also adding to our sense of what is at stake in COP and what are the potentials that we can get out of that. Now I am going to turn to my left. So Azmat, if you are ready to take the floor, over to you.

A. Khan, Chief Executive Officer, Foundation for Rural Development, Pakistan: The panellists before me have done a great job. They have prepared the ground for my intervention. Just one thing. This morning, in one of my comments, I said that the concepts of fragility and conflicts when it comes to the mainstream news channels, are really important and they need to be taken care of.

But the climate change itself does cause conflicts in situations which are like from a local perspective, if the rainfall patterns are changing and there is scarcity of water in certain areas, then definitely the chances of conflicts towards the control of the sources of water increases. There is documented research that one failed crop due to no rain in certain



areas of the world increases the chances of civil war even in the next year because the people are food insecure and they do share problems.

As local actors, we have to exist in those communities. We are not just actors or NGOs, we are also part of those communities. Those climate change impacts have a direct impact on us and our families and our livelihoods. And that is the place which actually gives you a desire to make a real change. Whenever we talk at the Geneva level, at the New York level or Berlin and now the Rome level, this nexus approach sounds quite difficult because development actors have different programming cycles, and humanitarian actors have different programming cycles.

The communities with whom we are working do focus on what they need. And as local actors, we have to be responsible to the real needs and then we find ways on how to address those issues. And I am giving you just one example. We entered a partnership with the World Food Programme to help the internally displaced people who returned to their places of origin and whose livelihoods were destroyed. And we were actually working on the conditional cash grants where we were trying to create short-term jobs for the returning IDPs and make them food secure. We, from FRD, did sit together with colleagues from the World Food Programme and we convinced them that instead of involving them in activities just for the sake of activities, it was better to design activities in such a manner as to contribute to the resilience building of these communities.

In Pakistan we have the issue of drought but we also have the issue of floods. People think that these are just opposite of each other, abundance and scarcity. But the situation really is like this, like out of 365 days a year, you have scarcity of water and no rainfall like for many months and then, all of a sudden, for two or three days, you have showering of rain and you have floods.

The flood has its own damages, but this lake of rain throughout the year is actually having an impact on the underground water availability. And whenever the wells are going dry, the springs are going dry, there are more power struggles between communities to have access to sources of water and all those things.

We designed our cash grants intervention using nature-based solutions for soil and water conservation, we are putting in place nature-based stones that are available over there, people come together and use the dry stone machinery structures so it slows down the flow of water. The velocity of water is reduced, so it reduces the damages downstream in terms of the soil erosion, but this slowing-down structure also gives more time to the ground to absorb a portion of water and contribute to enhanced availability of water in the aquifer. So, within the same project, we had adaptation but also a small part of mitigation.

If the livelihood of poor people are dependent on deforestation and timber products, and you are telling them to not cut trees and to take care of them, their answer is, we have to eat something as well. So we tried to shift the livelihoods of a certain community from deforestation to reforestation where we enrolled them in the nursery raising of walnut trees, and now they are earning from raising walnut trees – and the useful life of a walnut tree is more than 90 years. We do contribute to the carbon sink as well. And just to remind you, the programme is a humanitarian early recovery.

The point here is that humanitarian action can prepare the ground for development actors after us. We can pilot these small interventions to them, like blurring the boundaries between the humanitarian and development action is today. We have to take action today and break these silos.

Instead of focusing on the decisions at the New York, Geneva and Rome levels, let us implement it on the ground, let us think in this other direction, the communities living somewhere in Africa or Latin America or Asia, who are suffering from the climate change phenomenon.



What solutions do they have? They really have solutions. And every solution is very context specific. Let us listen to them. Let us find whatever they have. By localization we do not need to give money to local NGOs, by localization we mean that communities who get impacted by climate change and humanitarian action should have a say in the design of programmes. We should not ask them to come and fit within our criteria, but we should adjust our funding to the real needs on the ground.

Chairperson: Azmat, thank you so much for making that strong case for localization really passionate and from a local perspective, shifting from the more global material we have been hearing to getting that local perspective and highlighting the fact that we have humanitarian, development and, I would add, climate silos that are kind of our own global construct.

And oftentimes you get clarity by having a people-centred community-focused approach where you start with solutions locally and then that can help break down silos. I do think you made a strong point there that we need to explore further. Also keeping on from a local perspective, certainly last but not least, we have Lucia Pande from the Tanzania Red Cross.

Ms L. Pande, Secretary General, Tanzania Red Cross Society: I am glad I am here today to represent the local NGOs. And since Red Cross, we are working with the communities at the ground level, so I am here to present what we have been doing at the ground level. For us, we believe responding to a disaster before it comes is the crucial way rather than waiting for the disaster to happen.

We are working much on the health system, whereby we work together with the vulnerable community to transform the message from the meteorological agents to the community itself. As the local partners, we transform what the agents say when it comes to climate change issues. Since we are working on the ground, it is easier for us to do as much of mapping risk assessment at the ground levels. And this has been done through the community itself.

As local agencies, we do risk mapping on floods. We have been going through a lot of floods in our country. What we do with the community is the mapping based on what happened before. If it is a flood, if it is a drought, we look at the same. But again, we promote the local community involvement in all the assessments we do. Our activities are to involve the community in risk assessment, assessing the population where we believe the flood or the disaster will happen. But again looking at the community in general.

