



Report of the 2021 Global Assembly on the Climate and Ecological Crisis

Giving everyone a seat at the global governance table

November 2022



“

Last month, I launched Our Common Agenda, a roadmap to begin rebuilding our world and mending trust. The Global Citizens' Assembly for COP26 is a practical way of showing how we can accelerate action through solidarity and people power. You are helping to send the message loud and clear: people everywhere want bold, ambitious climate action, and now is the moment for national leaders to stand and deliver.”

António Guterres, Secretary-General of the United Nations,
October 2021

This report contains details on the methodology and outcomes of the first ever global citizens' assembly on the climate and ecological crisis, which was run to coincide with COP26 in late 2021. For a more succinct, high level overview, please see the Executive Summary, also available at www.globalassembly.org.

This report was written and edited by the following members of the Global Assembly Core Delivery Team and partner organizations:

Susan Nakyung Lee and John M Stormonth-Darling (co-leads).

Granaz Baloch, Yago Bermejo Abati, Flynn Devine, Eva Sow Ebion, Islam Elbeiti, Brett Henning, Marius Kamugisha, Jamie Kelsey-Fry, Claire Mellier, Jon Stever, Remco van der Stoep, Sarah Whitley, Rich Wilson, Fatima Zamba.

Copy editing by Natalie Marchant.

Design and layout by [Honest Studio](#).

This report can be cited as:

Global Assembly Team (2022), *Report of the 2021 Global Assembly on the Climate and Ecological Crisis*, Earth. Available at <http://globalassembly.org>

© Copyright Global Assembly 2022

Deliberativa (Spain), Innovation for Policy Foundation (pan-African), Iswe Foundation (UK), Rax Consultancy (UK), Centre for Environment Education (India), Community Organisers (UK), Delibera (Brazil), G1000.nu (Netherlands), iDeemos (Colombia), MSU-Iligan Institute of Technology Center for Local Governance Studies (Philippines), Mohammed VI Polytechnic University School of Collective Intelligence (Morocco), Shimmer SDG Hub (China), and UDaan (Pakistan).

Contents

Forewords	06		
Chair of the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee	07		
Chair of the Global Governance and Participation Advisory Committee	09		
People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth	11		
Glossary of terms	20		
01. Introduction	24		
Giving everyone a seat at the global governance table	25		
Introducing the Global Assembly	26		
– What is a citizens' assembly and why do we need it at a global scale?	26		
– The Global Assembly logo	28		
– Theory of Change	29		
– Team	35		
– Governance	36		
Evaluation and learning	40		
02. Core Assembly	41		
Members of the Global Assembly 2021 Core Assembly	42		
Introduction	44		
Building the Core Assembly	48		
– Preparation: defining Assembly Member demographic criteria	50		
– Step 1: Global location lottery	53		
– Step 2: Building a global, decentralized team	57		
– Step 3: Decentralized recruitment of Community Hosts	63		
– Step 4: Recruitment of potential Assembly Members by Community Hosts	70		
– Step 5: Choosing the final Assembly Members	73		
– Decentralization overview and conclusion	76		
Designing the Core Assembly	77		
– Governance	77		
– Trialing the process: Deliberative Labs	77		
– Learning materials	82		
– Translation	97		
– Hosting participation in online deliberations	97		
– Meeting schedule and logistics	100		
– Mediums and platforms	102		
– Co-Creation Method	102		
– Voting method	104		
– Implementation roles during the Core Assembly	105		
– Putting it all together: delivering the deliberations	119		
– A week in the Core Assembly	120		
The journey of the Core Assembly	122		
– Block 1 Understanding the current situation	123		
– Block 2 Reviewing scenarios, pathways and principles	124		
– Block 3 Developing submissions to COP26	126		
– Block 4 Participation and observation at COP26	128		
– Block 5 Review commitments and future agenda setting	130		
– Assembly Members' perceptions on the climate and ecological crisis	133		
– Activation and engagement	139		
Evaluation of the process	151		
– Headline reflections from the Core Delivery Team	168		

03. Community Assemblies	179	05. Finance	241
Introduction	181	Raising funds	242
– Why Community Assemblies?	181	Managing the funds	242
– Scope of the 2021 Community Assemblies	182	Reflections and future outlook	244
Developing the Community Assembly Toolkit	183	– What went well	244
– Design approaches	184	– What didn't go well	244
Outreach method	188	06. Conclusions and future outlook	245
Data Collection	189	Giving everyone a seat at the global governance table	246
2021 Community Assemblies highlights	195	– Key conclusions	246
– Expressing hopes and fears	195	2021 impact: revisiting the Theory of Change	247
– Transnational events	197	– New governance model	247
– Alignment with community initiatives	199	– Institutional actions	247
– Art and culture campaigns	201	– Citizens' actions	248
– Outcomes of the Community Assemblies	203	2022 and beyond	249
– Quantitative learnings	206	07. Acknowledgements	250
Learnings from the Community Assembly team	213	Special thanks	251
– Successes	213	Global Assembly organizational roster	252
– Areas for improvement	214	– Core Delivery Team	252
04. Communications and Cultural Wave	216	– Hosting Circle	258
Introduction	217	– Decentralization Circle	261
Communications	219	References	272
– Press and media coverage	221		
– Events	225		
– Core Assembly delivery support	231		
– Cultural Wave	231		
Learnings and reflections	237		
– Decentralization of Communications work	237		
– Finding the stories that resonate	239		

Forewords

Foreword by the Chair of the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee

My whole career, since I was 30, has been chairing national and international science assessments, presenting the findings to governments around the world, and being a scientific advisor to US and UK government agencies, as well as the World Bank.

In these roles, I have interacted with the world's very best scientists and had the pleasure of interacting with senior policymakers in governments across the world.

The scientific assessments have addressed issues including stratospheric ozone depletion, climate change, loss of biodiversity and degradation of ecosystem services, and unsustainable agriculture. These assessments evaluated the state of the environment, the underlying drivers of change, the impacts of environmental change on human well-being, and options to limit and adapt to environmental degradation, through policies, technologies, and behavior change.

Governments around the world use these national and international assessments to set national and global policies, acknowledging the differential impacts of environmental change on human well-being, and the differential effects of policies on different societies, depending on the socioeconomic-political situation.

Experts from all stakeholder groups are involved in producing these assessments and, while governments set national and international policies, the private sector and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have input.

But the average citizen has no voice. Therefore, when I was approached to chair the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee, I recognized that it was an opportunity to contribute to a process that would allow citizens around the world to have a voice on the critical issues of climate change and the destruction of nature.

The idea of a global citizens' assembly was, in my opinion, long overdue. Governments and the private sector around the world could listen to the concerns and aspirations of a wide range of citizens, from different countries, with different socioeconomic backgrounds, and educational levels.

The role of the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee was to develop an unbiased paper based on the best available information on the state of climate change, the impacts of climate change on socioeconomic sectors,

human health, and nature, and potential response options, such as options to adapt to climate change and options to limit it. We had to ensure our paper was not an advocacy document forwarding our personal views on the need to address climate change. Rather, it had to present the full range of facts to the members of the Global Assembly without using scientific jargon, so they understood how climate change could impact each and every one of them, and how policies and technologies that might be developed by governments would also impact them.

In my opinion, we need global citizens' assemblies, complemented by national citizens' assemblies, for each of the big challenges facing the world today, including climate change, loss of biodiversity, and pollution. These are not just environmental issues, they are development, economic, security, social, moral, and ethical issues, affecting current and future generations all around the world. Citizens' assemblies can let governments and the private sector know how they view these issues and how they should be addressed.

Professor Robert T. Watson

Former Chair of IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) and IPBES (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services)

Foreword by the Chair of the Global Governance and Participation Advisory Committee

Imagining better futures is a daunting task. Often, our aspirations are interrupted by our own fears and insecurities. We remember every moment of failure and are immobilized by the prospect of failing again. What if our plans do not succeed? What if our hopes are little more than wishful thinking? What if the people — whose support we count on to succeed — believe our goals unworthy of pursuing?

The Global Assembly on the Climate and Ecological Crisis is a reminder that ambitious political projects can be pursued amidst constraints. The Assembly took place during a global pandemic, a few months before the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change declared that only “drastic cuts in greenhouse gas emissions” would prevent an environmental disaster. It is easy to reduce this undertaking as too late and too futile, but the problem is far too urgent to dismiss, one we simply cannot afford to leave in the hands of experts and world leaders.

The idea of a global citizens’ assembly is not new. Political theorists have long made a case for a citizens’ assembly to be a permanent feature of global governance, whether it is on the topic of global poverty, mass migration, or genome editing. They argue that citizen-led deliberations on a global scale can offer pathways for meaningful international cooperation, perhaps even better than supra-national institutions. The argument goes that citizens are less beholden to domestic special interests. They are better equipped to reflect on expert evidence, listen across differences, and offer views based on lived experience.

It took more than ten years before this vision came to life. On October 7, 2021, the first session of the Global Assembly, one hundred people from randomly selected points on the world map came together to answer one question: “How can humanity address the climate and ecological crisis in a fair and effective way?”

I have been involved in the Global Assembly as chair of the Global Governance and Participation Advisory Committee. In this role, I had the pleasure of discussing with colleagues from the academe and the development sector the various ways the Global Assembly can enforce norms of inclusion and reasoned discussion. I heard organizers ask difficult questions on design and implementation. I witnessed Assembly Members scrutinizing expert evidence, working with translators to listen to the voices of their peers across the world. I watched their assured reading of the People’s Declaration for the Sustainable

Future of Planet Earth in COP26. The nuts and bolts of organizing the Assembly, and the lessons learned in this undertaking, are all documented in this report.

Readers may have downloaded this report because they are interested in citizens' assemblies and climate governance, or they may have just been curious about ways of doing politics differently. I invite readers to appreciate this report not as a template for citizen engagement, or an uncritical celebration of a landmark event in the field of democratic innovations, but as a story of democratic possibility amidst structural constraints. The Global Assembly is a proof of concept, but one that will evolve over the years, as lessons are learned from the world's first global citizen deliberation.

Professor Nicole Curato

Professor of Political Sociology, Centre for Deliberative Democracy
and Global Governance, University of Canberra

People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth

Crafted by Members of the Global Assembly's Core Assembly and presented to the world at COP26. Then refined and passed by those Members in a clause-by-clause majority vote on December 18, 2021.

Preamble

The Global Assembly is a first of its kind in the world, conceived to raise community voices at global level for the sustainable future of planet Earth.

We, Global Assembly Members, have been selected by a lottery process to represent the interests of the citizens.

The purpose of the People's Declaration is to deliver a flourishing Earth for all humans and other species, for all future generations.

By uniting and rallying citizens in recognizing the needs of all, we can build consensus to generate community-level solutions and become decision-makers.

In recognizing world leaders and decision-makers as our main audience, responsible for making high-level decisions on the climate crisis, we will demand climate action using a strategic plan to achieve an equitable and sustainable solution to the climate crisis.

Every human, regardless of background, should have a voice.

We call upon corporations, everyone who pollutes the Earth, the private sector, and investors to be recognized as audiences of the People's Declaration, in order to hold them accountable for finding solutions to and implementing legal measures on the climate crisis.



01

The Paris Agreement is humanity's best chance; it must be affirmed and enforced by all governments and people, and rigorously monitored in collaboration with citizens and grassroots mechanisms.

- (1i)** Countries, governments, and people worldwide must make every effort to reduce global emissions drastically and limit global warming to 1.5°C in accordance with the Paris Agreement.
- (1ii)** We believe that the Paris Agreement is humanity's best chance to avoid dangerous climate change. Parties to the Agreement have to adopt immediate measures for transitioning to a sustainable low-carbon economy. These measures include shifting financial support from fossil fuels to clean energy, improving energy efficiency, introducing carbon taxes, and tackling issues of overpopulation and overconsumption.
- (1iii)** In addition, parties have to support adaptation measures, especially by empowering vulnerable communities who will be worst affected by climate change.
- (1iv)** The Agreement has to be enforced and monitored by the United Nations, informed by science, within the framework of international regulatory law, and in collaboration with the relevant actors at all levels of governance, mass media and civil society. Breaches should be reported, resulting in financial penalties and sanctions for perpetrators.
- (1v)** Within enforcement, citizen monitoring shall be implemented with the support of grassroot mechanisms, such as Community Assemblies, and NGOs, with support from social media, private companies and local governments. Citizens' privacy must be safeguarded within these mechanisms.



02

Equity must be a core focus when meeting the goals in the Paris Agreement; spreading responsibility according to the capabilities and historical contributions of countries and corporations is vital.

- (2i)** Strategies to meet Paris Agreement goals must be implemented in accordance with equity and global justice, acknowledging different starting points without leaving anyone behind.
- (2ii)** At the global scale, equity requires common but differentiated responsibilities. All countries have the common responsibility to fight climate change together in a spirit of solidarity. Each country must strive to implement the Paris Agreement to the best of its capabilities. Countries and corporations must assume differentiated responsibilities proportional to their historical and current emissions. This means top emitters must lead the fight against climate change.
- (2iii)** Countries with high standards of living and strong financial capability should assist countries needing support in building up autonomous capabilities for climate action, particularly in financial and technological terms. Institutional mechanisms should be established at all levels of governance to ensure effective and targeted use of assistance, in cooperation with civil society.
- (2iv)** At the national scale, equity requires that governments safeguard the livelihoods of all segments of society, particularly those of the disadvantaged groups.
- (2v)** Financial responsibility and consequences should be shared proportionally by countries and organizations that have benefited from nature, and large corporations must support the enforcement of the future use of natural resources. This responsibility must be implemented by all, and can be applied as an incentive or as a penalty depending on different countries' wealth.



03

Actions on the climate crisis must be participatory, enabling people at all levels to contribute to decisions on climate, particularly groups from countries least historically responsible for and most affected by the climate crisis.

- (3i)** The way decisions are made around climate change at the global level today is not democratic or fair enough. Powerful countries and large corporations have disproportionate influence over the process to the detriment of others.
- (3ii)** It is the legitimate right of people to participate in decisions which impact their lives. Citizen participation mechanisms such as citizens' assemblies must be expanded and made an integral part of climate decision-making at the global level, as well as the regional, national, and local levels. We, the Global Assembly, are a living example that citizens from all around the world, representing all the diversity of humanity, can come together around an important issue such as climate change and make a meaningful contribution through their collective wisdom.
- (3iii)** The voices of the most affected people and areas have to be given more space in climate decision-making, including those of countries least responsible for and most affected by the climate crisis, disadvantaged social groups, indigenous peoples, women and children, and small-scale farmers.
- (3iv)** Fairness, inclusion, and participation will lay the ground for effective and equitable climate policies.



04

The right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment must be included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and protected at multiple levels of law; we should raise awareness and citizen engagement on human rights in relation to climate and the environment.

- (4i)** We uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) which establishes our equal basic rights as human beings. It is a shame that after more than 70 years since the adoption of the UDHR, there are still gross human rights violations in many parts of the world. We must now take concrete steps to honor these fundamental rights.
- (4ii)** Climate change and ecological crisis undermine human rights as they lead to food insecurity, displacement, poverty, war, and disease. Basic rights of present and future generations depend upon a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment. This has to be recognized by including a right to clean environment in the UDHR.
- (4iii)** Once in the UDHR, this right must also be enacted in international human rights law and be strictly enforced and monitored by organizations recognized at the international level (i.e. NGOs) and by participatory forums such as Community Assemblies.
- (4iv)** Countries must enact this right into their national, regional, and municipal laws and report regularly and in a standardized way on its enforcement to the relevant bodies at all levels of governance, based on fairness, transparency, and efficiency.
- (4v)** To raise awareness on human rights and the human values which bolster these rights, governments must promote education and community engagement for all.



05

This Declaration is grounded in the importance of Nature having intrinsic values and rights, and in all beings on Earth forming an interconnected whole; we must protect Nature from Ecocide legally, engaging communities and establishing multiple governing bodies to enable this.

- (5i)** We acknowledge that Nature has intrinsic value and rights, as stated in the Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth. The rights of Nature are inextricably linked with the rights of humans, they should be interpreted and applied harmoniously.
- (5ii)** All beings on Earth form an interconnected whole, each of them playing an essential role in sustaining ecosystems. We humans must remember that we are part of Nature. We must learn to coexist with other components of Nature and to approach them with care and respect. We must change our ways of life to protect the right to life and the right to exist of Nature with all its diversity.
- (5iii)** Ecocide has to be codified as a crime in the international and national laws, applicable to governments and corporations. It has to be firmly enforced alongside existing environmental protection laws.
- (5iv)** To raise awareness on Ecocide and the rights of nature, governments must promote education to all and large scale community engagement.



06

Education on climate change must be formally integrated, within the school syllabus and in governmental communications, and also informally disseminated through more accessible platforms, like social media, to reach as many as possible.

- (6i)** Formal and informal education on climate change must be urgently prioritized, to foster citizen participation and inclusion from all age groups, or those without access to the education system and universal awareness mediums.
- (6ii)** Inequality of any form or nature must be recognized as a contributing factor to lack of information and action on the climate crisis.
- (6iii)** Education on the climate crisis and biodiversity should be approached through tackling media misinformation, reaching those who cannot access mainstream media, and promoting critical thinking to younger generations.
- (6iv)** Media companies, including social media, must take responsibility to encourage action on the climate and ecological crisis through positive influence and tackling misinformation by presenting expert opinions.
- (6v)** Climate environmental education, as a duty of governments, should be a subject in the schools syllabus and in informal education from an early age.
- (6vi)** Governments should introduce warnings on products that have high ecological footprints and enforce environmental protection regulations by law.
- (6vii)** Citizens must join together in recognition that we have the power to change minds and take action. The Global Assembly encourages all members to share videos and stories with the world in an effort to motivate change as well as to educate, and we encourage other community organizations to do the same.



07

To ensure a fair and just energy transition, we must ensure that countries and people with less means are supported through a gradual change, and recognize the shared responsibility between citizens, governments, and corporations in enabling it.

- (7i)** The transfer of wealth from countries with historical responsibility for the climate crisis to countries least responsible for the climate crisis in the implementation of the energy transition is fundamental to build equitable conditions for development. This should be implemented within a reasonable timeframe, and this must be legally enforced with clear responsibilities to ensure monitoring.
- (7ii)** We must cooperate globally to minimize disruption to major industries in the event of an energy crisis. This should include ensuring multiple sources of energy available to communities in need, sufficient funds, and a continuous energy supply to countries that may otherwise face rationing.
- (7iii)** We appreciate that the energy transition will have huge implications for livelihoods, such as jobs transformations, therefore there must be a gradual energy transition, to allow for a shift to new career paths.
- (7iv)** We should encourage information sharing by institutions and individuals on the energy transition, through channels available to everyone, to form new habits around energy use which will help preserve the environment.
- (7v)** We call for shared responsibility for the energy transition, to enable equitable consumption for healthy living and minimal damage to the environment, recognizing the need for governmental, corporate, and industrial responsibility alongside the behavioral change of citizens as the consumers of energy.
- (7vi)** We should assign clear primary responsibility to the parties most strongly implicated in the energy transition, such as fossil fuel corporations, and make damaging the environment a legal matter that is enforceable.

Glossary of terms used in this report

Assembly Member

A participant of the Global Assembly's Core Assembly selected by global civic lottery. Their role was to deliberate with their peers on the framing question and co-produce recommendations, primarily in the form of the People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth. They represented only themselves, but collectively approximated a descriptive sample of the global human population in terms of geography, age, gender, education, and attitudes about climate change.

**Breakout Facilitator
(often referred to as Facilitator)**

A convenor of Breakout Group discussions. An experienced facilitation professional whose skills lie in their ability to lead, but not influence, constructive deliberations between Assembly Members, ensuring that all voices and perspectives are heard and respected equally.

Breakout Group

A group of between four and six Assembly Members, accompanied by their Community Hosts and/or translators, who shared a convenient time window within which to engage in regular deliberations. Each group was supported by a regular Breakout Facilitator and Notetaker. The majority of deliberation sessions took place in the Breakout Group setting. Even during Plenary Sessions much of the time was spent in these Breakout Groups, although sometimes their composition was rearranged to promote cross-pollination of ideas and diversity of thought.

Citizens' assembly

A group of citizens who come together to learn, deliberate, and make recommendations on a certain issue. These citizens are selected by civic lottery such that they form a descriptive sample of a given population by criteria such as age, income, geography, political views, etc. A citizens' assembly is a form of deliberative mini-public.

Cluster

A sub-group of Community Hosts and their Assembly Members grouped together for administrative purposes by virtue of a common language or longitude range. Each Cluster was administered by a Cluster Facilitator.

Cluster Facilitator

A civil society organization and/or research center and its staff/representatives who administered a Cluster. They provided a layer of managerial decentralization, distributing leadership across the Global Assembly, as well as reducing the administrative burden on the Central Circle.

Central Circle

A group of 10 individuals representing the founding organizations of the Global Assembly responsible for its high level strategy, development, and administration.

Core Delivery Team

A group of individuals consisting of members of the Central Circle and others who were responsible for the practical execution of the Global Assembly.

Community Host

A community organization and its staff/representatives who were based near one of the points selected by the global location lottery. They performed the following roles: recruitment of potential Assembly Members for the Core Assembly, contextualization and translation of information materials, promotion of the Global Assembly, enabling participation of Assembly Members (including transportation, internet connectivity and computer access, live translation during sessions or provision thereof, technical support, payment). While often present during deliberations, they served only as a conduit for Assembly Member participation and were instructed not to influence them in any way.