We also produce and disseminate warning information to the community. Some of the communities in our local countries normally believe in their traditional way. Like for us, we believe in technical, we believe in information from the meteorological agencies, but when it comes to the tradition of the community itself, sometimes they believe much in a traditional way. It is our responsibility, as the Red Cross, to work with the people to understand when it comes to the forecast, what does it mean.

For example, meteorological says we are expecting to have heavy rainfall today or maybe tomorrow, at the community level they say we do not believe it because we believe in our traditional way, which is when they feel the sand smell, soil smell, they think the rain will come, but not from the technical side.

We, as Red Cross, involve the community to understand what it means when we get information from the technical meteorological department. But also we do a lot of restoration of natural ecosystem, we involve the community on activities to reduce the flood or drought by planting some trees, whether it is fruit trees, or trees for firewood to ensure that they understand that we need to do the same.

But again, we escalated the same to the schools where we introduced the clubs to make sure that students understand the impact of climate. And especially now that we had a



number of floods, people understand what it is. We encourage them to plant a lot of trees to avoid the erosion in case of flood.

But we also involve a lot of farmers on agriculture. We introduced short-term seeds to them, which are used for drought resistance. We as partners work on the ground level. Most of the people sitting here are working on the higher level, but we are working on the ground. We understand what the community means when it comes to the flood or when it comes to the need.

But again, we do a lot of capacity building. We do it through the local government, also in partnership with other stakeholders to make sure that we train our people, we train our communities at the ground level. We do a lot of community-based adaptation, particularly in vulnerable areas, by implementing adaptive measures tailored to their specific needs.

This may include forestation, sustainable farming practice, etc. And we do a lot of advocacy. You can imagine that we are doing a lot of advocacy. It is not because people do not understand, but we want to make them more aware of what is happening. We do raising awareness by highlighting the humanitarian impact of climate crises throughout local stories and cases studies, advocate to understand more on the issue of the climate impact on the most vulnerable communities.

We also do a lot of local solutions where we promote and celebrate successful climate initiatives to inspire other regions. This is done through peer-to-peer education or one region to other regions education. We use a lot of volunteers in sharing best practice and successful stories. We also work together to support the vulnerable communities' advocacy effort.

We prewrite more on voices to the most vulnerable communities, ensuring that we include the community in decision-making. You know, sometimes we create ourselves the need of the community without considering what they really need. We go to the community itself and look for their needs. Not to provide what we think is supportive to them, but we ask them what really we want to give to them.

Working together on the ground with the community itself gives us a lot of understanding on how to tackle it when it comes to any disaster. We also believe our partnership role is very crucial because we need a lot of collaboration between local NGOs and international NGOs. We know sometimes we do not need funds, but we need also technical expertise to help on peer-to-peer education but again, an improvement on early warning systems.

We still need to work a lot on early warning systems. We do not need to wait for disasters to come. We need to prepare before they come. The critical comes. We need to work hard on preparedness and not to respond when it comes to the issues.

Chairperson: Lucia, thank you so much for providing that from the ground perspective taking full advantage of the breadth of your presence in country at that local level and taking advantage of that. And in terms of bridging local knowledge with some of the central knowledge that is available by giving voice and listening to communities, but then also distilling best practices and then replicating those where appropriate across the country.

You are really performing a very valuable role as those communities now grapple with the intensified risks that climate change is bringing in a very appropriate way, as I can see it, with tailored approaches, nature-based solutions and so on.

Thank you to the panellists. We are up and running here with a great set of perspectives from the global views from more local perspectives, from different geographical areas and all pointed to COP and what we can get out of it.

We would like to hear from all of you now certainly there might be some questions, but also any ideas you can help us have this kind of broad-based partnered campaign as we go into COP to get the most out of what we see as some key developments that are coming,



bringing to bear some of the perspectives/principles that we certainly started off today with that reinforce with these discussions, people-centred, local solutions, localization and nexus approaches and so on.

Look forward to hearing from all of you. Let us first look around the room. We will take a few interventions at a time, and then we will ask our panellists to help address them. Let us go with my two colleagues on the left, Somali NGO Consortium and Structure Rurale d'Appui aux Communautés, and then we will go over to HIAS.

Somali NGO Consortium: Thank you very much for a really rich and informative conversation on the climate issue. It is refreshing to hear the importance of us working differently. I am a little bit conflicted on whether in the past seven years, since the Grand Bargain conversation, we have moved the needle as far as we need to and as quick as necessary.

In other conversations that I have been involved in there were people who were saying, look, the localization was not in the conversation in these global forums. Even having localization as a theme of conversation constantly it is an achievement itself. But then if you really talk to the local partners on the ground, they seem to be very frustrated, seven years of talking about advancing localization agenda and nothing concrete.

If we even take the transactional measurement of the 25 percent of funding going directly as possible to local partners, we are even failing that as a community. I think it is less than 4 percent that is going directly to local partners. The conversation gets even more complicated when we talk about the climate issue. The climate financing, it is another complexity and all the things I have heard from the panellists people-centred and listening to the community, looking at the locally-led solutions, I hear all of those all the time.

Maybe my question to the panellists and everyone here is, how are we moving the needle forward to ensure that we are elevating the suffering of the community? And if you look at the fragile and protracted crises, we certainly need to do things differently because we cannot be trucking water every couple of months for places like Somalia.

Couple of weeks ago, we were talking about this unprecedented drought in the east of Africa, particularly in Somalia. And right now as we speak, there are areas where there are huge floods leading to more displacement on already vulnerable populations in these regions.