COP and COP26

The term 'COP' refers to a 'conference of the parties' which is the governing body of an international convention; a written agreement between actors accountable to international law.

These actors are often nation states. Examples of conventions with a COP include the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. COP26 was the 26th annual COP of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and was significant because it was attended by world leaders, something which only happens at every fifth COP. It also marked the fifth COP since the 2015 Paris Agreement (devised at COP21) and thus was a key moment to assess the progress on the milestones decided at that meeting.

Civic lottery

A lottery-based method of selecting citizens using a modern type of sortition which incorporates stratification to ensure that the cohort of participants selected is representative of the broader community, according to key demographic criteria.

Deliberative mini-public

A broad term for deliberative democracy processes in which a subset of a population engage in informed, reasoned and open deliberation on issues. A citizens' assembly is a type of deliberative mini-public.

Docking

Analogous to the intricate task of connecting the entrances of two spacecraft, docking in the context of the Global Assembly describes the process of interfacing in a compatible way with existing institutional structures.

Editor

An individual responsible for collating the outputs from Breakout Group discussions, in order for them to be evaluated by all Assembly Members at a later date.

Global Support Team

A subset of the Core Delivery Team which was devoted to the practical implementation of the Core Assembly, primarily through the steering of the Hosting Circle and troubleshooting any real-time issues with attendance or participation.

Plenary Co-Facilitator

An individual who served as the host of Plenary Sessions. This role was shared between two people during the Core Assembly.

Plenary Session

A session of the Core Assembly in which all Assembly Members were present at the same time. These occurred on Saturdays at 12pm UTC, a time window calculated to be the most convenient across the diversity of participants' time zones.

Process Team

A subset of the Governance and Process Design Circle responsible for translating the high-level process into Session Plans in time for Core Assembly Breakout and Plenary Sessions.

Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)

Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) are non-binding commitments to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions developed by individual countries or groups of countries.

Notetaker

An individual responsible for documenting the written record of Assembly Members' deliberations. They were also responsible for preparing translated online learning materials for their Breakout Group before sessions and transferring key outputs to a format accessible to Editors after sessions. They also provided technical support to the Breakout Group and general assistance to Breakout Facilitators when required.

Sortition

An umbrella term describing any mechanism to select participants who are demographically representative of a community.

Coordinated Universal Time (UTC)

Coordinated Universal Time (UTC) is the primary time standard by which the world regulates clocks. For most applications it is interchangeable with Greenwich Mean Time (GMT).

A note about quotations

This report contains many quotes from Assembly Members and members of the Global Assembly team and wider community. Some of these could not be attributed to an individual because they came from surveys which were anonymized before analysis, or because the individual chose to remain anonymous.

Introduction

01

Giving everyone a seat at the global governance table

In 2021, the world's first global citizens' assembly took place in the lead up to COP26. Central to the Global Assembly (GA) was the assumption that it will take a combination of action by power holders (political, business, media and others), and a groundswell of citizen activation to drive the necessary action on major global issues, such as the climate and ecological crisis. This project was initiated in the hope that the Global Assembly, or something like it, will become a permanent piece of global governance infrastructure that gives everyone a seat at the decision-making table.

The Global Assembly consisted of three components:

1. **The Core Assembly:** 100 people selected by global civic lottery (or 'sortition'), representing a snapshot of the world's population. They collectively produced the People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth.
2. **Community Assemblies:** Self-organized events that could be run by anyone anywhere, using the same learning materials as the Core Assembly, and guided by a 'do-it-yourself' Toolkit.
3. **The Cultural Wave:** An invitation to artists and creators to develop work that expressed the idea of the Global Assembly and the climate and ecological crisis in a way that would reach people through popular culture.

Each component responded to the framing question: **"How can humanity address the climate and ecological crisis in a fair and effective way?"**

The climate and ecological crisis was chosen as the first topic of the Global Assembly for three reasons:

- There was widespread bottom-up demand coming from civil society for a global citizens' assembly on the climate and ecological crisis^a
- It is a well-known, pressing issue which affects everyone on Earth and has proven difficult for existing global governance structures to address adequately
- An opportunity existed in 2021 to engage in its most prominent decision-making forum, the United Nations' COP26

Footnote

a. The most prominent global-scale civil society organization calling for citizens' assemblies on climate change is [Extinction Rebellion](#) who do so specifically in their third of three headline demands. Also indicative of widespread demand is [Leaders for Global Assemblies](#), a coalition of leaders in the fields of economics, business, finance, activism, broadcasting, academia and politics, advocating for global citizens' assemblies.

This report is the story of what happened in 2021 for COP26. Generally, the primary purpose of citizens' assembly reports is to communicate policy recommendations produced by participants. This report focuses on sharing methodology and learnings due to the unprecedented nature of a global citizens' assembly. We, the authors, hope that the findings in this report can support other practitioners to replicate and improve upon the model, in addition to influencing global policy on the climate and ecological crisis.

Introducing the Global Assembly

What is a citizens' assembly and why do we need it at a global scale?

Over recent decades there has been an increasing number of deliberative forums (e.g. citizens' juries, summits and assemblies) in which a subset of a population come together to learn, deliberate and make recommendations on a certain issue. These have usually happened at the local or national level. Characteristics which make a citizens' assembly^[1] distinct from other public meetings (i.e. townhalls, community council meetings) include:

- They are **demographically descriptive** of a population by criteria such as age, income, geography, and political views;
- **Members are selected by lottery**, so that as far as is possible any person from the target population has an equal chance of being selected^[2]
- They provide **significant time for high-quality, in-depth deliberation**, especially between people with **different views and backgrounds**
- The provision of information materials and witness testimonies that seek to be **accurate, accessible and balanced** to support meaningful and informed deliberation
- **The support of participants** through financial compensation and provision of support such as childcare and digital access to ensure the process is as **inclusive as possible**

The climate citizens' assembly movement^[3] has grown strongly in recent years in response to traditional governance mechanisms struggling to generate effective solutions to the climate crisis in five primary ways:

1. Policy is incommensurate with the scale of the crisis
2. Policy fails to prioritize local or global justice
3. Citizens are neither included nor activated as critical partners
4. Policy proposals are generated in ways which seed and foster division; meaning that lowest common denominator responses to adaptation and mitigation are generated
5. Even when policy is made, there is a growing gap between policy and implementation

There is now strong evidence^[4-9] that climate citizens' assemblies, when run well, can generate ambitious and just policy; activate citizens; overcome polarization; and create informed public debate. But it goes beyond climate, and if the Covid-19 pandemic has taught us one thing it is that we are interconnected. Everyday people are essential actors in finding solutions to the many crises we face, be it hunger, inequality, forced migration, pandemics, or environmental governance.


As the February 2022 IPCC Working Group II report on "Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability" finds, 'enabling conditions' for climate action include: "Inclusive governance that prioritises equity and justice in adaptation planning and implementation leads to more effective and sustainable adaptation outcomes."^[10, p.32] A global citizens' assembly could be an institution which fulfills this call for inclusive governance.

A **global** citizens' assembly is needed for five primary reasons:

- To build **solidarity and understanding** between people globally, because when people understand one another they make decisions that are less polarizing and better for everyone
- To invite citizens to **take action**; we all have a critical role to play in addressing the crises we face and too often this potential is untapped by formal top-down governance models
- To support leaders to take better **decisions**; citizens very often make recommendations that are more ambitious than politicians' decisions
- Many of the challenges we face are inherently global and so we need collective **global governance** mechanisms to address them
- To give everyone on Earth a way of **participating** in decision-making around issues which affect us all

The UN is a forum for nation states, the World Economic Forum exists for business, but there is no permanent body that exists for citizens. The Global Assembly hopes to further the cause of ensuring that citizens play a more direct role in global governance; either through providing the infrastructure to do it, or inspiring others to work more closely with citizens.

The Global Assembly logo



Akoma Ntoso is a Ghanaian Adinkra symbol directly translated as “linked hearts.” *Akoma Ntoso* symbolizes the deep understanding, agreement, and harmony possible when we communicate from the heart. It also represents unity; that all people are connected.

It was chosen as the logo in the hope that the Global Assembly creates heart-to-heart relationships between people across the world; as when we connect at the level of our real hopes and fears, strong relationships and new possibilities emerge. The decision was inspired by dialogues held in early 2020 with **VAZOBA Afrika and Friends Networking Open Forum**, a West African heritage organization based in Accra, Ghana.

Theory of Change

The Global Assembly wasn't just the world's first global citizens' assembly. It was also an attempt to build on the existing citizens' assembly model, drawing on learnings^[4, 7, 11] from other deliberative processes, and scale it to the global stage.

Adapting the citizens' assembly format for global governance

Global governance is not like local or national governance. There is nobody in charge in the same way that presidents are in charge of countries or mayors in charge of cities. Instead there is an ecosystem of institutions such as the UN, World Economic Forum, World Bank, International Monetary Fund and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); nation states; conferences, such as the climate and biodiversity Conference of the Parties (COP); mechanisms such as the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) which measure nation state contributions to combating climate change; and much more besides.

At nation state level, the convention is for a citizens' assembly to have a mandate from a politician (e.g. President Emmanuel Macron for the *Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat* in France) or a political body (e.g. the UK Parliament in the case of Climate Assembly UK) that prompts a question for deliberation, then decides how they will respond to the citizens' recommendations. That is, most citizens' assemblies are top-down; initiated by governments to listen to the people of their nation. This is the opposite.

The Global Assembly was co-designed with institutions, scientists, citizens, and social movements from around the world and built entirely from the ground-up. Initiated from within civil society in this way, it was 'docked' into formal COP governance arrangements with the guidance of representatives from the following institutions: the UN, the UNFCCC, COP26 host government (the UK), COP Champions Network, and the Scottish Government. Individual supporting statements were given by António Guterres, the UN Secretary General; Alok Sharma, COP26 President; Nigel Topping, High Level Champion for Climate Action COP26; and others (see Appendix 1.5).

Strategy


Based on the framing question "**How can humanity address the climate and ecological crisis in a fair and effective way?**", a Theory of Change was developed using the Aspen Institute model.^[12] For more information see Annex 1.4.

The ultimate outcome — to address the climate and ecological crisis in a fair and effective way — is supported by the following three sub-outcomes and associated assumptions.

Sub-outcomes	Institutional actions	Citizens' actions	New governance model
Three routes to impact	Governments and businesses taking actions (e.g. reducing use of fossil fuels) to address the climate and ecological crisis.	People (especially those touched by the Global Assembly) being activated to take actions (e.g. change their lifestyle or campaign) to address the climate and ecological crisis.	Through running the Global Assembly we are demonstrating that alternative ways of making decisions exist, and that these may help us address the climate and ecological crisis.
Key assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Some institutions will take the Global Assembly seriously – We will need to target multiple power holders to maximize impact – Institutions will not act on recommendations without external pressure – Citizens will support ambitious pro-climate action – There is a policy impact gap: many nations are struggling to deliver on their climate policy commitments, so pressure and support is needed for nation states to turn policy into impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – By going through the process, the self and/or collective efficacy of the Assembly Members will be increased – Assembly Members and others 'touched' by the process will be able to translate their motivation to act into practical actions – Citizens hold substantial power and needed to be treated as important 'power holders' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There is a growing recognition of the need to improve global governance – Institutions (e.g. World Bank, nation states) want to get involved
Activities* (decentralized)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National advocacy; ensuring national COP delegates are aware of the Global Assembly Declaration and the Assembly Member from their country – National press work; ensuring national press is aware of the Global Assembly Declaration and the Assembly Member from their country 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Offering Assembly Members (Core and Community) 'scaffolding' and 'enabling language' to cultivate their self and collective efficacy (see "Implementation roles during the Core Assembly", p105 "Evaluation of the Process", p151) – Supporting Assembly Members (Core and Community) to leave the Assembly with a personal action plan (see "Activation and engagement", p139) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Involving the Global Assembly network in the project design (see "Governance", p36 "Deliberative Labs", p77; "Building the Core Assembly", p48) – Raising the profile of the need for governance reform through national advocacy and press work – Liaising with national stakeholders to explain the need for global governance innovation
Activities* (centralized)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support of the Assembly Members, Community Hosts, and delivery partners to take forward national press and advocacy – Centralized press and advocacy work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Supporting Facilitators and Community Hosts to proactively cultivate Assembly Members' self and collective efficacy (see "Implementation roles during the Core Assembly", p105) – Designing the Assembly process to proactively cultivate Assembly Members' self and collective efficacy (see "Designing the Core Assembly", p77) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Raising the profile of the need for governance reform through core advocacy and press work – Liaising with key stakeholders to explain the need for global governance innovation (see "Institutional Advisory Group", p39)

Note: * listed activities are notable additions to running the primary components of the Global Assembly. These are ideal activities and were not always possible or desirable in 2021. Sections of the report describing activities that were undertaken in 2021 are linked above.

Figure 1: High Level Theory of Change diagram for the Global Assembly



Three routes to impact

The Global Assembly was conceived as three distinct parts: the **Core Assembly**, **Community Assemblies** and a **Cultural Wave**. The Core Assembly followed the traditional model of a citizens' assembly: deliberation by a lottery-selected group of citizens. There is, however, now evidence^[13] that this model has three potential key weaknesses:

- Low impact on policy: one of the key reasons given by power holders for ignoring outputs from deliberative processes is that so few people are involved that they do not provide a sufficient mandate for change,^[14, 15] and although the group may be 'representative' of the public, because they have been through a unique process they lose their representativeness. One way of overcoming this is by 'bringing people outside of the assembly along' with the deliberations. This can happen through media coverage, as was effectively done for the *Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat*, where in June 2020 70% of French adults were aware of it,^[16] giving it a significant impact on the associated public debate.
- Assemblies are by their nature exclusive; only a limited number of people can be selected and paid to attend. There is indeed a debate as to the legitimacy of deliberative mini-publics (DMPs).^[17] While recognizing the attractive characteristics of DMPs, critics and skeptics have raised concerns that they represent a 'shortcut', which undermines democratic control over decision-making because most people do not have an opportunity to participate in these processes.
- The benefits of participating are not shared widely: it is known that participating in or observing citizens' assemblies can be a transformative experience, profoundly changing how people see the world and other people. However, because the numbers touched are so low the benefits are correspondingly low.

Consequently, the Community Assemblies and Cultural Wave were designed to be integral parts of the Global Assembly to ensure that:

- large numbers of people become aware of the Global Assembly and its recommendations, and that this widespread awareness would maximize the its chances of impacting policy
- the Global Assembly is inclusive: while anyone could be selected for the Core Assembly, its places were limited so anyone else who wanted to could participate by running or attending a Community Assembly
- as many people as possible could receive the benefits of participating in the Assembly.

Decentralized delivery model

All three components of the Global Assembly were designed to be implemented in partnership with a global network of institutions, practitioners, academics, and volunteers. Baked into the design were mechanisms to enable national and local partners to operate semi-autonomously. This decentralized delivery model (more information on page 36), was central to achieving the theory of change for four primary reasons:

1. **Influence nation states:** Nation states are the primary power brokers at COP negotiations, and therefore engaging countries in the People's Declaration is critical for impact at COP.
2. **Citizen activation happens locally:** It is the relationship between the Facilitators, Community Hosts and Assembly Members which is the key driver of citizen action so it is they who lead on making this possible.
3. **Translation and meaning making:** Community Hosts had a vital role to ensure the Learning Materials were not only translated into the local language, but also were meaningful to Assembly Members.
4. **Local is global:** The Global Assembly takes the perspective that the world is made up of a patchwork of localities such that the global and local are not in any way separate, but rather that local is a part of global and the global is made up of the sum of many locals. This way of thinking can help to build localities' legitimacy and agency in contributing to global governance.

Guiding values

All aspects of the Global Assembly were guided by the following eight values:

1. **We build new decision-making infrastructure:** We believe that people need to have a seat at the global governance table. We are establishing a new decision-making body that activates and involves as many people as possible in defining and addressing the challenges we face.
2. **We trust in people:** We believe that our common global challenges require collective global solutions. When people can access the tools to meet, connect and come up with solutions together, they can and they do.
3. **We build empathy between people:** We believe that we make better decisions when we understand each other. When people communicate at a fundamental level beyond opinions and debate we can overcome polarization and division and create mutual respect.

4. **We focus on the means, not the end:** We believe the most urgent challenge we face is not to propose solutions, but to come up with better ways of generating solutions together. We seek never to impose our own views, but create a platform for people to think, talk, listen, co-create and act together.
5. **We recognize our biases:** We believe that our values, experiences, contexts and identities influence our behaviors and perceptions and it is by actively surfacing and recognizing them that we can best serve others.
6. **We emphasize learning in practice:** We believe that we don't have all the answers, so we share all our findings and mistakes so that we can learn together.
7. **We are open:** We believe in making available all our documentation, data, source code, methods, and materials.
8. **We are independent:** We seek to understand and engage with existing power structures, while maintaining complete independence from them. Governments, funders, and institutions have absolutely no influence over the process.

Team

Members of the Core Delivery Team and Hosting Circle hail from 34 different countries and, within the wider community, the Global Assembly family represents more than 110 countries. In total, contributing personnel across the three components of the project is estimated to be more than 400 people. More information about the many roles is provided in the appropriate context throughout Chapters 2, 3 and 4. See pages 252-271 for a list of everyone involved.

Founding partners

The Global Assembly was initiated by several individuals and organizations who held a common intent to run a global citizens' assembly. In early 2021, a Central Circle was formed to steer the initiative under the umbrella of three main bodies: [Deliberativa](#) (Spain), [Innovation for Policy Foundation](#) (i4Policy; pan-African), and a UK-based group comprising members and associates of [Iswe Foundation](#) and [Rax Consultancy](#). These partners also formed the bulk of the Core Delivery Team. See Appendix 1.6 for founding partner profiles.



Other founding partners were [Danish Board of Technology](#) (Denmark), [Centre for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance](#) at Canberra University (Australia), [OSCA](#) (UK) and the [Sortition Foundation](#) (UK).




Global delivery partners

In 2021, the Global Assembly partnered with nine organizations around the world who served as the coordinators of groups based on language or geographical location; referred to as **Cluster Facilitators**. They were: [Centre for Environment Education](#) (India), [Community Organisers](#) (UK), [Delibera](#) (Brazil), [G1000.nu](#) (Netherlands), [iDeemos](#) (Colombia), [MSU-Iligan Institute of Technology Center for Local Governance Studies](#) (Philippines), [Mohammed VI Polytechnic University School of Collective Intelligence](#) (Morocco), [Shimmer SDG Hub](#) (China), and [UDaan](#) (Pakistan). They led the decentralized delivery of the project and were integral to implementing the Global Assembly. See Appendix 2.1 for full profiles of Cluster Facilitators.



Organizational structure

Figure 2: The Global Assembly's organizational structure



The Global Assembly team was organized in a non-hierarchical, circle structure (Figure 2), inspired by the principles of holacracy and distributed leadership, and operated on the basis of a great deal of trust. Each circle was autonomous and functioned around a collection of roles and responsibilities. Often the same people would perform roles within several circles. Overall coordination of the Global Assembly took place through the Central Circle, where representatives of different circles met weekly to discuss strategy and align their work.

Governance

Governance refers to the structures and processes that oversee, and are custodians of, the Global Assembly, but do not deliver it themselves. The governance of the Global Assembly was guided by two main advisory committees: the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee (KWAC) and the Global Governance and Participation Advisory Committee (GGPAC). In addition to these, an institutional advisory group provided advice on how to ensure that there was a clear, constructive, and productive relationship between the formal COP26 process and the Global Assembly.

Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee

The purpose of the KWAC was to ensure that the learning journey of all participants, both in the Core Assembly and Community Assemblies, were rooted in the best evidence available at the time. This committee met online six times between June and November 2021 and informed decisions on:

- the framing question that the Assembly deliberated on
- the selection of the experts and witnesses
- the content and design of the information materials and learning phase.

Members of the committee were selected as experts in their respective fields to bring a range of different perspectives on the climate and ecological crisis. Their areas of expertise covered: Earth systems science, systems change, engineering and geoscience, original peoples' wisdom, decolonization, ecology, climate science, environmental economics, industrial ecology, climate adaptation, behavioral and cognitive psychology, and depth psychology. See Annex 1.1 for full biographies of KWAC members.

The KWAC was composed of nine members:

- Dr Nafeez Ahmed, Founder and Executive Director of the System Shift Lab (UK)
- Dr Stuart Capstick, Deputy Director of the Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformation (CAST), Cardiff University (UK)
- Professor Purnamita Dasgupta, Theme Leader Ecosystem Services at the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), Nepal, on leave from the Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi (India)
- Professor Saleemul Huq, Director of the International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD) (Bangladesh)
- Dr Jyoti Ma (USA) and Dr Mindahi Bastida Munoz (Mexico), Founders of The Fountain, Sacred Economics & Indigenous Wisdom Keepers
- Professor Michael N. Oti, Petroleum Geology, University of Port Harcourt (Nigeria)
- Professor Julia Steinberger, Ecological Economics, University of Lausanne (Switzerland)
- Professor Robert T. Watson, University of East Anglia (UK) (Chair)

Global Governance and Participation Advisory Committee

The purpose of the GGPAC was to advise the Global Assembly delivery team on process and governance.

Between July and November 2021, the members of the GGPAC attended five online meetings to inform decisions on:

- the deliberation process
- docking with the wider global governance system
- connecting to social movements and other public spheres
- establishing a permanent global citizens' assembly
- evaluation and impact.

Members of the GGPAC were selected as experts in their respective fields to bring a range of different perspectives on: global governance, political theory, deliberative and participatory democracy, social change, anthropology, sociology, and human rights. (See Annex 1.2 for full biographies of GGPAC members)

The committee was composed of eight members:

- Professor Nicole Curato, Centre for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance at the University of Canberra (Australia) (Chair)
- Professor Baogang He, Deakin University (Australia)
- Professor Bonny Ibhawoh, Human Rights History and African History, McMaster University (Canada)
- Poonam Joshi, Director, Funders Initiative for Civil Society (UK)
- Professor H  l  ne Landemore, Yale University (USA)
- Dr Tiago Peixoto, Senior Public Sector Specialist, World Bank
- Vijayendra (Biju) Rao, Lead Economist in the Development Research Group, World Bank
- Natalie Samarasinghe, CEO of United Nations Association (UK)

Institutional advisory group

The purpose of seeking institutional advice was to ensure there was a clear and productive relationship between the formal COP26 process and the Global Assembly. A group of institutional representatives held bi-lateral meetings with the team and met twice as a full group between June and October 2021. These meetings informed decisions on the docking of the Global Assembly process into COP26 and participation of the Global Assembly in the COP26 proceedings.

The group was composed of representatives from five institutions: the UNFCCC, the UN Climate Change High Level Champions team, the UK Government Climate Policy team, the UK Government COP26 Unit, and the Scottish Government.

Evaluation and learning

Due to the prototyping nature of the Global Assembly in 2021, the delivery team was committed to generating live, iterative learning during the planning and delivery phases of the Assembly. It was also essential to ensure that researchers were able to observe the Assembly's proceedings to inform their respective fields of research and to provide an external evaluation of the Global Assembly.

The Global Assembly had several evaluation and learning needs:

Informing the design, before the start of the Global Assembly process:

As a global citizens' assembly had never been run before, various aspects needed to be tested in advance of the initial formal deliberations to explore what would work. So in October 2021, the Global Assembly team ran Deliberative Labs, small-scale pilot assemblies, to prototype and refine the assembly process and test various aspects of the methodology prior to running the Core Assembly. See section "Trialing the Process" (page 77) for more details. The Community Assemblies team also worked with the National Taiwan University to trial the Community Assembly Toolkit prior to its official launch. See section "Trialing the Toolkit" (page 187) for more details.

Iterative and responsive data collection, during the Global Assembly process:

Surveys were designed by external researchers, in collaboration with Process Team liaisons, to gather feedback on the ongoing process from many parties involved (i.e. Assembly Members, Community Hosts, Facilitators etc.) Members of the external research team were invited to join Plenary Sessions of the Core Assembly as Observers.

Formal academic evaluation, after the Global Assembly's process:

A group of 30 researchers, coordinated by Professor Nicole Curato, was given access to the Assembly's data in order to contribute to research in the fields of deliberative democracy and climate governance (See Appendix 1.3 for the list of researchers and their institutions). In addition to survey responses, the external research group was provided with all existing recordings of deliberation sessions and contact details of participants and staff to coordinate interviews. The external evaluation of the Global Assembly will be published in November 2022. The remainder of this report is an account of the 2021 Global Assembly written by the team that delivered it.

Core Assembly

02

Members of the Global Assembly

2021 Core Assembly:

Aduhaibier Aboduaini
阿卜杜艾尼 阿卜杜海比尔 | China

Alizada Gulnaz | Azerbaijan

Angel Grace Muerong | Philippines

Angelito Lareta | Philippines

Arjun Panth | India

Betra Youhana | Egypt

Chom Chaiyabut | Thailand

Christopher Mofor | Cameroon

Dalisto Banda | Zambia

David Key | United States of America

Davy Marchand-Maillet | France

Dejan Bošnjaković | Italy

Dhirendra Kumar | India

Dinda Marselit | Indonesia

Elizabeth Abroziekeya Utobore | Nigeria

Fanyu Meng 孟凡钰 | China

Farhat Parveen | Pakistan

Gabriela Otero | Argentina

Gayakwad Rameshwar | India

Guga Francisco Basilio | Mozambique

Guillaume Kasse |
Democratic Republic of the Congo

Helganna Trantes | Germany

Idris Mahamat | Chad

Ines Hellal | Algeria

Izildete Botelho | Brazil

Jan Grygoruk | Poland

Jannat Rakhimova | Uzbekistan

Jia Lu 刘佳 | China

Jiancheng Du 杜建成 | China

Jianxin Li 李建新 | China

Jiarong Wang 王桂荣 | China

Jinghan Wang 靖涵 | China

JooYoeng Lim | Republic of Korea

Joseane Leal de Souza | Brazil

Joshua Skinner | United States of America

Julio Eduardo Avendaño Rodríguez |
Dominican Republic

Kai Wang 王凯 | China

Kevin Anchundia | Ecuador

Kevin Mhlanga | Zimbabwe

Laila Nour | Morocco

LaNeisha Hodo | United States of America

Laura Chica Castells | Spain

Licia Tay | Singapore

Luis Guerrero | Cuba

M. Scott Palmer | United States of America

Madeleine Tchindrebeogo | Cote d'Ivoire

Mary Nassr | Syria

Masher Abdelrahman | Sudan

Mehraj Ud Din Khan | India

Mohamed Salem | Yemen

Mulki Devi | India

Musa Martha Diana | Sierra Leone

Neha Singhal | India

Nemo | China

Nilam Devi | India

Panut Bin Ramelan | Indonesia

Parisa Soltanpour | Iran

Philomene Tshiala |
Democratic Republic of the Congo

Poornima Verma | India

Pradip Lal | India

Raghunandan Yadav | India

Rajesh Kumar | India

Raju Ahmmed | Bangladesh

Ramdulari Devi | India

Rui Dai 代睿 | China

Sanjay Jagatia | United Kingdom

Shahana Khatun | Bangladesh

Soren Cardon | Belgium

Subodh Adhikari | Nepal

Sulochana Baidla | India

Taotao Li 李滔滔 | China

Tatiana Koroleva | Russia

Valérie Rama Revaera Fiononanianja |
Madagascar

Wanderson Pires | Brazil

Willy Abraham | Indonesia

XinXin Gui 贵新新 | China

Yaroslav Hrechko | Ukraine

Yeshialem Andualem | Ethiopia

Ysaida Castillo | Venezuela

Yufen Song 宋玉芬 | China

Yuzhen Yang 杨玉珍 | China

Zan Dubin-Scott | United States of America

Zian Lv 吕子安 | China

Zehui Xu 徐泽辉 | China

Jiayi Li 李家伊 | China

...and Assembly Members from India,
Indonesia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan,
Palestine, Russia, and Turkey who chose
to remain anonymous.

Introduction

The Global Assembly (GA) was the world's first citizens' assembly conducted on a global scale.

Participants were selected through a civic lottery process to represent a snapshot of the world's population in terms of geography, age, gender, education, and attitudes toward climate change. From 7 October to 18 December 2021, 98^b participants, or Assembly Members, joined 20 online sessions over 12 weeks – a total of 68 hours. Together, they produced the ***People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth***. This was presented to citizens, civil society organizations, and world leaders at the United Nations' COP26 in Glasgow, and subsequently refined to incorporate their reflections on COP26.

This chapter presents the journey of the Core Assembly, from early planning in December 2019 to the final session on December 18, 2021. This includes details on the methodology and materials developed, the reasoning behind design choices and the personnel involved. A visual summary of the timeline can be found on page 45. After this follows an evaluation and series of reflections supported by data gathered during the process. These data revealed that Assembly Members' interest in the climate and ecological crisis and in political participation grew throughout the process, alongside increases in their perceived political influence and belief in the power of this type of deliberative citizens' forum. Although almost all Assembly Members considered their participation to be a highly valuable experience, they also reflected that the impact of global citizens' assemblies on international policymaking is lacking; a sentiment which seems to be informed by the Global Assembly's limited influence on COP26 and its outcomes. These and other reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of the Core Assembly process are covered in more detail at the end of this section.

Footnotes

b. 100 Assembly Members started the process and 98 completed it. The first departure occurred after the opening session and the second at the end of October.




Figure 3: Timeline of the Core Assembly

“ We may all be different, we may come from different countries and cultures. But [the Global Assembly] brings us together and without discrimination with the same goal of fighting the same problem that unites us to form a group on the same side. I will never forget this experience, the people and the relationships we have built...”

Assembly Member, final survey, December 2021

“

For me, it has been a great learning experience and has provided a platform for common people like me to have our voices heard and to share our experience. I met so many people from different countries and communities, learned what issues they face and what measures are being taken to fight climate change. Global Assembly, in summary, is a medium to give voice to the voiceless and provide a platform to share their experience with policy makers.”

Assembly Member, final survey, December 2021

**“
I was kind of skeptical and
at the same time excited
about participation. What
I experienced was more
than what I had expected.
Great opportunity for
people like me. It has been
enlightening and it has
been fun. I’m very grateful
to Global Assembly for
creating this possibility
for 100 people scattered
all over the world to share
their experiences...”**


Subodh Adhikari, Assembly Member, Nepal

Building the Core Assembly




100

Locations



100

Community Hosts
one at each location



100


Assembly Members
each supported by
a Community Host

Recruiting Assembly Members by civic lottery

The Global Assembly aimed to bring together participants from all walks of life, who collectively represent the demographic diversity of the world's population. This is usually accomplished through a process called sortition, in which participants are picked at random rather than being elected, self-selected, or appointed. While methods vary, most citizens' assembly processes make use of data like postal codes, voting registries or census data, sending invitations to a random subset of a neighborhood or country, then running a demographically stratified lottery to pick the final, demographically-representative pool. This type of stratified sortition is known as a civic lottery.

The Global Assembly's task of selecting 100 everyday people who reflected the diversity of the global population was the first attempt to implement a civic lottery at the global level, as far as the team is aware. To achieve this required not only innovations in existing sortition methodology, but also the establishment of a global community capable of seeing the process through on the ground.

Steps to selecting Assembly Members by global civic lottery



Outcome: 100 Assembly Members hosted by 100 Community Hosts within 200 km of the 100 locations




Figure 4: The multi-stage civic lottery process used to select members of the Core Assembly.

Values underpinning the Assembly Member selection

The following set of values were used to guide the process of selecting the Assembly Members, even when they were not perfectly achievable:

01

Equality:

Everyone on the planet has an equal chance of being chosen

02

Representation and diversity:

The Assembly should be a descriptive sample of the entire human family

03

Inclusion:

We will work to eliminate any barriers to participation

04

Transparency and openness:

The algorithms, code, tools and processes are fully open and auditable

05

Equal compensation:

Everyone who participates will be compensated and valued equally

06

Learning:

This has never been done before. This is a process of learning and we hope it will inform processes in the future

Preparation: defining Assembly Member demographic criteria

In order to create a methodology for the civic lottery, the Core Delivery Team worked in collaboration with the Sortition Foundation. They have experience in running selection processes for many local and national citizens' assemblies, using an algorithm which they have developed to ensure the most equitable probabilities are used in the selection of participants.^[18]

To obtain a representative sample for local and national deliberative processes, organizers usually have census data, postal registers, or other demographic data to draw from. As there is no global scale equivalent, a new multi-stage process was developed.

The target sample

In order to have a proportionally representative citizens' assembly, the 100 Assembly Members had to compose a demographic sample of the global population. Demographics can be outlined in many ways; for the Global Assembly, the characteristics chosen were:

- Geography
- Gender
- Age
- Education (as a proxy for socioeconomic background)
- Attitudes towards the climate and ecological crisis

Four primary data sets were used to provide the demographic weighting:

- NASA Gridded Population of the World^[19]
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Dynamics^[20]
- Wittgenstein Center Human Capital, Data Explorer^[21]
- Results from the Peoples' Climate Vote, run by UNDP and Oxford University^[22]

With the help of these data sources, the demographic targets shown in Table 1 were established. The goal was to recruit a group of 100 people that represented (as closely as possible) the proportional distribution set out in this table.

Gender: Data source = UN Population Dynamics	Target %
Female	49.6%
Male	50.4%
Other or non-binary <i>Note: no existing global data Registrants placed in selection pool randomly</i>	N/A
Age: Data source = Wittgenstein Center	(% of 15+ global population)
Under 25 (minimum on country-by-country basis)	20.6%
25-39	30.1%
40-59	31.1%
60+	18.1%
Education Level (Socioeconomic proxy): Data source = Wittgenstein Center	
Never attended school	32.5%
Left school aged less than 12	
Left school aged 12 to 19	51.5%
Left school aged 20 or over	16.0%
Still in education	(depending on age place in a group above)
Geography: Data source = Wittgenstein Centre, based in UN Regions	
Africa Group	15.8%
Asia and the Pacific Group	58.5%
Eastern European Group	4.7%
Latin American and Caribbean Group	8.6%
Western European and Others Group	12.5%
Climate Attitude <i>Do you think climate change is a global emergency?</i> Data source = Peoples' Climate Vote	
Yes	64%
No	36%

Table 1: Demographic targets for Assembly Member selection

Step 1: Global location lottery

June 24, 2021

The first demographic criterion tackled was geography. This meant identifying 100 locations around the world from which the 100 Assembly Members would be recruited.

The algorithm

Using the Gridded Population of the World (v4) database^[19] (specifically from the 2020 [Administrative Unit Center Points with Population Estimates \(v4.11\)](#), which describes 13.5 million administrative units, or zones), a NASA database hosted by Columbia University in the USA, it was possible to create an algorithm that selected random points on the globe weighted by each area's population (i.e. the probability of selecting any administrative area was proportional to that area's population). In this way 100 administrative areas were randomly selected, subject to the capping criteria outlined below.

To randomize the final location within each selected administrative area, each location was furthermore randomly displaced from the 'centroid' (the central coordinates for each administrative zone, in the original dataset), according to the total area of the zone.

You can access the algorithm and code via the [Global Assembly's GitHub](#).

Capping

In order to ensure that the location lottery identified locations that were appropriately distributed across planet Earth, the algorithm was designed to ensure that regions and countries were not overrepresented. This was done by introducing limits on the number of locations chosen in any one place, a process referred to as 'capping'.

Caps were defined by rounding up each population to the nearest whole number percentage. For example, if a country is home to 4.5% of the global population, then the algorithm would ensure that no more than 5% of the locations (or five of the 100 locations) could be chosen from that country. Equally, if a UN-defined region held 12.5% of the global population, no more than 13 locations could be chosen from that region. These caps were calculated to be internally consistent with the gridded population database (see full capping data in Appendix 2.19).

The algorithm selected locations in a two-step process. It first ran a random selection of locations weighted by population density, then identified any cases where population centers or regions were overrepresented and randomly replaced a point in the over-represented regions with another random location.

Live location lottery event

On June 24, 2021, the running of the selection algorithm was live streamed and the public were invited to come and share this moment. During the event, members of the Core Delivery Team explained the methodology outlined above and spoke about the process, methods, and next steps in order to provide context on how the civic lottery would fit into the broader project.

The location lottery results

The algorithm generated 100 points, each of which designated the approximate location of one Assembly Member. These are shown in Figure 6. You can see the original raw data produced by the algorithm at the Live Sortition Event [online](#).



"A Snapshot of the Human Family"

**Global Assembly
Live Sortition Event**

June 24th, 2021
07:30 - 08:30 PDT | 10:30-11:30 EDT | 15:30-16:30 BST
16:30-17:30 CAT | 20:00-21:00 IST | 22:30-23:30 CST

Join us live, as we run the first ever selection of a global citizens' assembly. We have developed a world-wide civic lottery (also called "sortition"), and will be identifying the locations where the 100 participants of this year's Global Assembly will come from.

There will be a live Q&A where members of the Global Assembly team will explain what sortition is, our innovative methodology for achieving it globally, and how the Global Assembly will inform COP26 (the UN Climate Conference this November). Join us to participate in this little piece of history.

Watch here: livesortition.globalassembly.org

Figure 5: Social media advertisement for the Live Sortition Event



Figure 6: Map showing the 100 Assembly Member locations selected during the Live Sortition Event

Points per country

Country	Points	% of global population	Country	Points	% of global population	Country	Points	% of global population
China	18	18.2	UK	1	0.86	Yemen	1	0.39
India	18	17.77	France	1	0.85	Madagascar	1	0.35
USA	5	4.26	Italy	1	0.76	Côte d'Ivoire	1	0.33
Indonesia	4	3.49	Myanmar	1	0.70	Cameroon	1	0.33
Brazil	3	2.76	South Korea	1	0.66	Syria	1	0.25
Pakistan	3	2.69	Spain	1	0.60	Zambia	1	0.24
Nigeria	3	2.64	Argentina	1	0.58	Zimbabwe	1	0.23
Bangladesh	2	2.20	Ukraine	1	0.56	Ecuador	1	0.22
Russia	2	1.84	Sudan	1	0.55	Chad	1	0.21
Ethiopia	1	1.51	Algeria	1	0.55	Belgium	1	0.15
Philippines	2	1.41	Poland	1	0.49	Cuba	1	0.15
Egypt	1	1.32	Morocco	1	0.47	Dominican Republic	1	0.14
DRC	2	1.14	Venezuela	1	0.43	Azerbaijan	1	0.13
Iran	1	1.09	Uzbekistan	1	0.43	Sierra Leone	1	0.10
Turkey	1	1.06	Mozambique	1	0.41	Singapore	1	0.07
Germany	1	1.05	Nepal	1	0.39	Palestinian Territories	1	0.07
Thailand	1	0.90						

Table 2: Number of Assembly Member locations per country (population data source = Wittgenstein Center, 2020 figures)

Points per UN region

UN Region	Number of Points	% of world population
Africa Group	18	15.8
Asia and the Pacific Group	57	58.5
Eastern European Group	5	4.7
Latin American and Caribbean Group	8	8.6
Western European and Others Group	12	12.5

Table 3: Number of Assembly Member locations per UN region

Representation

It is important to acknowledge that the civic lottery selected points in only 49 out of the 193 (UN recognized) countries in the world. This means there were many nations without a point and, therefore, no-one from that nation was present in the Core Assembly.

An important aspect of the Global Assembly methodology is that no Assembly Member is a representative of any place or people; only themselves. Representation comes from proportional mirroring and therefore the global diversity of voices and experiences expressed, not via direct representation of countries or regions in the form of individual members.

However, to ensure the greatest representation possible, the Global Assembly was designed so that anyone in the world, including those from countries that weren't selected in the sortition, could participate in the broader project through the Community Assemblies (for more information see Chapter 3).

Step 2: Building a global, decentralized team

Assembling a Community of Practice

June 2021

The Core Assembly was designed to be globally coordinated and yet locally organized, so that Assembly Members were recruited, hosted and supported within their communities. After identifying the geographic points, the Global Assembly needed to then identify, recruit, and verify trusted local community spaces and conveners near each of the locations to serve as Community Hosts. This required knowledge of local realities and cultures in 100 diverse locations that ranged from rural Myanmar to urban Quito and Los Angeles to Socotra, a Yemeni island considered to be one of the most isolated landforms on Earth.

In order to build this capacity and to ensure that the Global Assembly was truly a globally co-owned initiative, the team was expanded and decentralized through the worldwide recruitment of volunteers and institutional partners. To do this an open call was announced via social media, the Global Assembly newsletter, and through the team's networks.


Figure 7: An Instagram post advertizing the open call for Community of Practice personnel



While building the Community of Practice, the Core Delivery Team ran introduction and onboarding sessions twice per week at separate times to allow as much time zone inclusion as possible. These sessions took place throughout June and July 2021, during which interested people and organizations were welcomed to join the Community of Practice and assist with Community Host recruitment, both asynchronously and during weekly coworking sessions.

From the open call-out, more than 250 individuals and organizations signed up to join the Community of Practice. At its peak, there were around 85 individuals from 36 different countries attending weekly co-working sessions, in addition to irregular visitors who dropped in to receive updates and offer support.

Figure 8:
Home countries
of regularly
contributing
members of
the Community
of Practice



The authors would like to personally thank and credit everyone who came to those co-working sessions. See pages 269-271 for a roster and logos of those who wanted to be included in this report.

Forming Clusters

July 2021

The second step in this process was the formation of **Clusters**, geographic and linguistic groupings of the lottery-selected locations, within which the work of partner recruitment and (later) training could be increasingly localized and autonomously organized.

The 100 locations selected in Step 1 were divided into 10 Clusters. Around one-third of the points were grouped together through a common national language: Arabic, English, French, Spanish, and Portuguese. The 18 points in both India and China were grouped together into national clusters and the remaining points were grouped geographically, into Clusters 1-3, through a neutral and balanced selection according to longitude.

Recruiting Cluster Facilitators

August 2021




Figure 9: Schematic illustrating the role of Clusters in interfacing with Community Hosts. Please note that Clusters were not uniformly limited to four Community Hosts as the diagram might suggest.

Cluster Facilitators formed the first node of decentralization. Many organizations, who later became Cluster Facilitators, initially began working with the Global Assembly on the research and development process of the Core Assembly earlier in the summer of 2021 (see “Deliberative Labs”, page 77).

Eight Cluster Facilitators took over the organization of one Cluster each, and the School of Collective Intelligence in Morocco coordinated two Clusters: French and Arabic. Cluster Facilitators coordinated the recruitment, training and support of Community Hosts and volunteers within their Cluster, and led the decentralized implementation of the Core Assembly together within the Decentralization Circle.