How do we then now leverage another complex instrument, which is climate financing, to address these shocks that we have been seeing for the last number of years? And we are saying from this morning we have heard that the needs are rising and rising, the funds are getting smaller, but we need to be able to leverage the nexus that we have talked about.

Again, another really nice word to say, conceptually really great, but if the system is not changing at the same time as we are having these conversations, then we might be having the same conversation 10 years down the line. I hope we are not, but we might be having that because I think we do need courageous leaders who want to change the system, who are brave enough to challenge the status quo and change for the people because we are here collectively to elevate the suffering.

There is a political dimension to this, but then maybe that is our strength. Since we are in the community working with the community, we need to be using our collective voice to advocate a lot louder than maybe we are doing right now.

Chairperson: Let us stay on that side of the table.

Structure Rurale d'Appui aux Communautés (original language French): I am from the Sahel region of Burkina Faso. I listened to our panellists and what we have seen in the field today, women and children, they have to leave the cities or the villages to fetch some food or to get some wood to cook.



And so this makes me wonder, cannot we actually join projects, humanitarian and resilience projects, but also concerning climate change? Because I see that today, even if the security crisis in Burkina Faso is arriving to an end, maybe by the end of this year, the climate crisis will still be ongoing. We have a population, almost 300,000 people, who will be going in a certain area of 2/3 kilometres and they are going to deforest everything they can and so there is really an issue. So, should not we actually join projects to address the needs of these communities?

Chairperson: Now, I will turn to HIAS, then Caritas Internationalis and Canadian Foodgrains Bank, and then we will draw a line there. Then for a second round, I already have CGIAR and Muslim Hands, so we will take that as a second round.

HIAS: Mark Hatfield with HIAS, which is the Jewish communities' organization for forcibly displaced persons. One of the things we are really struggling with is the inadequacy of both international instruments as well as national laws in addressing climate-induced forced migration.

I just wanted a slightly deeper dive if I could, on WFP's comments on the three priorities going into COP 28 specifically, the second one – strengthening partnerships at the nexus between humanitarian, development and climate – and the third one – the need for a strong solution approach to climate change in the context of the connection between climate-induced migration and food security.

Chairperson: Thank you for being concise. Caritas Internationalis.

Caritas Internationalis: I just wanted to come to the question of loss and damage and part of the question is new and additional money. I think as humanitarians, we need to be a lot more canny about loss and damage, and we need to understand how that fits with our world.

Before coming to the job this year, as Caritas' Secretary-General, I was Chief Executive of Caritas Scotland and was very involved in the Scottish Minister's role in COP 26 when we got there to announce the first money for loss and damage. That was a big step forward in terms of the cause of the loss and damage fund. But immediately the question came up, so what is loss and damage and what would the money be used for?

And the difficulty is it is actually not as distinct from humanitarian action as we might like to think. Much of what we as humanitarians are doing is essentially covering for uninsured losses of communities within which we are working. And so I think we just need to be quite careful about how we engage with that and where new money comes from.

In terms of the framework that was presented of the four areas of intervention, loss and damage even in there, and so it is going to become much more of an issue at COP 28 in Dubai. There is going to be a lot of discussion around loss and damage. And I think it is somewhat naive to think it will all be new and additional. We need to work out how to position ourselves within a real debate rather than standing on the side-lines shouting something we are not going to see.

Chairperson: And let us finish off around the table here.

Canadian Foodgrains Bank: Andy Harrington, Canadian Foodgrains Bank. I really appreciate everything that has been said here. Mathew outlined the situation extremely well. It was very interesting to see how we are moving from, I think Gernot said from 1.5 to 2.8, just in moments of years.

And it is not long ago since we were talking about 1.5 as being the red line. Suddenly we have changed that goalpost and nobody really knows what that is going to mean in terms of the consequences. One of the things that is coming out of that is an incredible hopelessness that people are feeling. I think young people in particular, I am sure we all know this, looking at the world and saying, do I even have a future?



I have talked with young people recently who are saying, I am never going to have kids because there is no future for them to be born in. It is very incumbent on us to take this conversation exceptionally seriously. And I think in doing that, and this is to speak to something that has already been brought up, it is really important that we think at a systems level here, we cannot be thinking about the silos and how we use these different pots of money.

We just have to see this is one situation, this is one system that we need to have upon us. Because by the nature of fragile and vulnerable contexts, this work is probably likely to start in humanitarian work, first of all, because of the nature of where we are actually talking about. That humanitarian aid is going to have to merge into development aid and climate financing aid if we are actually going to have long-term solutions focused here, which I think is really essential.

In that, we are looking at a programme in Canadian Foodgrains Bank around nature positive food solutions that is being funded as part of the Canadian Government's Partnering for Climate Programme. And we are looking at localized, these solutions are coming from local people, community-driven, processes around things like conservation, agriculture, assisted natural regeneration, improved water management, improved livestock and range management. But I think beyond that, also, we are looking at paradigm shifts for many of the people that we are working with.

We have got to be thinking about the livelihoods that come out of this, the full systems, the marketing systems, especially for women and girls. How are we going to see supported livelihood strategies that are going to work within the new systems that we want to set up. I just wanted to make that very clear point that we have to be thinking about nexus on steroids. It is not just the old nexus. This is a whole new nexus.

I really appreciated the Green Bargain words there, but we have to be thinking in ways that we find very hard because we are very protective about the way we do things, so we have to be thinking about how we think on a systems level basis to truly work in these kinds of contexts.

Chairperson: Why do not we take a break from the questions. We have a speaker's list for another round, and we have a bit of time for that as well. Let me turn to the panellists before we forget about some of those very valuable interventions. Could I just go in the same order maybe Mathew whatever you want to pick up there to respond to, Gernot following, Azmat and then Lucia.

M. Truscott, Head, Humanitarian Policy and Advocacy, Oxfam: I will try and answer some of these questions. Part of the reason that we wrote the paper we did is because these questions are coming up and we do not have good answers to some of them. Nimo I think your point on localization, I absolutely agree and it would not be another white guy on a panel to tell you what I think about localization.

But I think if I can see one positive on it, we, as humanitarians in this room, have been having that conversation for a long time without making much progress, but we are further ahead than a lot of the climate discussions. Maybe they can learn from our bad example. And that is kind of what we are trying to say in this.

We have not got this right, but we have identified the problem, and we need this to come into the climate finance discussions because that is, if I can be sort of critical of it, far more state centric than we are as humanitarians. And so how do we make sure that the states present in those conversations are not just having kind of tokenistic representation from the NGOs that they would like in the room, but actually bringing that diversity of voices? We have just started talking and so the next step is to get them talking. And I hope after that the step is to actually get action on that.



Maybe from highest on the point of migration and displacement. Yes, it is going to be a crucial issue. And we all know statistics on how many people are going to be displaced, how many are displaced already, both internally and externally. I think this is where it comes into to a bit of a question for me on that humanitarian principles discussion of trying to get age to allow people to remain where they are and so on. But in a situation of a global climate crisis, migration and moving away from areas which are no longer suitable for human habitation is a completely reasonable response. And that is maybe something we as a humanitarian system are going to have some difficult discussions about what does that actually mean.

And there is a colleague from the climate finance side who was saying, we should be using this money to help people move. Why are you wasting money trucking water into areas that are 500 kilometres away from a city? Put people on those trucks, get them accommodation, get them work, and let them move to the areas where it is actually sustainable. And that is where it comes down to that humanitarian climate principles discussion of what we are actually going to do in that. And that is a practicality that I think we are going to need to wrestle with and it is going to be difficult.

On the question from Caritas, I absolutely agree. I had an interesting discussion with a colleague where I tried to map out loss and damage finance because we had the typical graph of development and humanitarian and peace finance where you see one going up and the other going down. And I sat down with him. Where do we put loss and damage on this graph? Where does loss and damage come up? Is it when humanitarian is already going up? Or is it where development is cutting off? And their response was, well, loss and damage is not really a time bound thing, so you cannot put it on that graph because it is not going to be related to time. And my little humanitarian brain went, okay, but where does the money come in? Where is that call down going to happen? Because that is the practicality of it.

I do not think that discussion has been had, or at least not had to a level where we have got answers. You may know much more about that than me, but one of the things we are trying to say is to have these practical discussions when we get this funding in. And I agree a lot of it is not going to be new and additional. I am going to keep banging the drum that it should be, because maybe one day someone will listen. But when that money comes in, how do we make it work with the system we have that it is not just that kind of double counting or relabelling that we are really afraid it is going to be?

And then how do we make sure that it comes in at the time that it needs to come in? Because we have already seen with early warning systems that do not get funding when we call for those early warnings, we cannot afford to repeat that mistake with another climate crisis. East Africa is a good example. We sounded the alarm, we called for it. The World Food Programme, Oxfam, all of the others, and the money did not arrive.

And if that is going to be the pattern we see in climate change, we are in huge trouble. I am not sure that answers all of it, but I think those are some of the challenges.

Chairperson: Mathew, thank you for getting us going here. Gernot, anything you want to elaborate on there or things that were not touched on to take up?

G. Laganda, Director, Climate and Disaster Risk Reduction Service, WFP: Maybe a quick complement to the question on migration. Mathew has already said this. For us, migration is a very legitimate climate change adaptation strategy while with displacement, I think there is one additional element that we are trying to consider, which is that people who get displaced across borders, usually fall between the cracks of climate finance. They are neither eligible for climate finance in their countries of origin, nor are they eligible for the countries where they get displaced to.

And so whenever it comes to these declarations around climate and fragility at COP 28, we work closely with our friends from the UNHCR, also with IOM and others, to make sure that



the situation of displaced people is reflected in all these calls. Because otherwise there is no way that we can build these climate resilience projects the same way for displaced communities as we can for people that are still present in their states of origin.

Now on loss and damage. I think when you look under the hood of these new announcements that are being made, there is a lot of double counting with adaptation and there is a lot of overlap also. This is why in this graph, which is by the way in the IASC paper for loss and damage, you see adaptation as a different line of defence.

This is basically the cascade that leads to loss and damage in vulnerable communities. And we want to avoid that there is double counting between adaptation and loss and damage financing because ultimately loss and damage gets absorbed by local communities. Those are also the first responders in emergencies by governments, and then by the aid sector. The problem we have is that our international humanitarian aid system is not a climate justice instrument.

We do not make a difference between supporting somebody who is trapped behind the lines of conflict or somebody who is affected by a big once in a century drought or flood. This is the problem with the financing segmentation. Our approach is not to say we need that loss and damage funding to complement the humanitarian response.

We say we need, no matter where it comes from, climate money, development money, loss and damage money, we need that money to go into those systems that reduce humanitarian needs. Because again, when we get some funding from a donor, we cannot just set it aside while we have to cut rations in Yemen or in the Horn of Africa and just have it sit there because it needs to trigger only based on a particular type of disaster.