<p>Cluster 1 (0-45° E)</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: G1000.nu, Netherlands</p> <p>9 locations in Belgium, Ethiopia, Germany, Italy, Poland, Russia, Turkey, Ukraine</p>	<p>Anglophone Cluster</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: Community Organisers, United Kingdom</p> <p>12 locations in Nigeria, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom, United States, Zambia, Zimbabwe</p>
<p>Cluster 2 (46-90° E)</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: UDaan, Pakistan</p> <p>9 locations in Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Iran, Nepal, Pakistan, Uzbekistan</p>	<p>Francophone Cluster</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: Mohammed VI Polytechnic University School of Collective Intelligence, Morocco</p> <p>8 locations in Cameroon, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, France, Madagascar, Morocco</p>
<p>Cluster 3 (91+° E)</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: MSU-Iligan Center for Local Governance Studies, Philippines</p> <p>10 locations in Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, South Korea, Singapore, Thailand</p>	<p>Arabic Cluster</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: Mohammed VI Polytechnic University School of Collective Intelligence, Morocco</p> <p>6 locations in Algeria, Egypt, Palestinian Territory, Sudan, Syria, Yemen</p>
<p>India Cluster</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: Center for Environment Education, India</p> <p>18 locations in India</p>	<p>Spanish Cluster</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: iDeemos, Columbia</p> <p>6 locations in Argentina, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Spain, Venezuela</p>
<p>China Cluster</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: Shimmer SDGs Hub, China</p> <p>18 locations in China</p>	<p>Portuguese Cluster</p> <p>Cluster Facilitator: Delibera, Brazil</p> <p>4 locations in Brazil, Mozambique</p>

Table 4: Clusters, countries within them, and Cluster Facilitators

Cluster Facilitator Role

Lead the recruitment of Community Hosts in their Cluster by:

- Translating the relevant outreach materials (ie. flyers, phone call scripts, volunteer protocols)
- Researching and networking with local community organizations in their Cluster
- Communicating directly with applicants
- Liaising with Central Circle to coordinate volunteers
- Training and supporting Community Hosts throughout the duration of the Core Assembly
- Leading communications dissemination within Cluster

See full profiles of each Global Assembly Cluster Facilitator in Appendix 2.1 and Terms of Reference for this role in Annex 2.2.

“
What we’re building at the Global Assembly is bigger than an ordinary assembly of citizens, it’s an entire shift in the way we think and see ourselves as citizens, we’re changing the narrative, building a story, where we are one of the main characters side by side with others.”

Fatima Zamba, Cluster Facilitator for the Francophone and Arabic cluster, Morocco.

“

That the reason I started to do this thing because I feel like it's my responsibility, the responsibility of my generation to actually carry this, because I just wanted to help, I just wanted my grandfather to see that in the future there's a possibility that we are going to go back to the world that he had maybe and we are going to make it better... So, I think it's for ourselves, it's for humanity itself, so I always try to make it into a movement that everyone can be a part of, because we are all a part of it. We are all a part of this global village, global community... there's going to be more global issues and crises. So, we all need to work together.”

Peilin Chen (Blair), Cluster Facilitator, China Cluster

Step 3: Decentralized recruitment of Community Hosts

July - September 2021

With the Clusters and Community of Practice established, it was time to collaborate on the search for organizations which could serve as Community Hosts to the Assembly Members.

Recruitment co-working environment

August - September 2021

To enable a large group of volunteers to partake in the virtual global search for Community Hosts, a collaborative working environment was established on the online platform Miro. Figure 10 shows an overview and close-up of the Miro Board used for this task.




Figure 10: Overview (above) of the collaborative Miro board used for Community Host recruitment and close up of one Cluster's area (below)

The Community Host recruitment approach

The aim was to locate community organizations within a 200 km radius (the closer the better) and the same administrative region as each sortition-selected geographic point, and which might have the capacity and trust within their community to serve in the role of Community Host.

A Community Host was defined as a **trusted organization in local communities that bring people together around common activities and beliefs, such as community centers, public libraries, cultural venues, sports clubs, co-working spaces, faith-groups, and educational institutions, among others.**

Step 1: Identifying leads to contact

The Core Delivery Team defined multiple methods for finding organizations which might fit the Community Host criteria and be interested in the role. These were suggested to members of the Community of Practice as follows:

Option 1	Direct leads You know a local community organization located near one of the points (library, coworking space, educational institution, community center, etc).
Option 2	Snowballing You have contacts or friends near the point that might be able to identify potential credible local organizations.
Option 3	Desk Research Find community organizations located near points through online research to generate a list of leads.

Whenever a potentially suitable organization or institution was identified, their contact information and a short description was placed as a note on the Miro board.

Step 2: Contacting leads and introducing the Global Assembly

Members of each Cluster would then contact these organizations to openly advertise the role. The methods for this included:

Option 1	Social media dissemination Disseminate our Community Host flier on social media channels, including hashtags in local language, when appropriate, and tagging potential leads.
Option 2	Email or text message to leads Send leads the Community Host flier by email or text message, accompanied by an outreach message which includes the application link.
Option 3	Telephone Phone leads directly, using a suggested script to guide the conversation and making sure that leads know where to apply.

All progress was tracked on the Miro board so that other team members could see what had been done.

Step 3: Review received applications

The final decision to contract a Community Host was jointly decided within Clusters by Cluster Facilitators and Community of Practice members.

Selection Criteria were developed by each Cluster in breakout discussions during co-working sessions. A number of collective, non-negotiable criteria were agreed upon in open space, with each Cluster suggesting criteria to the others in order to activate collective intelligence. The final criteria were agreed upon within Clusters in recognition of the different needs and circumstances in each location and that Clusters were best-placed to make these decisions.

Example criteria included:

Non-negotiable criteria	Cluster-specific criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Location: Proximity to the lottery-selected geographic location — Availability: The organization is available for all sessions — Language fluency: At least one team member of the organization must speak both fluent English (owing to English being the exchange language of the Assembly), and the language of their local community — Internet Access: the organization must be able to secure a stable internet connection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Being locally-rooted: Prioritize local organizations over satellites of national or international organizations — Capacity: Has the organization conducted similar activities in the past? — Location: Will accept Community Hosts outside of a 200 km radius when unable to identify and/or recruit nearer organizations within the time constraints

Pairs of Community of Practice members interviewed all short-listed organizations who applied for the Community Host position. Each candidate was interviewed against the agreed selection criteria and reflections from the interview were recorded in a spreadsheet which other Community of Practice members had access to.

Once all candidates had been interviewed, Clusters reconvened in co-working calls to determine a final selection, and to then contact the successful applicants and contract them formally as Community Hosts. In a small number of cases, members of the Community of Practice were located near sortition-selected locations and applied to serve as Community Hosts themselves. In these cases, recognizing the potential moral hazard and conflict of interest, the concerned organizations did not participate in the final selection decisions for their Cluster.

Community Host recruitment stories

Socotra: Working around infrastructure

The Yemeni island of Socotra presented more challenges than most of the points in the Arabic Cluster. Some 400 km away from the mainland, it is a remote place where very few community organizations have an internet presence and internet/email access in general is patchy. After weeks of prospecting and failed outreach, the team finally came across an environmental activist based in Socotra on social media. Through him the team made the connection to the Socotri Women's Foundation for Response & Development, a local organization for women's empowerment. Throughout the Assembly, they had to rely on satellite internet providers to connect the Assembly Member to the online sessions and keep a line of communication open with the rest of the Global Assembly team.

United States: Unexpected difficulties

The USA has a high density of community organizations, most with a strong internet presence, accessible through online map searches. Despite this, the Anglophone recruitment team found it much more difficult to recruit the five US-based Community Hosts than in any of the other countries in their Cluster. This may have been due to the monetary value of the grant (US\$2,800 in compensation for the work, see Chapter 5 for more details) which, in per capita income terms, represented a smaller sum than in some other regions, or due to other cultural factors making people less likely to respond to cold calls and emails. Despite significant efforts from the global community and several weeks of extended deadlines, the team was unable to identify a community organization near the location in Erie County, New York and had to ask the Community Host in Los Angeles, California to support an additional Assembly Member. The Anglophone Cluster deliberated on this issue, and determined that it was better to have the position filled by a Community Host in the same country in order to have as much representation as possible. Thus, in the case of Erie County, New York, the Community Host and Assembly Member were well outside the 200 km target distance from the sortition point. The point in Indiana also fell 16 km outside of the target distance. Similar organizational recruitment difficulties were also experienced for some of the points in Western Europe.

Pakistan, Lakarna District: The highest number of applications

The Lakarna District in Pakistan received by far the most applications, with a total of 17. This was largely thanks to the efforts of one volunteer who, despite his keen interest in serving as a Community Host himself, fully embraced the spirit of the process and spread the word far and wide through his community and professional network. Despite the fact that he began volunteering actively before the location lottery had even been run, he did not project a sense of entitlement to being selected as a Community Host and truly did his best to find the most suitable organization to perform the role. Thanks to this hard work and commitment to the avoidance of bias, as well as the admirable work of his organization in improving the lives of disabled people in his local area, he was ultimately selected as Community Host for the Lakarna point. Individuals and organizations like this represent exactly what the Global Assembly's Community of Practice aspires to be, and will be critical in defining and manifesting the Global Assembly's future.

Community Hosts were recruited and contracted for all 100 of the selected locations.^c

This was only possible due to the hard work and commitment of Cluster Facilitators and Community of Practice volunteers, who persevered with cold-calling, researching and outreach until the very last locations were accounted for.

Keeping it local – distance of Community Hosts from the lottery-selected locations

In the search for Community Hosts, team members tried their best to find an organization within 200 km of the point selected during the global location lottery. Where this was not possible, attempts were made to stay within the same administrative zone. Figure 11 shows the distance of Community Hosts from their respective sortition point, 19 of which fell outside of the targeted radius of 200 km. The median distance of the community organization to the identified geographic location was 73.5 km.




Figure 11: Scatterplot showing the distances of Community Hosts from the points generated by the location lottery. Points for China are not included in this scatterplot, as hosting duties were centrally organized by the China Cluster Facilitator, Shimmer SDG Hub, and its distributed network of partner organizations and team members.

Community Host training

September 2021

Once all Community Hosts had been contracted, they attended multiple training sessions, hosted by Cluster Facilitators, to make sure they could recruit and support their Assembly Member with everything they might need to engage meaningfully with the Assembly and its content.

Training generally followed the syllabus outlined below. In addition, each Cluster created a WhatsApp group to stay connected with Cluster members, answer any questions, and to support peer sharing and learning.

Footnotes

c. As described in the box "Keeping it local", a Community Host was not recruited in Erie County, NY, USA; the Community Host in Alameda County, CA agreed to host two Assembly Members instead.

<p>Training 1</p> <p>September 2 or 9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — General induction to Global Assembly — Review Terms of References of Community Host — Potential Assembly Member recruitment protocol
<p>Training 2</p> <p>September 16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Each Community Host gives an update on potential Assembly Member recruitment, and shares best practices — Information Material translation protocol (including how to host Information Material Contextualization Event, see pages 84-86)
<p>Training 3</p> <p>September 23</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Overview of how to administer the consent form and contract the Assembly Member — Assembly Member hosting (internet, Miro, Zoom) and consecutive translation protocol
<p>Training 4</p> <p>September 30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Community Hosts shared updates on contracting Assembly Members and progress on Information Material translation — Review software tools and usage protocols — Facilitation plan review — Open space to discuss other questions before the start of the Core Assembly

“

I have two main reasons to be involved in the Global Assembly among many. The first is that the Global Assembly is in the truest sense by the people, for the people and from the people, and it will be the best platform for them to discuss their problems, to discuss world issues... it gives a seat to each and every one at the table, beyond their creed, color, country, or religion. And my second reason is, just imagine, around the world there are 100 points and there are 100 people talking together, they are sharing their emotions, they are sharing their problems, they are discussing the world issues and there are thousands who are providing the system to them, and then they are all coming out with a common solution. For the first time in the world this is going to happen. We are going to create a history so how could I not be part of it? Rather I would say that I am lucky to be part of the Global Assembly.”

Dr Manasi Dongre Joshi, Community Host, Chhattisgarh, India

Step 4: Recruitment of potential Assembly Members by Community Hosts

September 2nd – September 27th

The Assembly Member recruitment approach

During the training process, Community Hosts began the recruitment of potential Assembly Members. Community Hosts were asked to recruit four to six potential Assembly Members who represent the diversity of their community. In theory, this would serve to represent the individuality of each point whilst not placing too much prescriptive pressure on the Community Hosts.

Preparation

Community Hosts were provided with a 'pitch' of the Global Assembly in order to share a consistent explanation of the key points to mention and verify during recruitment, such as whether the person could be available for all of the sessions of the Core Assembly. They were also provided with a recruitment survey to enter candidate information and demographics (see Annex 2.3).

Recruitment method 1: In-person

It was decided that the only universally applicable method of recruitment that would produce a purely random pool of candidates was 'on-street' and 'door-to-door' recruitment. When using this method, Community Hosts would visit a neighborhood in their region and approach people on the street, or knock on random doors. Upon gaining someone's attention, they would explain the Global Assembly and ask if they would like to complete the short survey to register their interest in taking part. If interested, the survey was orally translated, and the person's answers were recorded on a printed or online form. Community Hosts would carry this out as many times as possible, or at least until they had the information from a sufficiently diverse pool.

Figure 12:
Community Hosts conduct on-street and door-knocking recruitment near Siwan, Bihar (left) and in Hooghly, West Bengal (right), India



“
The process was easy and fair. Everything is in written form – my agreement, my consent with translated form – easy to understand and respond accordingly. This is international training [but] I feel it like a local one.”

An anonymous Assembly Member reflects on the recruitment process

Recruitment method 2: Online snowballing

COVID-19 restrictions and concerns in the third quarter of 2021 limited the ability of some communities to engage in face-to-face recruitment. To design around this, Community Hosts were offered a second-best option for recruitment, which was referred to as the ‘telephone snowballing’ method (see Figure 13). In the telephone snowballing methodology, the Community Host would call someone they knew in the local community and ask to be put in contact with someone they didn’t know in the area. The Community Host would then in turn ask this third person to put them in contact with someone else they didn’t know in the area. This method would ensure that there were at least three degrees of separation between the hosting organization’s immediate social network and the candidates recruited.




Figure 13: The snowballing recruitment method

Recruitment protocols

To make sure the overall sample of potential Assembly Members was truly globally representative and random, and to avoid conflicts of interest and abuses of power, the following guidelines were advised:

- 01** The person selected cannot be a colleague, associate, or employee of the Community Host organization, or a friend or family member of any of its employees.
- 02** The person selected must not be self-selected in any way (e.g. by putting themselves forward for the role). This is because self-selection creates a bias. People who are already engaged in a particular topic, have access to information, and who feel comfortable in public participation settings, tend to be the more highly educated, opinionated and/or wealthier members within a community, which distorts the representativeness of the selected body.



My favorite parts in the Global Assembly would be first the recruitment process of all Assembly Members, it was also one of the most exciting parts. I myself went around Bangkok and its suburbs with my friends. The other team members went around the communities and villages in different locations throughout Thailand, such as Chiang Mai, Pattani and Kalasin. We talked to people on the street and went door to door about the Global Assembly and gathered names and contact details of people who would like to take part and we got an amazing list of candidates ranging from an indigenous community leader to a PhD graduate. So, one assembly member, Chom Chaiyabut, is a conservationist found by my team members in Pattani in the south when they were looking for candidates in Chom's village. I interviewed Chom alongside other people, then sent the list of confirmed candidates over to the Global Assembly for the lottery process. When Chom learned that he got selected as an Assembly Member, he was overjoyed, well his whole village was. So, he told me that it was definitely one of the best days of his life."

Onusa Kanhachat, Community Host, Thailand

Step 5: Choosing the final Assembly Members

September 27, 2021

To select the final 100 Assembly Members from the pool of candidates, a second civic lottery was conducted. The pool of potential Assembly Members recruited by Community Hosts totalled 675 people. This served as the algorithm's input dataset and the previously mentioned global demographic metrics (page 52) served as its target. In other words, the algorithm chose one person from each geographic location, to match as closely as possible with the global demographic characteristics across the selected metrics: gender, age, educational attainment, and perspective on the climate and ecological crisis.

After this algorithmic selection was complete, Community Hosts contacted the selected Assembly Members to confirm their participation and complete a contract. In 20 cases, the person selected by the algorithm was no longer able to participate in the Core Assembly and a replacement selection had to be made. In these cases, the most demographically appropriate candidate was identified by considering the selection criteria in the following priority order:

01

Geography

02

Gender

03

Age

04

Attitudes
towards
climate
change

05

Years in
education

The final 100 Assembly Members

On October 7, 100 Assembly Members began the journey and 98 completed it. One Assembly Member dropped out near the beginning of the process due to time availability and another was requested to discontinue a few weeks into the process due to misconduct on the part of their Community Host (see "Headline Reflections by Core Delivery Team" (point 6, page 171) for details).




Figure 14: Infographic representing the demographic make-up of the 98 Assembly Members who completed the GA process. Please note that not all Assembly Members answered all questions and all demographic characteristics are self-described.

Representation by key demographics

The multi-stage civic lottery process provided a cohort of Assembly Members who formed a descriptive sample of the global population according to the five selection criteria (see Figure 15). Any major deviation was largely due to the 20 points where the initially selected participant declined the invitation, thus requiring a replacement from the existing pool at that location who may not have mirrored all demographic criteria (see Appendix 2.20 for the demographic deviation of the original selection). Younger people were slightly over-represented (by around eight percentage points) and Members with more than 12 years of formal education were thirteen percentage points above the global average. Geographically, it was impossible to cover all counties of the world, but the distribution across UN geographic regions was within three percentage points of the global figure.




Figure 15: The 100 selected Assembly Member demographics relative to global population

Decentralization overview and conclusion

By September 2021, the team contributing to the Core Assembly had grown from a 10-person Central Circle to a truly global community of more than 400 individuals, and at least 120 organizations across 112 countries. As well as the Community of Practice, Cluster Facilitators and Community Hosts detailed so far, this also includes members of the Hosting Circle described on pages 106-119.

For the Global Assembly, decentralized implementation made it possible to deliver the incredibly difficult task of recruiting and hosting 100 everyday people from completely different contexts, all around the world. From the collective human connections required to recruit Community Hosts in such diverse locations to the coordination of volunteers, a decentralized way of working was essential to delivering the Core Assembly.

Decentralized design also reflected the Global Assembly values (see section “Guiding Values”, page 33). In building a global governance infrastructure to represent the voices of everyday citizens, it was important for these values to be reflected in the very way this infrastructure was built. This meant avoiding a structure that was prescriptive and top-down, but rather empowering local actors.

Furthermore, there was a need to design a way of working that was porous and decentralized; co-working calls that volunteers could come in and out of, led autonomously by Cluster Facilitators made it possible to put this into practice.

From the way that applicants for the Community Host position were interviewed, to how the initial pitch was delivered to people during on-street recruitment, members of the Global Assembly community took part in acts of ‘translation’ at all turns of this journey. The Global Assembly was reinterpreted and disseminated in ways that made sense to local communities worldwide, making it possible to bring people in authentically. For this project to be truly global, it needed to be truly local first.

Designing the Core Assembly

Governance

Like all other elements of the Global Assembly, the Core Assembly was designed with inputs from the two governance bodies. The Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee primarily informed the design of the learning journey, and the Global Governance and Participation Advisory Committee advised on the deliberation process. See pages 36-39 and Appendices 1.1 and 1.2 for details.

Trialing the process: Deliberative Labs

As this was the first attempt to implement a global citizens' assembly, it was important to pilot some of the processes that would be used in the deliberations. In the spirit of humility, everyone involved committed to learn by iteration, or what is often called 'practice-based learning'. While the entire 2021 Core Assembly could be seen as a pilot for future assemblies, there was also a need to run smaller-scale pilots in advance to inform the first implementation. In the summer of 2021, the Global Assembly ran eight three-hour deliberations with 21 partner organizations, known as Lab Partners, around the world. The learnings were incorporated into the design of the Core Assembly.

Lab Partners

Recruitment

Round 1 – July 2021	Round 2 – August 2021
<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Delibera Brasil (Sao Paulo, Brazil)— National Taiwan University (Taipei, Taiwan)— Centre for Environmental Education (Pune, India)— CURE India (New Delhi, India)— School of Collective Intelligence (Ben Guerir, Morocco)— Democracia en Red (Buenos Aires, Argentina)— HONF Foundation (Yogyakarta, Indonesia)— MSU-Iligan Center for Local Governance Studies (Iligan City, Philippines)— UDaan (Balochistan, Pakistan)— Wedu (Bangkok, Thailand)— Community Voices (Kwekwe, Zimbabwe)— House of Africa (Njamena, Chad)— Consumidores (Quito, Ecuador)— iDeemos (Bogotá, Colombia)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— SERAC-Bangladesh (Bangladesh)— SocLab Foundation & Center for Climate Assemblies (Poland)— Climate Science (Brazil)— Healthy Democracy (USA)— G1000.nu (Netherlands)— Fudan University (China)— Asian Energy Studies Centre (Hong Kong)— Madaniya (Sudan)

Table 5: Lab Partner organizations

An open call was made for Lab Partners in June of 2021, and out of more than 80 applicants, 14 were selected. Eight additional organizations were selected in July for the second round (see Table 5).

Roles and responsibilities

Lab Partners engaged in the following roles for a one-month round:

- Recruit one participant in their local area
- Coordinate their participation in pilot test meetings
- Host their participation with stable internet connection, and a computer for the participant and themselves
- Translate relevant materials into participant's language (i.e. recruitment survey, participant questionnaire, learning materials, etc.)
- Consecutive translation between participants' language and English during pilot test meetings
- Attend coordination meetings before the pilot test meetings
- Pay a recommended stipend of \$50 to the participant at the end of engagement in two three-hour Lab Sessions
- Support creation of Learnings Report on Lab Pilots

Lab Participant demographics

The Labs differed from the actual Core Assembly in that each Lab Partner recruited only one participant in their community and no civic lottery was run. Rather, each Lab Partner was assigned a gender to recruit for, to ensure balance on that one criteria, and advised to recruit someone from a less affluent background, someone not used to online discussions or someone not interested in the topic of climate change. The intention was to conduct these trial runs with participants whose circumstances were likely to generate difficulties which might arise during the actual Core Assembly, such as internet connection, commitment, or engagement.