But I very much agree that there is a lot of double counting, and I think this is all our collective responsibility to make sure that this does not happen. It needs to be really money that is available in the failure of mitigation, in the failure of adaptation, or even in places where adaptation has been tried but the extremes are now so high that all these defences are being overwhelmed.

And I think a last comment to our colleague from the Somali NGO Consortium how we can do things differently on localization. Most of the climate finance instruments that are out there, Green Climate Fund, adaptation fund, least developed country funds, special climate change fund, they get all piped through national government systems.

And I think the opportunity to work in fragile contexts is the one where we can show that we can actually work in different ways too, because you cannot do climate action through these national pathways in countries where you have international sanctions or where you have a government as part of a conflict or other things.

For us, I think this work of climate action fragile contexts is a proving ground for these localized ways to deliver climate action. But I think what we collectively have to do is we need to make sure that we share with each other what works, good examples, and we accentuate and amplify these good practices that are widely unknown because everyone only looks at climate justice as transfers from the north to the south, from government to government. But climate justice happens at the local level. You need to measure the success of climate justice investments with the protection of people that are at the local level and not a transfer from one government to another.

Chairperson: Azmat.

A. Khan, Chief Executive Officer, Foundation for Rural Development, Pakistan: On the question of our friend from Burkina Faso on joining projects and the nexus approach, that is exactly what we are advocating overhead, the humanitarian action. We should not be just focusing on addressing the needs of the communities who are affected by various disasters, but we should also be thinking about our own footprint in terms of the climate change, how much carbon we are emitting, how much paper we are using, and like the



example which I shared, that we can come up with solutions on adjusting the implementation style of our projects in such a manner as we do take care of the immediate needs of the communities who are affected. But taking care in such a manner as it sort of contributes to the resilience building of those communities in the long term.

Joining the question of Nimo and Caritas on the loss and damage financing thing. As a local actor we do understand that this is quite a different and difficult discussion. From the perspective of a local actor, we do not know how it should be, but we can share how it should not be. And it should not be like the existing climate financing mechanism, whether it is GCF, whether it is adaptation fund or whatever fund. But if loss and damage financing becomes so bureaucratic as the existing financing mechanisms are, it will not make any sense if the money is reaching where it is needed after two or three years.

Chairperson: Lucia.

Ms L. Pande, Secretary General, Tanzania Red Cross Society: I need to add on coordination point that when it comes to loss and damage money, we need to have a coordinated way where governments, United Nations agencies, international and local NGOs can work together.

Maybe there is a need to have a contingency plan and to understand the responsibility of each partner instead of everybody coordinating on its own. We need to have a contingency plan or SOPs to define the role of each and every one. That one will sort some of the problems we have currently.

Chairperson: We can afford I think one more round of interventions for which I did the best I could to get citing on. World Humanitarian Action Forum we will start with you then CGIAR, and Muslim Hands.

Then we will also very quickly survey the online. There is someone watching online right now. Those of you joining online, if you want to put something in the chat we will try to pick it up and give a treatment here. And if not here, you have heard that earlier today that we will come back subsequently on that.

World Humanitarian Action Forum: Let me ask very naive questions actually. How can the polluters help the polluted without stopping the polluters from polluting the globe? We just ask the polluters to give symptomatic treatment to the polluted without asking them to address the root causes is very important. Come back to our colleague from the Somali NGO Consortium.

Do we need to visit the system? Do we need to reshape the system or do we need to create another system? It is a very frank discussion between us because this morning we talked about food crisis and who is behind the food crisis.

We are just trying to give some symptomatic treatment. This afternoon we are talking about climate change. If we keep meeting for the coming few, maybe 50, 60, 70 years, discussing the same thing, we give them symptomatic treatment. It is how the polluters will help the polluted without asking the polluters of stopping polluting the globe.

Chairperson: Thank you for that intervention. And now CGIAR.

CGIAR: Thank you a lot for the fantastic discussion, really interesting. My name is Grazia Pacillo and I come from the CGIAR, the alliance of diversity in CIAT and I lead the CGIAR Focus Climate Security team. A very rich discussion and really interesting insights on the climate finance, specifically the needs and the gaps, to use these funds also to support those countries that are exposed to climate risks as well as to fragility and conflict risks and vulnerability. This is certainly a fundamental issue that needs to be addressed.

This gap needs to be filled, but it is not the entire problem. We have to also think about the climate action itself. Our research really shows that traditional approaches of climate action are not enough and they are not enough because episodes of maladaptation are



becoming more and more common, as we have seen climate adaptation strategies, such as migration, are changing. There is also forced migration because of the increasing of the climate crisis.

As we approach COP I think we really need to think not only on identifying those financial resources, not only to bring the global climate fund to invest in those countries that so far have been identified as too risky to invest, but also to change what we think about climate adaptation. First of all, to do no harm so not creating any more problems including maladaptation, but also as the climate, peace and security nexus research demonstrates also more fragility and more conflicts.

Climate can exacerbate these common drivers of fragility. But then on the other side, as the new agenda for peace by the United Nations Secretary-General says, we need to think on how climate action can become an instrument for conflict prevention, an instrument for peace.

Chairperson: Now, as I mentioned Muslim Hands. Then I have Actionaid, GOPA-DERD, BRAC UK, and Conseil pour l'éducation et le développement. That will probably be our speakers list given time. Please have your interventions to be very concise.

Muslim Hands: The points I wanted to mention have already been covered by Mathew in his response, but just to reiterate that for us as a sector to work on a climate change agenda, we need to make sure the solutions we are trying to find out are in line with what NDCs commitments have been made by all the countries. We cannot just work in isolation. We cannot find out our own solutions, whereas the countries are going on into their whole different solution points. Within that we need to identify the gap area.

When we talk about the NDCs, we need to see what we as a sector or humanitarians can do. It could be a capacity building element within that, which countries will appreciate to take on board. It could be more working with the local governments and also then the last but very important factor involving local communities to identify the solutions. That is one of the points I wanted to mention.

Then, we can also contribute towards developing climate investment plans for each country where the needs are high, but the plans do not exist and within that we find out the solutions where we can fit in as a sector. We cannot be just working in isolation.

And the last point is about the climate financing instruments which are currently existing. We need to advocate the financing, the donors to simplify the access to climate financing instruments and allowing the sector to work directly with them.

Chairperson: Actionaid.

Actionaid International: Thank you so much for the presentations and the interventions that I have heard so far. My point is on the role of local women, women's rights organizations, women-led organizations, in loss and damage conversations in climate adaptation efforts.

We know already that women are crucial in climate change adaptation in agriculture and food security as they make up an estimated 43 percent of the labour force. But despite this huge percentage, we find that women are often marginalized from decision-making in climate change adaptation planning, and they are also marginalized in terms of receiving climate financing.

Their indigenous traditional knowledge is often overlooked because most of the time we are in favour of scientific evidence and we tend to overlook traditional knowledge systems, which these women are custodians of. Therefore, how do we leverage indigenous traditional knowledge systems in early warning and in climate adaptation, putting women at the centre of it all?



There is need for us to fund women-led organizations and women rights organizations which are working on climate change adaptation and in addressing loss and damage because they are already deeply rooted in the communities.

They know how to facilitate women's participation in climate change adaptation efforts, and they have that capacity, but we need to be able to fund them for them to be able to scale that up. Our message on loss and damage is that the loss and damage that was announced at COP 27 should have a gender lens and it should be able to support local and national organizations, particularly women and youth-led organizations which are at the forefront of responding to the climate crisis that we find ourselves in.

Chairperson: And GOPA-DERD.

GOPA-DERD: Just a quick introduction to those of you who do not know GOPA-DERD. We are the largest faith-based organization in Syria. We flew in all the way from Damascus and we are really happy to be part of this conference. I just want to quickly go over just a few points. We began today's discussions by talking about lowered funding and this will be my starting point.

When we speak about lowered funding we spoke and we heard a lot about localization and the different insights about localization and how to support local actors because one day or the other, crises will diminish, international actors will withdraw and then local actors will remain in the arena or in the scene.

It is really true that we heard a lot about impartiality, neutrality, trust and all these elements that really make us support, or not, localization. And this is why I have to shed light here on the issue of due diligence. When a certain local organization has strong due diligence, then I think it is really worth it that these local actors are supported in all aspects of humanitarian funding.

The last point I want to shed light on, and this is where my question will come up from, is COP 28 and climate change. This year's main pillar for COP 28 will be the climate funding. And as GOPA-DERD is also part of the climate working group in Act Alliance, being a member of this alliance, we had great examples this year in an annual meeting that local faith-based organizations are the yeast of society. They are able to have a great impact when it comes to climate interventions.

We in GOPA-DERD benefit 4 million people every year. I know it is not a big number, but it is a really good place to start. My question here would be what does climate funding look like for humanitarian actors or local actors and faith-based organizations in particular?

Chairperson: We are going to finish off the speaker's list because of time constraints. So BRAC UK, over to you.

BRAC UK: Coming from BRAC, you would not be surprised if I give some examples from Bangladesh. And I think if you look at the history of Bangladesh just over 50 years now, it has made remarkable progress in preparing and responding to natural disasters and increasingly the climate disasters that we are experiencing.

In 1971, there was a major cyclone in the country where over 300,000 people died. These days when there is a similar cyclone normally just a handful of people sadly die. And this is because of the investments in early warning systems and also a huge network of cyclone shelters in the country. And there is the capacity in the country largely led by the Government, I might add, to move millions of people when a cyclone is on its way.

And I think we should take some inspiration from the progress that has been made in that country for where we can do things elsewhere. And the example of Bangladesh is an example of locally-led adaptation. And I would like to draw everyone's attention to the eight principles of locally-led adaptation that we are involved in drafting because they are very helpful guidance to that point.



And just to lastly pick up the point about migration again, that HIAS made so powerfully and Oxfam that in Bangladesh, over 2,000 migrants move every day to Dhaka, largely because of being driven by the climate crisis, either growing salinity or small farmers that cannot grow things on their land or floods and so on. Part of the adaptation is to support their settlement in urban areas and to enable that and that is part of our adaptation. So, really reiterate that point that was made there with the practical experience in Bangladesh.

Chairperson: Thank you for those insights in a real case, a live case, which actually I knew quite well over the last few years having worked in the region. Please sir, we are going to finish with you today.

Conseil pour l'Éducation et le Développement (original language French): I am the National Director of COPED, the national Council for Education and Development, an organisation born as an office for development, but in 1989 we became a local NGO. I thank all the people who took the floor before me, notably concerning climate change because they really gave us some elements that help us to understand the problem.

I have lived in Italy for almost 20 years, and then I went back to Burundi, my country, in 2016. And when we talk about climate change, what I noticed is that first of all, in Burundi, the understanding of this problem is really still at a very low level.