The final demographics for Round 1 and Round 2 are shown in Table 6.

Table 6:
Demographic
description of
Lab participants

	Round 1	Round 2
—	11 languages (no English)	Seven languages
—	Six male, eight female	Two male, seven female
—	Two participants younger than 25, eight participants aged 25-39, three participants aged 40-59, one participant aged 60+	Two participants younger than 25, three participants aged 25-39, two participants aged 40-59, two participants aged 60+
—	Three participants with 0-6 years of schooling, seven participants with seven-12 years, three participants with 12+ years, one still in education	Four participants with seven-12 years of schooling, three participants with 12+ years, one still in education
—	Five participants who did not think the climate and ecological crisis was an emergency, nine participants who did	One participant who did not think that climate and ecological crisis was an emergency, eight participants who did

Testing

On-street recruitment

Lab Partners were trained with a first version of the Recruitment Protocol, later shared with Community Hosts during their training. Each Lab Partner street-recruited or telephone snowballed one participant from their neighborhood, and shared their learnings from the process. These insights were integrated to form the final draft of the Recruitment Protocol.

Hosting of participants

Lab Partners each hosted their participant on their premises, providing internet connection and a computer to join meetings in addition to consecutive translation. The varying levels of internet quality, available transportation, and team capacity of each Lab Partner yielded a diversity of hosting set-ups and learnings (see Figure 16). For example, one Lab participant could not gain transportation to her Lab Partner's premises, which provided experience in the use of WhatsApp as a medium of translation to accompany the Zoom-based deliberations. The experience of another Lab Partner, whose organization had multiple team members, generated important best practices on hosting situations with more than one device. This process directly informed the hosting options and best practices shared with Community Hosts.







In-person		
<p>One device, one companion</p> 	<p>One device, two companions (Miro translator)</p> 	<p>Best practice & notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Two companions = best case scenario to have a Miro translator — Social distancing requires measures that allow a companion to support a participant in the use of Miro, e.g. face protection or large screen/projector which can be viewed from a distance — Prepare transportation and amenities, e.g. food
In-person, socially distanced as per COVID restrictions		
<p>One device, one companion</p> 	<p>Two devices, one companion</p> 	<p>Two devices, two companions (Miro translator)</p> 
Remote Hosting		
<p>Four devices, one companion</p> 	<p>Four devices, one companion, one in-person volunteer</p> 	<p>Best practice & notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Requires pre-session testing to check Zoom usage and internet connection — Requires setting up phone/text backchannel — May require extra transportation for in-person volunteer — Volunteer may be a close family member

Figure 16: Examples of different hosting set-ups and learnings produced during the labs, and consequently shared with Community Hosts

Sessions	Tested elements		
	Process	Miro	Additional
Lab 1 July 22 & 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Co-creating conversation guidelines — How climate change is affecting themselves and their communities — Identify actors accountable for climate change — Ice breakers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Using Miro (opening document, moving stickies and votes) — Multilingual Miro set up (note taking on automatic translation spreadsheet) — Clustering — Voting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Testing out different speeds & sentence lengths for translation
Lab 2 July 29 & 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Generating solutions to prioritized causes of climate change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Clustering — Voting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Honing verbal translation
Lab 3 August 19 & 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Participants learn how to greet in each others' languages — Intergenerational story sharing about great grandparents' lives, participant's lives and hopes for great grandchildren's lives — Co-creating conversation guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Testing new sign-posting method & new board configuration on Miro (iterated using feedback from Round 1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Global Assembly Hand signals — Honing verbal translation — Watching English-language video (translation process)
Lab 4 August 26 & 27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Chain-letter writing: Participants co-create a letter to their ancestors, each contributing one sentence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Co-creating a text in a multilingual context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Global Assembly hand signals — Honing verbal translation — Translating Information Booklet

Table 7: Process components tested during Lab sessions

Incorporating Lab learnings into the main process

Lab reports

During each round of Labs, Lab Partners met weekly for four meetings to share best practices. They also shared learnings with the Core Delivery Team via an online form. During the final meeting, Lab Partners worked with the Core Delivery Team to develop the outline of a learnings report, which was consolidated by the Core Delivery Team into the final Lab Reports. See the Round 1 Lab Report in Annex 2.4.

The Reports were shared with both governance advisory committees — Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee and the Global Governance and Participation Advisory Committee — to facilitate their understanding of the needs and limitations of the process.

Team structure

To ensure information flow and integration of lab learnings into the design of the Core Assembly, all members of the Process Team either observed, coordinated or designed the Deliberative Lab. Furthermore, seven out of nine Lab Partners went on to serve as Cluster Facilitators, thus optimizing information flow of learnings into the training of Community Hosts which they oversaw.

Learning materials

“

Previously, I felt like I was under a big tree. My perspectives on the world and climate change were so limited and those problems seemed too difficult for me to solve. After joining the Global Assembly, my horizons have been broadened and I understand world problems better. It's like I am now on the top of the tree – my perspectives are wider and farther.”

Chom Chaiyabut, Assembly Member, Thailand

Information Booklet development

The Information Booklet was created to inform the learning phase of the Global Assembly (see Annex 2.17). Its composition was led over 12 iterations by the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee, with input from Lab Partners and external organizations.

When designing the Information Booklet, it was essential to take into consideration different learning styles and ensure people could effectively assimilate the information they were introduced to.

The content of the Information Booklet was based on evidence provided by members of the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee. Thanks to the range of perspectives, the content of the booklet was diverse and included the following elements:

- Scientific input on the climate and ecological crisis
- Social sciences input on why we are in a climate and ecological crisis (e.g. what are the drivers and blockers of change from a systemic perspective, including the political economy and psychology)
- Lived experience input from communities affected by climate change and biodiversity loss around the world, and particularly the keepers of indigenous knowledge

One of the key challenges of the Information Booklet was to ensure that complex data and other information on the climate and ecological crisis was turned into accessible and engaging content for readers.

This was also necessary to make translation easier, so it could inform the multilingual deliberation between the Assembly Members. It was therefore critical that the original version written in English was very clear and not prone to misinterpretation.

See Annex 2.17 for full Information Booklet.

Animated slideshows

The purpose of the animated slideshow presentations was to provide an alternative way to engage with some of the content in the Information Booklet. As part of the learning and prototyping approach of the Global Assembly in 2021, two presentations were created. They explored the 'Greenhouse Effect' and 'Ecosystems and biodiversity'. They were developed by professional learning consultants in a way that allows for optimum accessibility in terms of language, cultural framing and educational background. Unfortunately, these resources proved challenging to translate within the time available and so were not used in the Core Assembly learning journey. They were, however, both made available on the Global Assembly's wiki.

Wiki

The Global Assembly's wiki had two primary purposes:

- To provide a repository of the learning resources for the Global Assembly
- To act as a participatory platform to support collaborative information generation and translation

The wiki hosted a variety of information. Some of the content was generated by the Core Delivery Team, while contextualized content was created by Community Hosts and Cluster Facilitators. Moreover the wiki was designed to accept crowdsourced inputs from the general public.

For accountability purposes, it was important to distinguish the different types of content on the wiki, which varied depending on the type of authorship:

- Global Assembly's content was originally the work of the Core Delivery Team.
- Translated and contextualized content was curated by the broader Global Assembly community (i.e. Community Hosts and Cluster Facilitators) and consisted of translated and/or contextualized versions of materials that were originally published by the Core Delivery Team. It also included original content authored by members of the Community of Practice. Contributions of this nature were made in 19 languages.
- Crowdsourced Content contributed by the general public. The authors of the content may be known or anonymous, the Global Assembly assumed no responsibility for the moderation of this type of content.

Information Contextualization Event

Figure 17:
Information
Contextualization
Event in Siwan,
Bihar, India



Community Hosts were asked to host an Information Contextualization Event to make sure that the final information materials were fully comprehensible to the Assembly Members. A fully translated draft of the Information Booklet was brought to each event by the Community Host, and invitees (including those from the initial pool of possible Assembly Members who were not selected) workshoped the draft together, editing the first translated draft and adding local examples to supplement understanding. Further, story-sharing about personal experiences with climate change and hopes for COP26 were designed to activate the community around the Assembly Member and unselected recruits.

Community Hosts were provided a protocol on how to host the event (See Annex 2.5).

There were **31 Information Contextualization Events**, comprising:
20 in-person events

Figure 18:
In-person Information
Contextualization
Event at Kwin 30
Village, Myanmar




Six online events

Figure 19:
Online Information
Contextualization
Event hosted
from Daejeon,
South Korea



Five hybrid events

Figure 20:
Hybrid Information
Contextualization
Event hosted by
Center for
Contemporary Art
'Typography' in
Krasnodar, Russia



Participant demographics

Organizers were asked to invite the final Assembly Member, unselected recruits from their initial recruitment pool and 5-20 other members of their community. Organizers were also asked to administer short surveys to participants to understand the demographics of each workshop.

Around 295 people participated in an Information Contextualization Event.

27 events (87%) included the final Assembly Member.

Assembly Members' participation in the event was encouraged to increase their familiarity with learning materials, but also to trial-run Zoom use and surface any other questions the Assembly Member might have before the start of the Core Assembly.

24 events (77%) included candidates who were not chosen by the algorithm.

How to include unselected candidates when using this method of selection in the process is a question that many deliberative processes grapple with. The Information Contextualization Event made it possible to include these community members in a constructive way.

Messages to COP26 from Information Contextualization Event participants can be found in Appendix 2.6.

Expert speakers and witnesses

Selection of speakers and witnesses

To support the learning journey of the Assembly Members, information was provided in two ways: via learning materials as described earlier, and video recorded presentations from expert speakers and witnesses. These individuals were selected by the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee, with the exception of some witnesses who were invited by the Core Delivery Team based on Assembly Members' requests after COP26.

Initially, members of the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee suggested a list of potential speakers and witnesses on the topics of fairness and effectiveness, and provided reasons for suggesting them. Following this, a list of criteria was identified for the selection, which included: expertise and recognition, gender, location (i.e. Global South or Global North) and ability to be a good communicator. Based on those criteria, the speakers and witnesses were selected.

“
I had trouble with
academic language as
I am not highly educated,
but this has been a dream
for me that I get education
from world scientists and
activists, particularly the
experience from the UN
and COP.”

Assembly Member, final survey

The role of expert speakers

Expert speakers had the primary role of providing the Assembly Members with evidence in an accessible and engaging way and highlighting trade-offs to be discussed in the deliberation phase of the Assembly.

In order to inform the Assembly Members' deliberation on the framing question — "How can humanity address the climate and ecological crisis in a fair and effective way?" — two expert speakers were selected by the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee to provide evidence on what the concepts of fairness and effectiveness meant in relation to the climate and ecological crisis. Their contributions, and those of others, are available on the [Global Assembly's YouTube channel](#).

Expert speaker on the concept of 'fairness'

The expert speaker who presented evidence on the concept of 'fairness' was Farhana Yamin.

Farhana Yamin is an environmental lawyer and expert on climate change, and development policy. She has advised leaders and ministers on climate negotiations for 30 years, representing small islands and developing countries. From 2013-2018, she was an advisor to the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) and has been deputy chair of the Expert Group of Advisors to the Climate Vulnerable Forum, a coalition of 48 of the world's most vulnerable countries that played a key role in the 2015 Paris Agreement negotiations.

Expert speaker on the concept of 'effectiveness'

The expert speaker who presented evidence on the concept of 'effectiveness' was Joeri Rogelj.

Dr Joeri Rogelj is Director of Research at the Grantham Institute, Imperial College, London. His research explores how societies can transform towards more sustainable futures, and crosses many disciplinary boundaries, connecting Earth system sciences to the study of societal change and policy. He was the Lead Author for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Sixth Assessment. He publishes on the effectiveness of international climate policy including the Paris Agreement, carbon budgets, the urgency of climate mitigation action, global net zero emission targets, the interaction between climate and sustainable development, emission pathways that limit global warming to 1.5°C and 2°C, and climate justice. He has been a lead author on the annual Emissions Gap Reports by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) since 2010. He was a Contributing Author to the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC, and served as a Coordinating Lead Author on mitigation pathways for the IPCC Special Report.

The role of witnesses

Following on from the expert speakers' presentations, the Assembly Members heard from witnesses who had a specific perspective or interpretation of the evidence, including perspectives gained from lived experience. Such witnesses included a range of people such as: representatives from advocacy groups, journalists, experts with a particular take on a topic, or the Assembly Members themselves.

The Assembly Members heard from 22 witnesses in total. The list is provided below in the order that they presented evidence to the Assembly members:

- Alok Sharma, COP26 President
- Vaine Wichman, Cook Islands Council of Women
- Saad Alfarargi, UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Development
- Jojo Mehta, Executive Director, Stop Ecocide
- Paul Ekin, Professor of Resources and Environment Policy, University College London
- Christopher Jackson, Petroleum Geoscientist, PetroVision Energy Nigeria Ltd
- Bob Watson, former Chair of the IPCC and IPBES, and Chair of the Knowledge & Wisdom Committee of the Global Assembly
- Laura Muwanguzi, Climate Justice Activist from Uganda
- Purnamita Dasgupta, Environmental Economist at the Institute of Economic Growth in Delhi
- Saleemul Huq, Director at the International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD)
- Hazel Healy, Co-Editor at the New Internationalist
- James Dyke, Assistant Director at the Global Systems Institute at the University of Exeter
- Assembly Member Sanjay from the UK
- Assembly Member Jan from Poland
- Assembly Member from Myanmar
- Stuart Capstick, Deputy Director at the Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations at Cardiff University

- Assembly Member Dalitso from Zambia
- Assembly Member Soren from Belgium
- Assembly Member Farhat from Pakistan
- Julia Steinberger, Professor of Ecological Economics at the University of Lausanne
- Ipshita Chaturvedi, Partner at Dentons Rodyk LLP Environment and Natural Resources practice
- Assembly Member Elizabeth from Nigeria

The Core Delivery Team would also like to acknowledge and thank a small number of experts whose generous contributions were ultimately not used due to time limitations and the delicate act of balancing the mix of subjects discussed.

All the recordings from the witnesses' presentations are available on the Global Assembly's [YouTube channel](#) apart from the presentation from the Assembly Member from Myanmar, who chose to only share his presentation with other Assembly Members in order to remain anonymous and to ensure his privacy was protected.

Supplemental Workbook development

The Supplemental Workbook comprises a series of resources that were used by Assembly Members to inform their deliberation on the climate and ecological crisis. Exercises in the Workbook were developed by members of the Process Team in parallel with development of the Information Booklet by the Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee.

Improving diversity of learning formats

In the development of the learning journey, it was determined that the process would have to be largely text-based due to the difficulty of translating alternative formats such as video or diagrams. By contrast, it was relatively trivial to superimpose translated labels onto Supplemental Workbook materials displayed in Miro. Therefore, rather than to introduce new information, the Workbook was designed primarily to support Assembly Members' comprehension of the Information Booklet through the inclusion of diverse formats. This section provides an overview of the methodologies behind Supplemental Workbook exercises used in the Core Assembly sessions (the complete Workbook can be found in Annex 6.2)

Figure 21:
Example of a panel
from the master
Miro board





Figure 22:
Example of a
Miro panel with
translation
labels added



01


Seven-Generation Anchoring

The Seven-Generation Anchoring Exercise (Figure 23) was designed to enable the translation of time-series data into narratives. It was inspired by the tradition of seven-generation decision-making attributed to the Iroquois Nation.

During the first session of the Core Assembly, Assembly Members shared their family histories, describing the lives of their great grandparents and an estimate of when they had been born. Members then described their own lives before describing their wishes for their great grandchildren (or their community's great grandchildren in the cases where they did not intend to have children themselves) with an estimate of when they might be born.


This activity produced an intergenerational timeline, indicating approximate and estimated birth dates of seven generations of each Assembly Member's family, with the Assembly Members themselves at the center. Sharing family histories and future possibilities in this way helped to build trust and empathy between Assembly Members, while simultaneously making them aware of the intergenerational context of environmental and climate change.

Figure 23: Miro panel containing the Seven-Generation Anchoring Exercise



The intergenerational family timelines of the Assembly Members were superimposed onto charts to enable their conversion into narratives in recognition of the fact that many Assembly Members had never encountered such graphs before. For example, a chart tracking levels of plant biodiversity over time (Figure 24) could be converted into a story: “between the time when your great grandmother was born and today, roughly 6,000 species of plants have become extinct.” In other words, the Seven-Generation Anchoring Exercise supported Assembly Members to understand how the events described by time-series data would have impacted, currently are impacting, and may yet impact themselves and their family.

Figure 24: Seven generations for four Assembly Members superimposed onto data for plant biodiversity loss




02

Illustrated comic of interconnectedness

This illustrated comic supplemented sections of the Information Booklet on biodiversity and interconnectedness. It was designed to support Assembly Members who prefer visual and narrative learning styles, and prompt additional story sharing around examples of interconnectedness by Assembly Members. The story was adapted from Tyson Yunkaporta's book, *Sand Talk*.

Figure 25: Miro panel containing the illustrated comic




03

Locating Assembly Members within geographic data

The geographic distribution of Assembly Members was superimposed on mapped data of predicted temperature and precipitation change. This exercise was designed to support Assembly Members' comprehension of the impacts of predicted changes by anchoring the data to their locations and those of their peers. Further, this exercise prompted deliberation on the varying levels of impact across different regions.

Figure 26: Miro panel containing geographical data with Assembly Member locations superimposed




“
It makes me feel sad because as well as mining, we can now expect famine because of climate change and maybe we won't make it”

Dalitso Banda, Assembly Member, Zambia, in response to viewing geographical climate projections.

04

Future scenarios

Figure 27: Miro panels containing graphical and tabular representation of future scenarios



As well as showing geographical projections, future scenarios of climate conditions and biodiversity loss, and their implications on society, were communicated by a collection of time series graphs and descriptive tables. These were used to describe several possible scenarios which depend on the nature and scale of human actions, all based on the latest IPCC report and academic sources.

Translation

The 'exchange language' for all deliberations in the Core Assembly was English. Simply put, this means that Facilitators spoke in English and all interventions were translated into English from Assembly Members' spoken languages. For 2021, English was chosen as the exchange language as it is the most commonly spoken language in the world when including second, third and fourth language speakers, and because of the local availability of English translators.

One of the main learnings from the Labs was to do with how best to make space for translation between languages. All methods required patience and some disruption to the flow of conversation. The least disruptive and accurate method was to encourage **real-time consecutive translation** (i.e. sentence-by-sentence or phrase-by-phrase, rather than large blocks). Speakers were also asked to leave a few moments' pause every few sentences rather than expecting translators to summarize a lengthy monologue after each speaker's contribution. This protocol was encouraged throughout all training sessions thereafter and during the Assembly itself.

Assembly Members' translation setups differed depending on how they were hosted during deliberations (see Figure 16). While a majority of Assembly Members were joined in-person by their translators, some received translations of others' interventions via a parallel mobile connection if attending deliberations from a different location as their translators.

In addition to the immense effort of Community Hosts and Breakout Facilitators to optimize multilingual dialogue, nonverbal communication played an essential role in building understanding and camaraderie between Assembly Members. Developed in the Deliberative Labs, a collection of hand signals were used regularly in the Core Assembly, not to mention by Global Assembly staff across the project (see Annex 6.1 Global Assembly Hand Signals).


Hosting participation in online deliberations

Given the diversity of access to internet and technology amongst Assembly Members, participation in online Zoom sessions was supported in multiple different ways by Community Hosts. Each hosting set-up was determined by the Community Host and Assembly Member, with the support of Cluster Facilitators and learnings from the Deliberative Labs.

64% of Assembly Members required translation from English to their preferred language in order to participate in deliberations.

Figure 28:
Translation requirements of Assembly Members

Did your participant need help with translation to be able to participate in the sessions of the Global Assembly



Further, as preempted during the Deliberative Labs, there was a wide variety of different hosting set-ups employed by Community Hosts.

Around 64% of Community Hosts reported that they hosted their Assembly Member in person. This meant that the Assembly Member was joined in-person by a translator (either a member of the Community Host organization or a third-party contractor), and sometimes a volunteer to support with tech issues and Miro usage. In many cases, the Assembly Member was provided transportation to join sessions at Community Host organization facilities.

Figure 29:
In-person hosting set-up for Assembly Member, Chom, from Thailand



About 23% of Community Hosts reported that they hosted their Assembly Member remotely. This meant that the Assembly Member generally joined deliberations from their own devices. If required, a translator joined the Zoom call from a separate site, but remained connected to the Assembly Member via a mobile connection to conduct translation.


About 5% of Community Hosts reported that they hosted their Assembly Member remotely, with an in-person volunteer. This meant that, in addition to the remote set-up described above, the Assembly Member was joined by an in-person volunteer, who was not able to translate, but did support the Member with tech-related issues and Miro usage.

Figure 30: Two different Assembly Members in China are each joined by an in-person volunteer (not shown in right) with their translator joining the meeting remotely from another location (notice mobile phone on table in right image providing a backchannel for translation).



The remaining 8% of Community Hosts engaged in a variety of alternative hosting methods, such as a hybrid format (a combination of in-person and remote hosting) or in-person with an additional volunteer for technical support. Further, a number of Community Hosts adapted their hosting setups during the Core Assembly, in order to better support their Assembly Member given new needs.

Figure 31: Variations in hosting formats used during the Core Assembly



Meeting schedule and logistics

The Core Assembly comprised participants and supporting personnel from all around the world. In order to maximize engagement, the Assembly Members were divided into smaller groups which could meet at an appropriate time in their local time zones. These are referred to as **Breakout Sessions**, a format also common in non-digital citizens' assemblies. Each Breakout Group comprised a Facilitator, a Notetaker and four to six Assembly Members, distributed to maximize cultural diversity within time zone windows.

Assembly Members were distributed across Breakout session meeting times as shown in Figure 32.





Figure 32: Breakout Session times (in Universal Coordinated Time) for each Assembly Member

On Saturdays, picked for the reason that it is the most common day off around the world, all Assembly Members met for Plenary Sessions. Plenaries took place from 12:00-15:00 UTC, which was the most equitable time window given Assembly Member's time zone distributions.

Figure 33: Histogram illustrating the number of Assembly Members online for a Plenary session at any given local time

Local times when Assembly Members were online for Plenary sessions



“
I have learned also
from my breakout
members and we
become like a family.
I’m gonna miss them
and miss all our
deliberations.”

Assembly Member, final survey.

Mediums and platforms

The Core Assembly used accessible online tools that worked at low internet bandwidth. The tools chosen are shown in Table 8

Table 8: Mediums and platforms used to deliver the Core Assembly

Tool	Purpose
Zoom	All Plenary and Breakout meetings of the Core Assembly, all training, all meetings of Hosting, Implementation and Process teams.
Miro	Live collaboration within Breakout Groups, presentation of translated learning materials, draft Declaration clauses for evaluation, etc.
PDF documentation	Dissemination of learning materials, Declaration drafts, etc. A printable backup to materials communicated on Miro.
Website forms	Capture feedback from Assembly Members and other personnel.
Email	Official communications amongst the broad Community of Practice and to external contributors.
WhatsApp	More time-sensitive communications between process designers, Global Support Team, and Hosting Circle.
Google Drive	All collaborative and organizational documentation, process planning, notes from deliberations, voting forms, translation tools, secure storage.

Co-Creation Method

The Co-Creation Method was designed to enable 100 Assembly Members, speaking 39 different languages, with varying degrees of education and literacy, to process their learnings, perspectives and collectively draft a shared statement asynchronously. The process (shown in Figure 34) was inspired by iterative design models, such as the double-diamond design process,^[23] that

alternate between an open idea generation phase and a period of consolidation where those ideas are brought together to draw out their common themes.

The Global Assembly's Co-Creation Process can be summarized in the following steps:

1. **Generate:** Assembly Members generate proposals (ie. Conversation Principles or inputs to the People's Declaration) in 20 Breakout Rooms.
2. **Consolidate:** Editors merge proposals from Breakout Rooms into a single draft.
3. **Comment:** Assembly Members provide comments in 20 Breakout Rooms.
4. **Consolidate:** Editors integrate comments into a revised draft.
5. **Comment:** Assembly Members provide further comments in 20 Breakout Rooms.
6. **Consolidate:** Editors integrate comments into another revised draft
7. **Vote:** Assembly Members vote on the draft. If not approved by majority, the process returns to step 5. The process of iterative review continues until time runs out in the Assembly. The production of an outcome was not presupposed in the conception of the Co-Creation Method; theoretically, it was possible for Assembly Members to leave any number of outputs unapproved at the end of the Assembly.

The approach sought to honor the Global Assembly's values, in particular to "create a platform for people to think, talk, listen, co-create and act together" (see all values on page 33). As such, it was critical that the Editors, who consolidated the inputs from Breakout Rooms, were independent from the Process Team and worked autonomously, communicating with a Process Team liaison only to align logistically.

After the close of the Core Assembly, Editors worked to consolidate the reasons that Assembly Members submitted for their assenting, dissenting or abstaining votes. These have been organized into the Explanatory Note (see Annex 2.18) as an ancillary document to the People's Declaration, providing further insight into the nuances of Assembly Members' views of their Declaration.

For a more detailed account of the iterative review involved in creating the People's Declaration, refer to "Journey of the Core Assembly" (page 122). For more information on how the Editors carried out the consolidation method, see "Editors" (pages 116-118).




Figure 34: Schematic illustration of the co-creation method used in the Core Assembly (AM = Assembly Member)

Voting method

In order to record the votes from the Assembly Members, a voting methodology was designed. There were four voting ‘moments’ during the Core Assembly: a vote on conversation principles in Block 2, a vote on the GA’s framing question and future vision during Block 3, a vote on the title and clauses of the People’s Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth in the form taken to COP26, and a vote on the refined Declaration at the end of the process.

In deciding on the voting procedure, several important factors had to be considered. Firstly, the system had to function in an online environment within Breakout Rooms or in a Plenary Session and allow for rapid, ideally real-time, collation of results. Ideally, it also needed to preserve anonymity and avoid the pitfalls of group-think. These parameters brought to mind applications like Mentimeter, but the Process Team were concerned that introducing a new tool might disenfranchise Assembly Members owing to the diversity of digital literacy amongst the cohort and their Community Hosts.

Furthermore, it was important that the tool was flexible and capable of rapidly aggregating results and presenting them in different ways. Ultimately, a spreadsheet seemed like the most blank and functional canvas to work with for this purpose. Given the technological and linguistic barriers mentioned above, Facilitators were chosen to act as intermediaries within the manageable and familiar environments of the regular Breakout Groups. The Facilitators (assisted by Notetakers as needed) were given instructions on how to record Assembly Members’ votes, submitted to them privately through the familiar Zoom chat feature. This meant that Community Hosts, Facilitators, Notetakers and the Global Support Team were able to see everyone’s votes but, crucially, they remained secret from each other and from the wider public. Copies of the four voting spreadsheets used can be accessed online via Annex 2.7.

This voting process worked relatively well, although it did take some groups much longer than others to record all the votes in a session and, in some cases, the use of the anonymous chat feature was not always executed perfectly. Mistakes and difficulties encountered were monitored and addressed by the Global Support Team as they happened and it was possible for the results of voting to be displayed at the end of the Plenary Session during which they were recorded. While not ideal from the perspectives of pure anonymity, speed and error avoidance, this voting system was considered to be the best approach given the budget, variations in digital literacy, and the time available for training.

Implementation roles **during the Core Assembly**

To make the Core Assembly happen required the coordinated actions of many individuals. These are summarized in Table 9 with certain roles detailed thereafter.

“

I really enjoyed getting to know the AMs in my Breakout - and feeling like a team working together with my Notetaker... and CHs/translators. Our room alone had a lot of logistical challenges to overcome, and every session reminded me that we are in this together.”

Deborah Tien, Breakout Facilitator

Existing roles	
100 Community Hosts^d	Each responsible for facilitating the attendance of one Assembly Member as well as the provision of translation/contextualization and payment
Nine Cluster Facilitator organizations	Each responsible for everyday communication with and providing assistance to a small number of Community Hosts
Hosting Circle Responsible for implementing deliberations in Breakout Groups and Plenary sessions. Also see Appendix 2.21.	
20 Breakout Facilitators	Each responsible for facilitating the deliberations of one Breakout Group
One Standby Breakout Facilitator	Responsible for filling in during Breakout Facilitator absences
Two Plenary Co-Facilitators	Responsible for leading Plenary Sessions
20 Notetakers	Each responsible for documenting the written record of deliberations in one Breakout Group and making this information available to Editors
Seven Standby Notetakers	Responsible for filling in during Notetaker absences if available
One Notetaker Coordinator	Responsible for training and managing the Notetaker team
Four Editors	Each responsible for collating the contributions of five Breakout Groups
One Editor Coordinator	Responsible for managing Editor workflow and consolidating the initial consolidations of Editors
Central coordination roles Roles held by Core Delivery Team to centrally support the delivery of the Core Assembly process	
Process Team	A subset of the Governance and Process Design Circle responsible for translating the high-level process into Session Plans in time for Core Assembly Breakout and Plenary Sessions
Global Support Team	Composed to centrally steer the Hosting Circle and troubleshoot any real-time issues with attendance or participation
Hosting Coordinator	An administrative role interfacing between multiple teams to support the practical hosting of deliberations
Observers	Responsible for observing Plenary Sessions and providing objective internal feedback

Table 9: Summary of Core Assembly implementation roles

Footnotes

d. 98 Community Hosts completed the process to the end. See section “The final 100 Assembly Members” (page 73).

Community Hosts

In addition to their pre-Assembly work to recruit Assembly Members and translate learning materials, the Community Hosts played an essential part during the actual Core Assembly deliberations. The following section outlines the role of Community Hosts during deliberations.

See Terms of References for Community Hosts in Annex 2.8.

Roles

- Host Assembly Member during deliberations, providing a venue, access to a device, high-bandwidth internet and tech support, if necessary
- Provide consecutive translation to Assembly Member to/from English, if necessary
- Support Assembly Member's comprehension or fulfillment of translated materials and forms

Personnel

- Members of a Community Host organization, plus any additional contracted or voluntary translators or tech-support assistants who were required

“
As a member of this global community, it is a moral imperative to be a part in changing the world for the better in a way that is inclusive and at the same time you are able to find your voice in the plurality of the human family.”

Yasmira Moner, Community Host, Philippines

Breakout Facilitators

Out of a total of 68 hours of process delivery, 36 hours took place in Breakout Groups of four to six Assembly Members. Each group was held and facilitated by the same Breakout Facilitator for the duration of the Core Assembly.



Figure 35: Breakout Facilitator team photo from final session

Overview

- Breakout Facilitators: Attend and facilitate one Breakout group of four-six Assembly Members throughout the duration of the Core Assembly
- Standby Facilitators: Facilitate Breakout Groups in the instance that the primary Breakout Facilitator is absent

Essential criteria

- English proficiency
- Commitment to attend all Breakout Sessions
- Previous facilitation experience on video conferencing platform
- Agility and flexibility to problem-solve when needs arise
- Organization and steering ability to ensure all agenda items in the process are covered during session

Profiles

- Experienced facilitators of diverse deliberative processes
- Selected for English language skills, problem solving skills and agility
- IT competence or online facilitation experience
- Assigned to Breakout Groups based on availability at session times

Desirable criteria

- Previous multilingual and/or multicultural facilitation experience
- Experience creating safe and brave spaces for dialogue with humility, empathy and integrity
- Tech-savvy and familiar with online cloud storage and collaboration tools, such as Miro

“
It was such an honor
and privilege to be
part of a great Global
Assembly team, as
a channel to impact
the world to be a
better place.”

Esther Owido, Breakout Facilitator

Breakout Facilitator Agreement

- I will put myself in service to what is needed.
- The principle of servant leadership requires me to be participant-centric and put my own views aside.
- I will read the process plan at least two times to prepare myself, test beforehand that my microphone and camera are working properly, be in touch with the Notetaker and ask the Process Team about anything I am unsure of.
- I will strive to listen with an open mind and heart to what they have to say through their translators and attempt to stand in their shoes to view the world through their eyes.
- Servant leadership is the road to empathy. I will be open to all concerns shared by participants, acknowledge and recognize the value in each, be honest about what I can address immediately, and those which I need to think about more deeply or consult my colleagues about.

See Annex 2.10 for the full list of Breakout Facilitator Agreements.

Facilitation Guide for Breakout Facilitators

Breakout Facilitators convened weekly with the Process Team throughout the duration of the Core Assembly to reflect on deliberations and surface best practices together. In addition to these meetings, Breakout Facilitators were randomly assigned into 'Family Groups' of four to five Facilitators to form group chats and schedule separate meetings. These were designed to encourage peer-to-peer learning and support.

“
I really valued having the hosting circle time on Mondays to debrief and learn from fellow Facilitators and Notetakers. Also found the WhatsApp group and 'peer mentoring group' super helpful.”

Tina Puryear, Breakout Facilitator

A typical week for a Breakout Facilitator would proceed as follows:

Monday:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Attend Hosting Circle to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Debrief with fellow Facilitators on deliberations and surface best practices— Learn and discuss process plans for the following week with Process Team
Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Attend and facilitate Breakout Group deliberations— Learn process plans asynchronously from Process Team, if there is a delay
Saturday:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Attend Plenary Session and facilitate original Breakout Group or Mixed Groups during breakouts

Plenary Co-Facilitators

Role

- Facilitate Plenary Sessions
- Lead Hosting Circle meetings to guide reflection and surfacing of best practices

Profiles

- Experienced facilitators with:
 - Leadership and peer-mentoring experience
 - Large-group facilitation experience

Plenary Co-facilitators worked closely with the Process Team to plan **Weekly Hosting Circle Meetings**. In particular, they lead the first hour of the meetings on reflections and surfacing learnings or best practices.

Every Saturday, Plenary Co-Facilitators hosted the **Core Assembly Plenary Session**, leading warm up exercises, introducing guest speakers, and managing transition times between Breakout and Plenary Sessions.

See Annex 2.11 for Plenary Co-Facilitator Terms of Reference.



A memorable moment was when we invited everyone in the call (around 300 participants) to start their microphones and say hello in their own language. This was a bold request as we knew that it was going to be chaotic; there was chaos, but it was beautiful and powerful. We heard the diversity in the many languages spoken, but most importantly I heard and felt the joy, respect, and passion, it was extraordinary. It was a memorable moment not only because of the diversity but it was also a reminder that as a Facilitator, it's important to dance in the space between chaos and order with the belief that this is the space where the magic happens, and creativity emerges."

Mar/Charo Lanao, Plenary Co-Facilitator

Notetakers

Role

- Record the deliberations of Assembly Members in a document
- Prepare Miro board with translations before sessions
- Operate real-time translation tool if required
- Assist Assembly Members and Facilitator with technical issues
- Share specific outputs for Editors to consolidate

Values

- Global Assembly values
- An emphasis on neutrality and accuracy
- Non-interference with process
- Responsible custodianship of Assembly Members' expressed opinions

Profiles

- Young people from around the world, engaged in community work or postgraduate studies
- Selected for English language skills and IT competence
- Assigned to Breakout Groups based on availability at session times

See Annex 2.12 for Notetaker Terms of Reference.

Notetaker Agreements

- I understand that my work constitutes the definitive written record of deliberations and take this responsibility seriously.
- Adaptability can be practiced through continuous practice on Miro in order to accurately report what is being said and present it in an organized manner.
- I will not add or subtract from that which is expressed by participants. I will not embellish, emphasize, de-emphasise or in any other way alter the meaning of their words as received in English directly or via translator.

See Annex 2.13 for the full list of Notetaker Agreements.



Figure 36: Notetaker team photo from final session

Any citizens' assembly requires accurate notes of its deliberations and outcomes to be recorded. Often, this task will be conducted by Facilitators but, for the challenging environment of the Global Assembly, - it was decided that it would be better to form a dedicated team of Notetakers who could also double up as technical support. The Notetaker team consisted of around 20 Notetakers (one assigned to each Breakout Group) and around seven Standby Notetakers. Notetakers were expected to uphold the values of the Global Assembly with a particular emphasis on neutrality, and an awareness that they would be responsible for capturing the record of what was expressed during the sessions.

“
It was unexpected to see how people from different backgrounds connected, empathized, and even laughed together, finding a way also to go beyond their daily dimensions, learning mutual respect and maybe widening their horizons.”

Midori Yajima, Notetaker, Italy

The Notetaker role was advertised as described above and applicants invited to complete a short form on the Global Assembly website. A shortlist of the most qualified applicants were selected approximately in proportion to the number required for each timezone, and were asked to make a short follow-up video to support their application and make it possible to better assess their proficiency in English. Of these an initial cohort of 25 were selected for onboarding and training.

Training was initially based on the processes established in the Labs (see “Trialing the process: Deliberative Labs”, page 77), emphasizing live interactions on Miro and live translation via the Translation Spreadsheet, so a training curriculum was delivered based on these. During the first few sessions of the Core Assembly, the Notetaking process was reinvented rapidly, first by a major shift of emphasis away from direct Assembly Member interaction with Miro, and then towards a more traditional document-based process rather than noting everything down through the Translation Spreadsheet. This latter change was co-created between the Notetaker Coordinator and members of the Notetaker team at the weekly Hosting Circle meeting between sessions 2.2P and 2.3B, and phased in by 3.1B.

“
I also really liked that the hosting circle met on Mondays and that the feedback given there fed right back into the process.”

Emma Obermair, Notetaker, UK

Training continued for several weeks into the Core Assembly due to a small number of Notetakers dropping out and thus necessitating new recruits. The less Miro-focused process meant that it was easier to conduct this training over one or two short sessions. By the end of Block 2, there was a solid team of 20 Notetakers and seven Standby Notetakers, with several members of the wider Global Assembly team also filling in from time to time in emergencies. Notetakers were supported by the Notetaker Coordinator who produced written and video guidelines for Miro setup and other important workflow details, and the team was coordinated via email and a WhatsApp group. Standby Notetakers were offered observation slots of sessions so that they could stay up-to-date with the process, and all team members were encouraged to schedule a meeting with the Notetaker Coordinator if they had anything pressing to discuss.

During a typical day, Notetakers received instructions from the Notetaker Coordinator to prepare the Miro board and notetaking document. During the session, Notetakers would record all Assembly Member responses and conversation as verbatim as possible and assist the Facilitator if necessary. After the session, Notetakers would finalize notes and submit outputs into the shared database, or **Input-Output Spreadsheet**.



I would love for the Global Assembly to keep fighting this lovely battle in order to change the face of decision-making and give global citizens a seat at the table. It is honestly quite lovely seeing sustainability and equity be the focal point of decision-making, and I would love for one of the resolutions to be implemented worldwide.”

Lea Bou Salman, Notetaker, Lebanon

Editors

Overview

- Editor Coordinator: Liaise with process team to design workflow, consolidate four Editors’ work into final consolidation for iterative review
- Editor: Consolidate raw comments from 5 Breakout Groups each

Profiles

- Independent Editor team not involved in previous work in the Global Assembly
- Trained facilitators
- Experience in copywriting

See Annex 2.14 for Editor Terms of Reference.

Editor Agreements

- We strive to express the collective views of the Assembly Members in the best way in writing
- When editing the words of Assembly Members, I must strive to give them all equal value and not make biased assumptions about what is meant behind the words – simply to represent them as they are
- We will work carefully on the feedback that the Assembly Members will provide on the drafts

See Annex 2.15 for the full list of Editor Agreements.

“

The process flows from a deliberative collection of ideas, edited into a more concise format in each iteration, to a succinct Declaration for world leaders. Every iteration is tracked with Member comments, and every single Global Assembly Member contribution is considered in the versions leading up to the final Declaration. Most importantly, the process is Member driven – to be truly democratic, at each stage of grouping arguments, Members agreed and informed this decision making and they dictated the editing sessions.”

Amy Campbell, Editor Coordinator

“

One thing that stood out was how the Members’ thoughts, opinions, and reflections were taken into account to improve each successive session. As a result, they not only felt heard but they also felt empowered to bring lasting change in their corners of the world.”

Susan K, Breakout Facilitator

A typical week’s consolidation process for Editors was as follows:

<p>Step 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Attend Hosting Circle meeting to understand process and consolidation needs — Editor Coordinator drafts workflow and communicates deadlines, meeting with Process Team liaison when necessary
<p>Step 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Once Notetakers populate Input-Output Spreadsheet with raw inputs, Editors copy and paste raw inputs into consolidation template prepared by Editor Coordinator <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p style="text-align: center;">INTEGRATION OF Comments on previous clauses (Awareness & Education Version)</p> <p>Task: To integrate new comments into previous clauses</p> <p><u>Section 1: All comments</u> <STEP 1: TRANSFER ALL RAW COMMENTS FROM ROW #99 IN IOS></p> <p>Breakout A1</p> <p>Breakout A2</p> <p>Breakout A3</p> <p>Breakout A4</p> <p><u>Section 2: Categorizing comments into clauses</u> <STEP 2: CATEGORIZE & INTEGRATE THE COMMENTS ABOVE INTO THE SPECIFIC CLAUSE THEY CORRESPOND TO></p> <p>ORIGINAL VERSION: (3iv) Awareness should be raised on climate change and citizen participation through education and media.</p> <p>EDITED VERSION: (3iv)</p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Editor consolidates, or integrates, raw inputs from five Breakout Rooms, marking/tracking which raw comments are being used to do so
<p>Step 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Editor Coordinator consolidates into a final consolidated draft to share with Assembly Members for review

The same process was also followed to consolidate questions from Assembly Members which could be answered by the governance advisory committees or Core Delivery Team.

Process Team

The Process Team consisted of four members of the Governance and Process Design Circle who were responsible for translating the high-level process, designed under the independent guidance of both governance advisory committees, into Session Plans in time for Core Assembly Breakout and Plenary Sessions. Members of the Process Team tied together a number of different circles of work, including the Stewardship, Knowledge and Deliberative Labs coordination.

Hosting Coordinator

The Hosting Coordinator was recruited from the pool of volunteers helping with Community Host recruitment. Responsibilities included scheduling and being the Zoom host of Plenary Sessions, liaising and assisting the Process Team with last minute preparations, constructing and managing voting spreadsheets, as well as other general tasks involving the coordination of the Hosting Circle. The Hosting Coordinator also served as the Notetaker Coordinator.