And I have seen that when we speak about, for example, waste management and separation, it is used like a slogan, but at the end of the day the population has a really hard time actually adopting this view. We also talk a lot about recycling, again as a slogan, but in fact, we do not recycle that much.

My suggestion is, especially in certain countries, you can do some advocacy, but in the governments there needs to be good, shared knowledge and understanding of this problem because in certain countries, at least in certain African countries, this problem is not yet fully understood and so it has not been really integrated.

We need to have some advocacy for a better understanding of this problem first of all, and I really appreciated all the interventions concerning the importance of local interventions and, in particular, small interventions aimed at efficiency. We need to promote in order to solve this climate problem, we need to have a local approach, a participatory approach. In small interventions, we need to strengthen the capacities so that local and small communities can be implied and they can tackle the problem by themselves.

And the third point is localization, what would be the advantage of localization in front of the big challenge of climate change? Localization could, first of all, help populations actually understand and deal with these problems but we want to give solutions - a problem that many people have not understood yet.

There are many international organizations, and we see right away that they have a desire to actually respond, in a concrete way, to the needs of the beneficiaries but some others seem to be there just to work and just - using words that might not be appropriate - "to use money". But the fact is that sometimes they just content themselves with doing the least they can do.

I insist on localization so that some international organizations can intervene to support and strengthen local organizations so that they can actually implement some projects dealing with climate change.

Chairperson: As everyone is aware, we are at the allotted time mark, and so we are running the risk of unleashing the wrath of Tomson on us. But if he can hold himself at bay for a minute, what we will do is turn back to the panellists and I will go in reverse order, starting with Lucia and then Azmat, Gernot, and Mathew.

And if I could ask the panellists to respond to points you would like to pick up, but also leave one takeaway with us as you effectively are wrapping up. So Lucia, we will start with you.



Ms L. Pande, Secretary General, Tanzania Red Cross Society: I think I have picked one question from this side, I do not know if it is from Catholic Relief Services or somebody else regarding the gap we are having.

To me, I believe one of the biggest gaps we are having is the involvement of the community itself. Most of the time, the decision has been made based on other people's thinking, not involving the community itself. I believe if we concentrate on the community to understand their problems, understand their needs, that would be one of the gaps that is going to be closed.

This is what I take out. But also on taking part, I think a keynote I could take from here is the responsibility of climate does not lie on the hands of local governments, or international agencies or the local community. It is our responsibility. It is a collective responsibility to each and every one of us. So, if we support each other, we work together, that is easy to help the vulnerable communities.

Chairperson: Thank you very much, Lucia for rounding that out. So, over to Azmat.

A. Khan, Chief Executive Officer, Foundation for Rural Development, Pakistan: Responding to a few inputs really interesting and very good questions. Thank you so much for the questions. Your introduction, the World Humanitarian Action, this is a question of climate justice. Yes, you are very right that the polluters are doing certain things and putting it in terms of religion, climate change is a sin which has been committed by the rich, and now the poor are being asked to repent on their behalf, and the poor are being sort of punished for that. Yes, that is a question of climate justice and the world should be asking about those things.

The Muslim Hands intervention on the local community solution. This is really the way out because climate change is not creating impacts of the same nature across the globe. It is quite contextualized and it has very contextualized impacts on local communities. Unless and until we put those communities in the driving seat of the programming and the designing or adaptations, like someone else used the word "maladaptation", many of the adaptations would be maladaptation whatever we do.

Input from Actionaid in putting the women in the decision-making process and in the designing. Those segments of the society, which are the worst hit, have the best solutions, because they want to avoid being faced with the same problem again.

My takeaway from this session is that we do see now climate change is not just an economic discussion, like everyone considers it a reality, and we need to take action. How can we take action is that instead of being loyal to our own frameworks and policies, and the programming designs and the programming cycles, we should become more loyal to the needs of those people who get affected by the climate change. Once we get loyal to the needs of the communities, we will find out ways on how to adjust them within our programmes.

Chairperson: Can I turn to Gernot next and then Mathew.

G. Laganda, Director, Climate and Disaster Risk Reduction Service, WFP: Three quick points, and thank you for making very, very relevant comments, I very much subscribe to all of them.

On the do no harm aspect that our colleague from the CGIAR mentioned. I think this is increasingly important when it comes to climate change adaptation. This is why WFP has environmental and social safeguards, which you will find in field-level agreements. It is really important that we are not contributing to the problem under the guise of adaptation.

And there are examples out there where the wrong types of trees have been planted, where groundwater tables have been lowered, where the excessive borehole drilling has led to a problem for people rather than an adaptive capacity that we want to create. It is basically a



call for all of us to make sure that we have our environmental and social safeguards knowhow up to date, and that we work together on sharing knowledge about this and I think we will also do our part on this.

There was a question raised by the colleague from GOPA-DERD, how does climate finance look like for humanitarian actors? I think a lot of the content here is in the ability to work with different types of financing in partnership. For example, anticipatory action systems. They cannot be built with humanitarian finance, they need to be built on early warning systems. A contingency plan needs to be built with development or climate funds.

WFP, for example, is the only humanitarian organization in the United Nations system accredited with the Green Climate Fund. We mobilized these funds for governments, but then execute through local institutions that are then helping to establish these systems at the local level and we then release prepositioned humanitarian financing once these systems trigger. But it is a question of sequencing and combining different sources of finance.