Observers

Observers were invited to witness and provide internal feedback on Plenary Sessions. Observers included:

- Members of the External Research Team
- Cluster Facilitators
- Members of the Central Circle who were not directly involved in the session-by-session process but may have had input into the broader process design

Observers were each assigned to a Breakout Room within any given Plenary Session in which they watched unobtrusively with their cameras and microphones off. After sessions they were invited to fill in feedback forms and attend the debrief meeting. Their contributions were incredibly valuable to the continuous refinement of hosting procedures and the process in general. See Annex 2.16 for the Observer Guidelines.


Putting it all together: delivering the deliberations

Throughout the Core Assembly, all Hosting Circle and Core Delivery Team personnel executed their roles, comprising one piece in a larger puzzle necessary to deliver deliberations and guide the Assembly Members in co-creating the People's Declaration. Figure 37 paints a picture of how these roles fit together to execute the Core Assembly.

A week in the Core Assembly


Step 1: Process Team designs deliberative process

GGPAC & KWAC contribute inputs at the beginning of the process.



Step 2: Hosting circle preparations

Every Monday during Hosting Circle Meetings, Notetakers, Facilitators & Editors debrief on the previous week's deliberations and learn the necessary preparations for the following week.




Breakout Facilitators

Facilitators explore this week's deliberative process with the Process Team.

Editors

Editor coordinator meets with Process Team liaison to confirm deadlines for consolidation.




Editor coordinator shares finalized workflow with Editors and assigns each Editor to consolidate outputs from 5 Breakout Rooms



Notetakers

Notetaker Coordinator meets with Process Team to confirm Miro needs for this week's deliberative process.



Notetaker Coordinator completes a master template Miro board and populates the Input-Output Spreadsheet) with necessary inputs. E.g. if a new consolidated draft needs to be reviewed by Assembly Members, the Notetaker Coordinator copies the new draft, consolidated by Editors into the spreadsheet.




Each Notetaker sets up their Breakout Room's Miro board based on the master template provided.

Figure 37: Diagram summarizing a typical week in the Core Assembly

Step 3: Deliberations

Breakout Facilitators steer the conversation, based on the Process Plan, Community Hosts translate the conversation to enable Assembly Members to deliberate with one another, and Notetakers record any outputs from the Assembly Members, which will be consolidated by the Editors in the next step.



Step 4: Iterative review of deliberation outputs

Editors consolidate the outputs of each deliberation into consolidated drafts for review. New drafts are communicated to the Process Team, who liaises with the Notetaker Coordinator to ensure they are included in the Miro board for future deliberations.

The journey of the Core Assembly

This section contains an outline of how the Core Assembly progressed. Sessions were grouped into blocks and numbered to reflect the block and session number within that block. A 'B' or a 'P' was appended to that number to indicate if it was a Breakout or Plenary Session.

“

The process plan was sometimes a challenge because of the time when it arrived, but I loved how it was structured to ensure we were all doing the same.”

Maria Nube, Breakout Facilitator


“

The detailed process plan... gave a balanced approach to facilitation (enough guidance to encourage uniform delivery of the same message across breakout rooms. But, enough flexibility to adapt to the unique dynamics of each Breakout Room)”

Susan K, Breakout Facilitator

Block 1

Understanding the current situation



In Block 1, Assembly Members were inducted into the project, began their learning journey on the climate and ecological crisis and story-sharing about their own lived experiences and backgrounds. By the end of the Block, Assembly Members had co-created and reviewed the first version of their Conversation Principles, consolidated by the Editors. They had also completed introductory chapters on the climate and ecological crisis in the Information Booklet, with the support of Supplemental Workbooks and linked this information to their own family timelines.


“

After seeing the illustration, I felt fear, sadness and anger. Fear because the dangers and effects of climate change brought us here. Sad because poor people, who are helpless will be highly affected. Angry because we cannot find an urgent solution to it, partners are not taking quick action.”

Angelito, Assembly Member, Philippines

Block 2

Reviewing scenarios, pathways and principles



In Block 2, Assembly Members heard from speakers and witnesses, in addition to engaging with the Information Booklet and Supplemental Workbook. By the end of Block 2, Assembly Members had approved, by majority vote, their Conversation Principles. Where, in Block 1, the learning focus had been on the basics of the current climate and ecological crisis, in Block 2, Assembly Members focused on projected future impacts of the crisis, current governance models and how questions of fairness apply to pathways for addressing the crisis. Using these learnings, Assembly Members began generating inputs for their submission(s) to COP26, which the Editors would begin consolidating at the beginning of Block 3.

“

I know that in trying to create an emission free world it will take sacrifice. We will lose a lot of things.”

Dalitso Banda, Assembly Member, Zambia

“

There are so many political gaps in the international level.”

Ramdulari Devi, Assembly Member, India

“

We should build up a new social transformation together – a new social norm or decision-making standard – to help the society to realize such kind of [economic, social and environmental] transformation.”

Anonymous Assembly Member, China


“

It's not good to make decisions when people are not together!”

Guillaume Kasse, Assembly Member, Democratic Republic of Congo

Block 3

Developing submissions to COP26



In Block 3, Assembly Members primarily generated inputs for their submissions to COP26, drawing on previous learnings as well as information from new speakers and witnesses, the Information Booklet and Supplemental Workbook materials. By the end of Block 3, Assembly Members had learned about two rights frameworks, the ecocide initiative and heard two contrasting perspectives on fossil fuel subsidies. They also conducted two interactive reviews on their COP26 submissions which were consolidated by Editors. In the final two sessions of Block 3, Assembly Members approved, by majority vote, the framing question of the Global Assembly and their COP26 submission, entitled "People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth".

“

We found it interesting in our breakout group that a human right to a clean environment did not already exist, and that the rights of Earth did not also exist. Even the Earth’s rights are human rights.”

Scott Palmer, Assembly Member, USA


“

The thing that we are doing now, the Assembly, is a step forward, a step to justice, that each person has his/her voice and has the chance to be heard. Probably in the future as we have more and more people in the discussions involving more people like indigenous people and disadvantaged groups. It is a step forward in terms of equal and fair discussion.”

Tatiana Koroleva, Assembly Member, Russia

Block 4

Participation and observation at COP26



In Block 4, Assembly Members each observed at least eight hours of COP26 online, and shared their reflections on an online form after each event. In the two sessions of Block 4, Assembly Members reflected on COP26, heard the perspectives of invited speakers, and surfaced new themes they were interested in discussing further during Block 5. These themes were crowdsourced from the cohort and prioritized by order of popularity by the Process Team.

“
When I read [the People’s Declaration],
I feel something is improving me, making
me a better person and connecting me
to nature!”

Dejan Bošnjaković, Assembly Member, Italy


“

For 10 days, [COP26] was going as we were expecting, it was on the right direction. But at the end when the decision should have been taken, many governments just stepped back and all the discussions that we had been building in our Global Assembly meetings, all the agenda that we adapted thoroughly, weren't appreciated. It gave me sorrow as well as a sense of something very uneasy inside, so where will we take the mission next? Maybe this is a question for everybody around us.”

Dhirendra Kumar, Assembly Member, India

Block 5

Review commitments and future agenda setting



In Block 5, Assembly Members learned about and deliberated on the top three most popular topics requested by their peers in Block 4. These were: Awareness and Education, Energy Transition, and Monitoring and Enforcement. They also conducted an iterative review on the existing clauses in the People's Declaration and generated new clauses and sections. By the end of Block 5, Assembly Members had conducted four iterative reviews on the People's Declaration, amending existing clauses and adding new ones. During the final session of the Core Assembly, Assembly Members finalized the People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth by majority voting.

“

I would say the promises are quite aligned with the declaration but I am skeptical on how ready they are to apply them and how aligned they would be with these promises, how this is monitored and how it would be enforced etc.”

Anonymous Assembly Member, India

“

It is sad to observe that we are far from equity, that our indigenous people are still in threat, and that our government is not aligned to the climate change objectives, because of this, we are not sure about the power of the Blue Zone nor of the Green Zone.”

Izildete Botelho, Assembly Member, Brazil

“

I think the declaration is an opportunity to engage civil society; it should be a part, not just the governments of the countries... I love the Global Assembly idea and our Declaration, but I have a big concern about how civil society should interact with governments, to monitor and [make] them comply.”

Mary Nassr, Assembly Member, Syria

“

We worked really hard together... We were very respectful to each other and everybody was heard. I appreciate this kind of working together. We really were discussing not on a superficial level but we really went into the details.”

Helganna, Assembly Member, Germany

“

People’s Declaration is the voice of the Earth. We are their little voice, we are conveying the Earth’s anxiety.”

Willy, Assembly Member, Indonesia

Assembly Members' perceptions on the climate and ecological crisis

Assembly Members were invited to complete several surveys throughout the course of the Core Assembly: after their induction session, session 2 (1.2P), session 9 (3.1B), session 12 (3.4P), session 14 (4.2P) and the last session (5.6P). The following sections describe some of this data, beginning with Assembly Members' changing perceptions of the climate and ecological crisis. The response rate for each survey was:

- Induction survey: 92%
- Session 2 survey: 90%
- Session 9 survey: 97%
- Session 12 survey: 27%
- Session 14 survey: 82%
- Final session survey: 71%

Please note that these surveys were anonymized before analysis so it was not possible to attribute the comments made in these surveys, presented here as quotations, to the person who made the comment.

Concern, interests and emotions



Frankly speaking, I was thinking that all this is useless for me but as sessions happened I realized how important that is for me and others.”

Assembly Member, final survey

At the beginning of the learning phase, a little over half of the Assembly Members were 'very concerned' about the climate and ecological crisis and 'very interested' in talking about it (see Figure 38 and Figure 39). These two figures increased to around 75% by the end of the Core Assembly, by which time almost everyone was at least 'somewhat concerned' and everyone was at least 'somewhat interested' in talking about it. For both measures, there is a notable step between Sessions 9 and 12 which corresponds to the period in which Assembly Members were composing the first version of the People's Declaration, which may be due to a greater depth of discussion occurring at this time.

Figure 40 provides some insight into the emotional journey, albeit with only three data points. It is interesting that emotions tended to peak at Session 14, shortly after observing COP26 and with the benefit of two sessions to comprehend the outcomes. By the end of the process the emotional intensity had generally returned to pre-deliberation levels, suggesting perhaps that Assembly Members were able to process and adapt to the more heightened feelings they felt after the 'rollercoaster' of COP26, and sessions which followed it directly.

Figure 38: Change in Assembly Members' interest in discussing the climate and ecological crisis




Figure 39: Change in Assembly Members' concern about the climate and ecological crisis





Figure 40:
The trajectory
of Assembly
Members'
emotions
throughout the
Core Assembly



Confidence about the future

Over the 20 sessions of the Core Assembly, the Assembly Members appear to have lost some confidence though still remain relatively hopeful; high confidence being replaced by moderate confidence (Figure 41). When asked if the Global Assembly itself could make a difference (Figure 42), the results are generally positive, although drop significantly (17% drop in 'a lot of confidence') after observing COP26, possibly due to the limited awareness of the Global Assembly in public discourse and the lack of any acknowledgement of the Declaration by world leaders. Belief in the Global Assembly's role later recovered to a similar level expressed at the outset, as Assembly Members gained more nuanced insight from speakers on their preferred subjects and rallied to refine and ratify the final version of their Declaration. During the final questionnaire, Assembly Members expressed a predominantly middling to quite negative perception of whether "politicians care about the members of the Global Assembly" (Figure 43). This negativity alongside the restoration of confidence in the Assembly's ability to make a difference suggests a certain acceptance that its aims will be difficult to realize, yet ultimately possible and worth the effort.

Figure 41: Change in Assembly Members' confidence that humanity can deal with the climate and ecological crisis




Figure 42: Change in Assembly Members' opinion of whether the Global Assembly can make a difference





Figure 43: The extent to which Assembly Members think that politicians care about them

How much would you say that politicians care about the members of the Global Assembly (for instance at COP)?



Who is responsible for addressing the climate and ecological crisis?

Between the beginning of the Core Assembly and Session 14 (after COP26), we see an increase in the perceived responsibility of all actors to address the climate and ecological crisis (Figure 44), with government actors almost universally considered highly responsible. Only individuals are granted something of a reprieve, peaking in perceived responsibility at Session 9 with a responsibility index of 70 (compared to 85-90 for government actors) before falling to 65 at Session 14, the same figure as charities. Data was not collected about the responsibility of businesses after Session 14, but even if it leveled off or dropped slightly, it would have been likely to remain high.





Figure 44: Line chart indicating the relative responsibility which Assembly Members assigned to different actors at three different times during the Core Assembly. Note 1: the normalized responsibility index was calculated using the following method: (1) assign a numerical valence and magnitude to each of the 5 responses such that 'Not responsible' = -2, 'Slightly responsible' = -1, 'Somewhat responsible' = 0, 'Quite responsible' = 1 and 'Very responsible' = 2; (2) multiply the fraction of respondents who selected each option by this valence number; (3) sum all of these multiplied values for each actor; (4) normalize all values such that the maximum value for the whole dataset equals 100. Note 2: the question was not asked about businesses in the Session 14 survey which is why that line appears to be incomplete.

In addition to assigning responsibility, Assembly Members explored possible pathways for responsible actors to consider. Figure 45 shows that after the Assembly, respondents showed increased support for citizen involvement in local and global decision making (both around 10% more agree or completely agree), especially at the local level, as well as a slight increase in support for more scientific expertise in policy making (4% more agree or completely agree). Faith in multilateral collaboration between governments remained almost static, but this was high from the start, with close to 90% of respondents voicing agreement or complete agreement.

Figure 45:
Assembly
Members'
opinions about
what is needed
to deal with
the climate and
ecological crisis

What do you think is needed to deal with the climate and ecological crisis?
We need... (respondents who 'agree' or 'completely agree')



Activation and engagement

Part of the Theory of Change for the Global Assembly involves the activation of participants such that their self and/or collective-efficacy builds through engagement. In addition to perceiving the process itself as a valuable experience, the aim is that participants are more likely to take action as a result of their participation in the Global Assembly.

Assembly Members activation

Perception of influence

Over time, Members tended to feel that they had slightly more influence at the local level than at national or global levels, although the positive change was more pronounced for the larger scales (Figure 46). This is shown by a fall in the two most negative responses, expressing 'very little influence' or 'no influence', from 30% to 21% (9% drop) for local decision-making compared to 45% to 32% (13% drop) for national decision-making and 47% to 32% (15% drop) for global decision-making. In all categories they ended the process with a greater sense of influence than they started with, although this is far less pronounced for the national and global level if we only consider the two most positive responses, expressing 'a great deal' or 'a lot' of influence, which show only 5% and 1% improvement, respectively. In comparison, perception of personal influence in addressing the climate and ecological crisis, and influence over local decision-making improved by 18% and 16%, respectively.

It is interesting to note that pessimism is at its lowest after Session 12, just before COP26, and how a lack of agency returns after observing the conference's proceedings. This is likely to be due to a feeling of empowerment during the writing of the Declaration, followed by the observation of world leaders' lack of engagement with it, and disappointment with the final wording of the Glasgow Pact. Indeed, this feeling of relative powerlessness upon exposure to global governance is testament to the crisis of representation which could be addressed by a more prominent place for citizens' assemblies at national and global levels.

How much influence do you feel you have personally on the following aspects?




Figure 46: Assembly Members' changing perception of their personal influence in four areas

“ I expected more influence in the decisions made at COP26. I understood it is a collective effort of governments, corporations, fossil fuel companies, NGOs, [and] communities [which] have to take responsibility and work towards a common goal.”


Assembly Member, final survey

Interest in political engagement and leadership


Survey responses collected around political interest show a notable but not universal growth in engagement among Assembly Members. There was a notable increase in the number of Assembly Members who were ‘very likely’ to organize a community activity through which to share their learnings (31% to 44%), although a rise in neutral responses prevented the two positive options from gaining much ground collectively (see Figure 47 top). We also see a noticeable decrease in political apathy from where it was before the Assembly began, conveyed by the reported decreasing disinterest in politics (44% to 29%, see Figure 47 bottom left) and increased likelihood of attending a public sector meeting in future (44% to 57% ‘very likely’ or ‘likely’, see Figure 47 bottom right).

Figure 47: Three dimensions of Assembly Members’ political interest before and after the Global Assembly


How likely are you to organize a community activity to share your learnings from the Global Assembly?



How interested would you say you are in politics?



How likely would it be for you to attend a government or public sector meeting in the next year?



Questions posed during the Core Assembly’s final session (Figure 48) show that a majority of Assembly Members expressed an interest in advocating for the Assembly, and speaking publicly about their personal experiences at international events (83%). Most also wanted to stay actively involved with the Global Assembly in the following year (85%), receive passive updates (91%), and invite other actors to endorse and contribute to their People’s Declaration (82%).




Figure 48: Assembly Members' aggregate responses to several questions about the future of the Global Assembly, posed during the final Plenary Session of 2021

Perception of the Global Assembly methodology

Other questions asked during the final session (Figure 48, lower two bars) reveal a broadly positive outlook on global citizens' assemblies as a methodology. An overwhelming majority (88%) indicated the preference for the Global Assembly to become a permanent part of global decision-making. They were also keen to see another assembly formed in the near future to continue the work they have begun in mobilizing citizen deliberation to address the climate and ecological crisis (89%).


Focusing on the ways in which global citizens' assemblies can be useful (Figure 49), Assembly Members increasingly recognized the format to be a 'very good' or 'rather good' way to raise awareness (90% to 96%), enhance fairness (84% to 93%) and learn about other perspectives (88% to 96%). However, enthusiasm dropped off slightly for the ability of global citizens' assemblies to develop coherent strategy (92% to 86%) and influence policy makers (91% to 87%). These drops may correspond to an increasing awareness of the complexity of global politics, yet we should recognize that the minimum positive sentiment across all categories in Figure 49 was still very high, at 84%, indicating that global citizens' assemblies were perceived to be a valuable tool in addressing all of these important outcomes.

Figure 49:
Trajectory of
Assembly Member
opinions about the
effectiveness of
a global citizens'
assembly



By the end of the process, over half (59%) of Assembly Members also supported the use of lottery processes for the selection of decision-makers in general (Figure 50) although many were not sure (31%). This meta question and others like it could be given more attention in future global citizens' assemblies.


Figure 50:
Assembly
Members'
propensity to
recommend a
lottery selection
process for
selecting
decision-makers,
before and after
the Assembly



At an individual level, almost all Assembly Members felt that their participation in the Global Assembly's Core Assembly was a 'very' (76%) or 'quite' (21%) valuable experience for them personally, with several Members echoing this in their personal comments (see Figure 51 and following quotes). Such high levels of satisfaction are not uncommon amongst participants of citizens' assemblies.^[11, 24]

Figure 51: Personal value obtained by Members through their Assembly experience

To what extent would you say that participating in the GA was a valuable experience for you personally?



“
A very valuable experience to be able to share concerns and find solutions together for the common good.”

Assembly Member, final survey

“
Pleasant, full of knowledge and information, enlightening.”

Assembly Member, final survey

“

It is a lifetime changing experience. I have never been properly educated and never thought that I would meet people from different countries and learn things I have never thought [were] important.”

Assembly Member, final survey

Community Host activation and engagement

Community Hosts were surveyed at the end of the Core Assembly to provide their perspective on the process and their critical role in it. This eclectic array of community organizations were the interface between each Assembly Member and every aspect of Global Assembly operations, thus the importance of their perspectives cannot be overstated. This long survey was administered in two parts, and had response rates of 62% and 65%.

With this in mind, it is heartening to see that the vast majority of Community Hosts ‘agreed’ or ‘completely agreed’ that attending the Core Assembly sessions was a rewarding experience (83%, see Figure 52) and interest in remaining actively involved with the Assembly was high (80%, see Figure 53). While future location lotteries will be the primary decider of who can serve in this role hereafter, the organizations involved in this pilot incarnation of the Global Assembly represent a hugely valuable addition to any group promoting the use of these kinds of processes in the future.




Figure 52: The extents to which Community Hosts enjoyed attending Core Assembly session and COP26 events

Would you be interested in remaining part of the Global assembly?




Figure 53: The proportion of Community Hosts interested in remaining part of the Global Assembly

The majority of Community Hosts attended the majority of sessions with their Assembly Member (75% 'all' or 'most', see Figure 54). Those who didn't were most likely the ones who were not also acting as translators and for whom physical hosting and technical assistance were not required. COP26 events were less well attended by Community Hosts, which was to be expected due to the timing of these being less regular and the fact that viewing these sessions was intended to be done asynchronously.




Figure 54: Community Host's self-reported attendance at Core Assembly sessions and COP26 events

Beyond feelings about the Global Assembly itself, Figure 55 shows that many Community Hosts expressed an increased interest ('somewhat' or 'much more') in both politics (34%) and the climate and ecological crisis (73%). The fact that this change in interest is less profound for politics may be because many Community Host organizations were already quite politically attuned. Similarly, concern about the climate and ecological crisis had been relatively high at the

outset (72% 'very' or 'quite' concerned, yet this concern still grew for around two thirds (67%) of Community Host organizations (see Figure 56).

It is difficult to discern how much influence Community Hosts had on the changing opinions of Assembly Members and how well they were able to conduct themselves as neutral enablers of participation. While it is desirable for them to be something of a conduit for Assembly Member activation, this becomes detrimental if they bring pre-existing biases to the process. The fact that more than 80% reported that they were already experiencing the effects of climate change (Figure 56, lower bar) illustrates a level of vigilance on the matter which exceeds the global average, but this could itself be a result of participating in the Assembly.