And the last point, which is probably also my takeaway in response a little bit to our colleague from Muslim Hands and our colleague from Burundi. I think there is already a lot of technical assistance available to governments for nationally determined contributions, capacity strengthening, including through the Warsaw mechanisms, through the UNFCCC. But there are two glaring gaps. The first one is, there is a problem with fiscal space. There is not enough fiscal space for national governments to respond to loss and damage and to climate impacts. And this is, I think, a conversation about debt relief that you will see and you will hear in COP 28 where a lot of IFI reform conversations go in this direction. But debt relief, especially for fragile contexts, needs to be a priority.

And then there is a second, very obvious gap, which is insufficient funding for localized disaster risk reduction. And part of that is because we are not good enough collectively to showcase what works and what has worked and how our localized disaster risk reduction efforts have really reduced humanitarian needs. There is also a measurement problem, a storytelling problem.

And I think this is probably the one ask I have. Let us make sure that we share good examples with each other so that we can collectively then amplify those and make sure these stories are known and are being told.

Chairperson: Mathew.

M. Truscott, Head, Humanitarian Policy and Advocacy, Oxfam: World Humanitarian Action, I absolutely agree. Polluters have to pay. We have to change the system. I think we have seen this week in the votes in the Security Council how damaged the system is. In Oxfam we talk about turning the system on its head. And I think that is what we have to do. When we talk about this Green Bargain it has to be about shifting that power and calling for climate justice.

To Actionaid, I, absolutely agree with your point. I think that is one of the key reasons that whenever I talk about this, I use that example about how we get that finance to a woman in the village who is able to do those projects because we know that is where the work gets done. And we know that is one of the challenges facing us. And if we cannot do that as a financing system, we are failing. I think that is absolutely key.

And then maybe my final point is a takeaway and very much agreeing with BRAC, I think as humanitarians, we follow the bad news because that is where we tend to go next. We do not look at what we have done well, and that is what we need to be looking at here. I think we have got some good examples from Bangladesh. I think we have got good examples from all across the world of small projects, which have stopped erosion, which have reforested, which have re-greened.



The explosion of solar power is absolutely extraordinary. The way that we are using that now in all of our water and WASH infrastructure. There is a lot of good news here, and I think the thing we need to be taking forward into COP and other discussions is that this is not hopeless.

The deadlock mechanisms are taking time, but there are ways of doing this. There are ways of succeeding, and we need to come with that hope. We need to bring those stories and saying it is going to be difficult. It is a challenge, the likes of which we have never faced, but we can overcome it if we do it properly and if we do it quickly, and if we use the lessons, a lot of which we have learned, not as well as we would like to have, but a lot of which we have learned. That is my message. We can do this. Let us get it moving as quickly as possible.

Chairperson: I am just going to take a couple of seconds just to first of all, report back to you that there were online postings. We did not detect any questions that were not being covered by your interventions here. We think that we did cover that conversation. I think we do deserve this aperitivo that is coming because we took advantage of an hour and a half and really packed it in in terms of interventions. Excellent interventions and responses from the panellists.

Just the bottom line is that I think we have accomplished the awareness raising that COP is going to be pretty pivotal to that and offer a lot of possibilities and potentials that we need to rally around, but really get more joined up, better coordinated at different levels on the advocacy side of things, but also being vigilant that somehow this will not undermine or derail or take us away from some of the Grand Bargain and other values we have been promoting.

Also making sure that it stays focused on localization, local solutions and so on. But it will be a new environment post-COP potentially where we will have a more hyper nexus environment that we might be dealing with, humanitarian development and now the climate community all arriving with everything that comes with it into these fragile settings as well.

A complicated period coming up. We will want to stay joined up. And what we did today was intensify the start of a dialogue, which we will want to maintain now going to COP and taking action thereafter. Hopelessness was mentioned. I think we are far from that. I think Mathew helped us stay away from that. There are local solutions out there. There are a lot of them. And we have to find ways of finding those, promoting those, replicating those, developing those.

There is plenty of money around if it is all managed well. But we have to stay vigilant again in terms of double counting and so on and really holding those that have those funds accountable for achieving what they are designing and hopefully agreeing to in COP.

Tomson, I will abbreviate there. I could have said much more, but I think, I just want to thank everyone for all your interventions, your engagement. We will all be available to join you outside. And WFP more specifically is available to talk to you about COP preparations and then we will be part of a humanitarian hub and a food systems and agricultural pavilion. And those will be places we can rally during COP to advance our advocacy and our discussions.

With that, thank you and a big thank you to Tomson for being so patient for giving us a bit of extra time. Thank you so much.

T. Phiri, Spokesperson for Southern Africa Regional Bureau, WFP: Fantastic. How was that panel? Let us put our hands together for the panel. David Kaatrud, Gernot Laganda, Mathew Truscott, Lucia Pande, Azmat Khan, fantastic work. Thank you so much for that.



I know I stand between you now and your aperitivo but it is very important that I tell you that tomorrow is a very light day. Coffee and tea will be served at 9:00 and then we do have a group photo at 9:45. And the first session will start at 10:00.

The second day is always lighter. The layout of this room will be slightly different for the first session tomorrow, as we have invited members of WFP's Executive Board but our messengers will guide you to your seats as you come through. And in line with Executive Board sessions, in addition to French for tomorrow, we will also have interpretation in Spanish and Arabic.

Now you are all invited to the welcome reception in the Peace Garden, which is where we had our coffee and lunch. Thank you for today and see you tomorrow.