Figure 55: Community Host organizations' changing interest in politics and the climate and ecological crisis





Figure 56: Three dimensions of Community Hosts' concern about the climate and ecological crisis

When asked about their perceived level of influence on the climate and ecological crisis and the decision making around it, Community Hosts reported a similar distribution of sentiments as the Assembly Members did in their final survey (compare Figure 46 and Figure 57). This consistency suggests a certain uniformity of thought between Community Hosts and their Assembly Members, at least in aggregate,^e or may simply represent a distribution that would be replicated for any cohort who had engaged with the same process. Almost exactly half of Assembly Members reported that these perceptions had changed as a direct result of their involvement in the Global Assembly (data not shown), which provides good evidence for successful activation.



Part of the role of Community Hosts, particularly as members of an enduring Community of Practice, is to engage with and promote the Global Assembly and deliberative democracy on various media platforms. In Figure 58, we see a strong preference for community-based engagement (not surprising when you consider the profile of these organizations), some activity on social media and relatively little with the local press, perhaps because it is so much easier to publish on social media than through other media platforms.

Footnotes

e. Comparing responses for Assembly Member and Community Host pairs shows no obvious correlation.

Have you made additional effort to engage with or communicate about the GA with or on...




Figure 58: Extent of Community Hosts' communications activities around the Global Assembly

According to Figure 59, more than half of Community Hosts were not familiar with citizens' assemblies or sortition processes before their involvement in the Global Assembly. Given this new found awareness, almost 60% of respondents would now like to see lottery-selection applied more widely (a perspective which for 16% of respondents had changed as a result of participating in the Assembly) and more than a quarter would like to explore more uses of the method.




Figure 59: Community Hosts' pre-existing knowledge and subsequent opinions about citizens' assemblies

Less than one third (28%) of Community Host organizations had been politically engaged enough to attend a public meeting in the years leading up to the Assembly (data not shown), yet 72% now say they are 'likely' or 'very likely' to attend such an event (Figure 60). This lends strong support to the ability of citizens' assemblies to activate people politically. On top of this, almost 90% are interested in arranging events to communicate the learnings and outputs of the Global Assembly. This is much higher than the similar question posed to Assembly Members (see above), but is perhaps to be expected given that Community Host organizations are already involved in this kind of work.




Figure 60: Two indicators of Community Hosts' political engagement

Evaluation of the process

An important part of the regular surveys was their function as a barometer for the deliberation process itself and the way it was being delivered by the Global Support Team and Hosting Circle.

Learning journey

Looking at Figure 61, we see a generally positive response that the Information Materials were consistently pitched at the appropriate level for the majority of Assembly Members. Nearly two thirds (59%) report being 'quite' or 'very' confident in their understanding of the causes of the climate and ecological crisis before the Core Assembly, rising to 90% by the end (Figure 62). In line with this, Figure 63 shows that understanding was 'very much' improved for 66% of respondents by the end of the process, with the rate of improvement accelerating profoundly after observing events at COP26.

Figure 61: Assembly Members changing perception of the complexity level of information communicated to them during the Core Assembly





Figure 62: Assembly Members' confidence in their understanding of the climate and ecological crisis before and after the Assembly




Figure 63: Assembly Members' changing perception of their increased understanding of the topic




Deliberation schedule

Figure 64 (top left) reveals that most (80%) Assembly Members perceived the whole process to take up about the right amount of time. That said, 70% of Assembly Members could have committed more time to the process (Figure 64, top right) and were particularly keen to hear more from experts, witnesses and their peers (Figure 64, bottom).

The Global Assembly process was...



Would it have been possible for you to have given more time to this process, for instance an extra day or longer sessions?



How do you think additional time should have been used?




Figure 64: Assembly Members' feelings about the time needed for the Core Assembly

For Community Hosts, efforts to arrange Breakout Sessions at convenient times were effective for more than 80%, and even the Plenary Sessions were reported as convenient by almost as many (see Figure 65). Community Hosts were somewhat less positive about the high frequency of sessions but, similarly to Assembly Members, mostly thought that the total time devoted to the Assembly was about right (see Figure 66).

“

The Global Assembly process exceeded my expectations. There was a very serious professional structure in front of me. It was like school. In this school, I also had the opportunity to travel around the world... get to know, and understand the people of the countries I visited. I felt the hopeful struggle of the common consciousness formed between us. It is the best experience I have ever had. It was perfect. I have learned a lot about climate change and the ecological crisis.”

Assembly Member, final survey




Figure 65: Community Hosts’ feeling about the timing of sessions




Figure 66: Community Hosts feelings about the time required for the Core Assembly

Inclusion and technical issues

Internet connection issues were a significant disruptive force. This is reflected in Community Hosts’ feedback, although the fact that about 25-30% did not consider it an issue by the two measures shown in Figure 67 provides some confidence that the overall process was at least partially resilient to the intermittency of conversation experienced in many sessions.

Any future process operating globally through video conferencing should take steps to verify the internet capability of any Community Host or equivalent role. It is important, however, to acknowledge that in some parts of the world the infrastructure is simply not present and there is little that can be done to guarantee a robust connection. In particular, the use of additional tools like Miro might pose greater difficulty for participants with low bandwidth connection; about 34% of Assembly Members found the Miro ‘rather difficult’ or ‘very difficult’ to use (Figure 68). This is likely to be due to lack of familiarity with the platform itself, but this may also be a result of slow connection speeds. With enough funding there may be scope for future organizers to provide equipment to meet the connectivity needs.

Connection issues






Figure 67: Community Hosts' perception of internet connection issues

Figure 68: Assembly Members' opinions about how easy or difficult it was to interact with the Miro platform



Most importantly, according to more than 90% of Assembly Members, their Community Hosts were able to facilitate their inclusion by the four important measures shown in Figure 69. The presence of some negative sentiment, even if consistently below 5%, is troubling as it may indicate that a small minority of Assembly Members felt that they were consistently excluded from discussions to some extent. Furthermore, the 6% neutral response to how well their views were communicated to the group indicates that several Assembly Members could not gauge the impact of their presence through the veil of translation.

Figure 69:
Assembly
Members'
perceptions of
Community Hosts'
role in ensuring
their inclusion in
deliberations



Facilitation and deliberations

“

I'm really happy with this project. I am pleased that I had participated, and I had never known about it before... There was a lot of pressure in those first months, but I benefited a lot from these sessions. We also shared our opinions and ideas and benefited from our friendships in the Breakout Rooms with people from around the world. Sharing our opinions and ideas, we were like one family.”

Mohamed Salem, Assembly Member, Yemen

According to Figure 70, Assembly Members reported a strong sense of respect and inclusion by four different measures, all of which improve notably towards the end. Whether this was because of improvements in facilitation or the process in general, or simply a growing familiarity and comfort with the process is hard to discern, although we do see that feelings expressed in relation to the conduct of Facilitators did improve over the weeks (Figure 71), so that may have been a significant contributing factor. It is regrettable to see that a small proportion of Assembly Members still felt that inclusion was not what it should have been; if we are to truly give everyone a seat at the governance table then the aspiration should be that no respondents 'disagree' or 'completely disagree' with statements such as these.

In the small group discussions...




Figure 70: Assembly Members' changing feelings about inclusion in Breakout Sessions

The facilitator...




Figure 71: Assembly Members' changing opinions about their Breakout Facilitator. Please note that data begins at session 9.

“
All the people [were] working passionately together. Participants were active and friendly, facilitators professionally and effectively organized the activities and communication within the groups... it created a great concentrated working atmosphere in a circle of close friends.”

Assembly Member, final survey

The three graphs in Figure 72 add further nuance to the perceived quality of deliberations. Of particular interest is the fact that a trend towards improved understanding of peers' perspectives occurs relatively simultaneously with increases in altered opinions and sense of influence. This suggests that it took several weeks for Assembly Members to settle into the process, or that deliberations naturally became more in-depth after the initial learning stage was complete and the composition of the Declaration had begun (around Session 9).




Figure 72: Assembly Members' changing perceptions of understanding and influence amongst their peers

“

This was the first iteration for the Global Assembly, there's so much to learn from this. I believe that this model has so much to offer to the world. I want to reflect on the role of the Facilitators. I think that, in the future, it's important to give the Facilitators good support on the art of hosting and gathering before they host Breakout meetings, as there were different levels of skills and experience. Another important element is how to create the conditions for cross-pollination between the different Breakouts and to keep it simple.”

Mar/Charo Lanao, Plenary Co-facilitator

There are important learnings to be derived from the responses collected about the pressure to fit in and the diversity of opinion amongst the cohort. According to Figure 73 (upper bar), Assembly Members were almost completely polarized about whether they felt pressured to agree with their peers, suggesting a high variation in the quality of deliberation across different Breakout Rooms. Furthermore, around three quarters of Assembly Members indicated that the opinions held by their peers were largely homogenous (see Figure 73, middle bar). This can be taken as a positive sign that consensus has been established amongst this diverse group of people by the final session, but it might also indicate that the cohort were too similarly minded throughout, that latent epistemic diversity was not sufficiently nurtured, or that the process itself did not strike an appropriate balance of neutrality.




Figure 73: Assembly Members (upper two bars) and Community Hosts' (lower bar) perceptions of the quality and diversity of dialogue during deliberations

From the perspective of Community Hosts, 81% 'agreed' or 'completely agreed' that Assembly Members were able to engage in meaningful dialogue (see Figure 73, bottom bar). Sadly about 8% were not so positive about this dimension of the experience, and future iterations of the Global Assembly should seek to improve on this.

“

It has been rewarding and challenging. There have been a lot of hours spent on the computer as well as difficulties to understand other participants (due to language, ways of speaking and connection). I've felt comfortable to express my opinion and have felt welcomed to do so (the facilitators have been great!). I've also practiced a lot my patience as it has been a slow process. I really enjoyed hearing examples about the impacts of climate change over the world. I don't think there has been enough talk about grassroot solutions, I found the education and awareness section very broad.”

Assembly Member, final survey

“
The discussions we had
were very pleasant, and
if there are differences of
opinion that are common,
we respect each other’s
differences of opinion so
that I feel very happy.”

Assembly Member, final survey

Contribution to the People’s Declaration

It was important for the Assembly Members to own their Declaration, and not just feel ownership superficially, as is a risk in such a rapid and strongly guided process. The seven questions asked after voting on the first version of the People’s Declaration before COP26 (see Figure 74) show an almost unanimous sense of ownership, understanding, and approval of the process. Similarly, there is a strong sense of collective ownership shown by the responses to the two questions asked after ratifying the final version of the Declaration (see Figure 75). However, any positive conclusions drawn from this apparent confidence should be tempered by the questions raised above about the diversity of views and pressure felt by some Assembly Members to conform to the others (See Figure 73).

Questions about the pre-COP26 version of the People's Declaration




Figure 74: Assembly Members' opinions about the crafting of the People's Declaration (pre-COP26 version)

Fidelity of the People's Declaration




Figure 75: Assembly Members' opinions about the crafting of the People's Declaration (final version)

“

Yes [the Declaration outcome met my expectations], and I couldn't have hoped for more. It even exceeded my expectations. We didn't forget the smallest details, it proved that many people working together can create great things. The best ideas come from the different ideas that are put together. And above all, the good ideas come from the citizens, the citizens are very well placed to know the existing problems.”

Assembly Member, final survey

“

I thought we would list some more concrete proposals, actions, as the French Citizens' Convention for Climate did. But we did not have the same budget and we had more diverse backgrounds. I think the declaration is not operational enough, just one more great declaration of intent, with no actual effects afterwards.”

Assembly Member, final survey

Community Host support

As mentioned earlier, Community Hosts played a vital role in delivering the Global Assembly and supporting the Assembly Members, and therefore they can provide a critical perspective on the quality of the project. Figure 76 to 79 indicate that Community Hosts generally felt well supported throughout their engagement with the Global Assembly, and had enough information and guidance to fulfill their role effectively. In particular, it is good to see that support offered at various levels of decentralization (via Breakout Facilitators, Cluster Facilitators and the Global Support Team) largely met their needs, and that the personnel in these positions were almost always perceived as ‘pleasant and easy to work with’.

Figure 76: Community Hosts’ perceptions of the information available to them before the Core Assembly began




Figure 77: Community Hosts’ perceptions of the information available to them during the Core Assembly




Figure 78: Community Hosts’ perceptions of the support they could provide their Assembly Member and that which was available to them from different parts of the Global Assembly team





Figure 79: Community Hosts' satisfaction with their working relationships



Notably, the strongest reported discomfort among Community Hosts was the time available to translate written information materials prior to the start of the Assembly (nearly 20% 'completely disagreed' or 'disagreed' that the task was manageable in the time available – Figure 80, top right). Figure 80 also indicated that other tasks where some Community Hosts felt rushed were Assembly Member recruitment, wiki management, and the administration around selection and contracting. This latter task was also perceived to be the least appropriate task assigned to them, and the one for which they were least well supported. On the whole, however, the large green and blue regions in Figure 80 indicate that the majority of Community Hosts felt that the tasks they were assigned were appropriate and manageable with the level of support provided.




Figure 80: Community Hosts' opinions about their primary tasks

Headline reflections from the Core Delivery Team

The following section presents reflections on the process by the Core Delivery Team, based on our observations while delivering the Core Assembly process, as well as reflections on the perceptions of Assembly Members and Community Hosts outlined above. The official external evaluation of the process will be published in November 2022. Here, we highlight aspects which we felt went well, and those that can be improved in future from our perspective as process initiators and implementers. We hope our process will provide important learnings for future implementations and we share these areas of improvement with a commitment to transparency and iterative learning. Reflections on institutional impact and docking into COP26 can be found in Chapter 6.

Assembly Members' perceptions on the climate and ecological crisis

1. Overall, Assembly Members' interest in and concern about the climate and ecological crisis increased throughout the duration of the Core Assembly

By the last session, about three quarters of all Assembly Members reported being 'very interested' in and 'very concerned' about the climate and ecological crisis (compared to around half before the Assembly); nearly all participants reported being at least 'somewhat concerned' and 'somewhat interested' (see Figure 38 and Figure 39). Despite the relatively high prior enthusiasm for the topic, the gradual increase in interest and concern throughout the Assembly supports the learning that participation in climate citizens' assemblies generally activates participants on the topic. Assembly Members' perception that the most salient outputs of a global citizens' assembly on climate change is to 'raise global awareness' and 'learn about other perspectives' (Figure 49) reinforces this learning, while highlighting the need to build on other types of impact such as influence on policymakers.

Like other citizens' assemblies, team members often engaged in discussions about avoiding bias and practicing integrity in our respective roles as process designers or Facilitators. For example, the Process Team and Hosting Circle collectively decided to flag and discuss certain Assembly Members' minority dissenting opinions on the People's Declaration, to give space to these voices and respond to informal concerns about uniformity of opinion. However, it is worth considering how particular aspects of the Global Assembly, such as language barriers, diverse education level and hosting formats, may have exacerbated the influence of team members on Assembly Members' perspectives. At the same time, it is also promising to note that the greatest increases in interest and concern, as well as opinion change, were

reported between Sessions 9 and 12 (see Figure 38 and Figure 39); the period in which Assembly Members were co-creating the People's Declaration. Following the consolidation approach, Assembly Members engaged in a hands-on manner during this process and worked semi-autonomously in some cases.

Finally, it is also interesting to note that about 70% of Community Hosts indicated they became at least 'somewhat more interested' in the climate and ecological crisis after engaging as staff in the Global Assembly (see Figure 55).

2. Observing COP26 had an impact on Assembly Members' perceptions on the climate and ecological crisis

After 12 sessions of deliberations, Assembly Members spent the beginning of November 2021 virtually observing eight hours of COP26 sessions each. After two sessions to share reflections and hear from witness speakers on COP26, Assembly Members were administered another survey with COP-specific and repeated questions.

Assembly Members were somewhat skeptical that "politicians care about the members of the GA (for instance at COP)." While there was a small subset who indicated politicians care 'a lot' (8.6%) or 'quite a lot' (15.7%), the majority indicated politicians care 'very little' (32.9%) or 'some' (37.1%). Some 5.7% of Assembly Members felt politicians did not care 'at all' (see Figure 43). Furthermore, responses to some repeated questions shifted rather significantly following COP26: emotions (both negative and positive) in regards to the climate and ecological crisis peaked at this time (see Figure 40), perceived confidence that the Global Assembly will make a difference hit the lowest point (Figure 42) and, unlike all other suggested impacts, fewer Members reported that they thought global citizens' assembly on climate change was a 'rather good' or 'very good' way to "develop a global strategy to deal with climate change" (Figure 49).

Qualitatively, a number of Assembly Members expressed disappointment in the lack of uptake of the People's Declaration by delegations in COP26, as well as the general quality of decision reached at COP26. For deliberative processes that operate in both extra-institutional and institutional spaces, and especially those without an explicit mandate, it is critical to establish clear expectations prior to the handover of recommendations to avoid undue disappointment. In hindsight, we feel that we conveyed overly optimistic expectations of the Global Assembly's presence at COP26 to Assembly Members, which may have contributed to feelings of disillusionment.

Political activation and engagement

3. Participation in a citizens' assembly increased perceived influence and interest in political participation

One of the most affirming outcomes of the Core Assembly was the rise in perceived self-efficacy amongst Assembly Members throughout the process. Compared to the beginning of the process, Assembly Members finished with an increased collective confidence in their influence in addressing the climate and ecological crisis. Feelings were most optimistic at the local level, compared to the national or global, which may be a product of Members' observations at COP26. It is also worth considering, however, that the Core Delivery Teams' own enthusiasm towards lobbying for impact may have swayed participants' political outlooks. This possible influence notwithstanding, Assembly Members' interest in political participation and leadership, be it organizing a community activity or attending public sector meetings, grew during the process. This resonates foundationally with the Global Assembly's value that when "people can access the tools to meet, connect and come up with solutions together, they can and they do" (see "Guiding Values", page 33).

4. Participation in a citizens' assembly increased interest and confidence in deliberative mini-publics as a methodology

As in other citizens' assemblies, participation proved to be a pathway through which both Assembly Members and implementation personnel formed positive outlooks on deliberative mini-publics. About 60% of both Assembly Members and Community Hosts indicated that they would recommend the use of lotteries for the selection of decision-makers (see Figure 50 and Figure 59). About 30% of Community Hosts also indicated they were interested in exploring other uses for lotteries (see Figure 59). In addition, an overwhelming majority of Assembly Members responded that a global citizens' assembly should become a permanent part of decision-making at the global level (see Figure 48). While this may not necessarily be a new learning for initiators of deliberative mini-publics, it underscores the powerful experience that participants and staff undergo as a result of engaging in a deliberative process and, in turn, the importance of providing guidelines for these actors to become effective pollinators after the close of processes, should they desire it. From the perspective of the Core Delivery Team, we regret that we have not been able to invest much effort in following-up on this, given the enthusiasm generated for the methodology.

Learning journey

5. **Weighing trade-off between visual formats and translation time for multilingual learning journeys**

Overall, participants' perceived understanding of the climate and ecological crisis increased as a result of their engagement in the Global Assembly, and a majority of participants indicated that the information presented to them via the Information Booklet, supplemental materials and expert and witness testimonies were 'the right level of complexity' (see Figure 61). The Supplemental Workbook sought to provide alternative learning formats and anchors to accompany the diversity of languages and educational backgrounds in the Core Assembly. There was, however, still an over-reliance on often-text-heavy learning materials which required dedicated reading time during sessions for two reasons: firstly, given the diversity of Assembly Members, we felt that the expectation to dedicate time outside of compensated sessions might exacerbate existing asymmetries; and secondly, while Information Booklets were translated prior to the start of sessions, we understood that some participants might need the support of their Community Hosts for clarification, or oral reading for illiterate participants in the case that there had not been sufficient time to receive an audio recording. Although we ultimately appreciate the prioritization of inclusion in this trade-off, it nevertheless reduced the time available for deliberations.

With a more spacious timeline, future multilingual processes can no doubt make use of a broader range of creative learning formats to offer options for different types of learners. We would, furthermore, recommend expanding the local contextualization of the information materials, and personalization according to the needs of individual Assembly Members, as we sought to achieve with the support of Community Hosts. This year, for example, Community Hosts of illiterate Assembly Members were asked to record audio versions of the information materials, and the Information Contextualization Events, which were organized by 31 Community Hosts, provided an opportunity to integrate additional local materials and references to support Assembly Members' learning journeys.

Inclusion, support, and technical Issues

6. **Decentralized local hosting of participants was successful on many counts, and can be improved through further decentralization and distribution of tasks in future**

The model of decentralization and local Community Hosting was not only an embodiment of the Global Assembly's values, it was a central element of the Assembly's success in 2021. Without the provision of community-based in-person hosting, many Assembly Members would not have had

adequate access to the high bandwidth internet, devices, software, literacy support, and real-time translation necessary to partake. The Community Host model, and the exceptional commitment of the Global Assembly's Community Hosts and Cluster Facilitators, is what enabled the inclusion of such an unprecedented level of diversity of Assembly Members, and made it possible to accommodate substantial variations in culture, language, education, literacy, and infrastructure. That Assembly Members were supported by an organization in their, or a neighboring, community also enabled all learning content and deliberations to be comprehended through their own context-specific cultural lens.

Owing to time and resource constraints, we co-located numerous roles and accountabilities into a single host organization: recruitment of Members, text and oral translation, hosting, and the responsibility for paying Members' stipends and safeguarding their welfare. This deeply manifested our value of "trust in people", and placed significant responsibility for the implementation of the Core Assembly onto the shoulders of individual community organizations. The aggregation of so many roles into a single organization, however, also introduced some potentially perverse incentives and moral hazard. The limited time for onboarding Community Hosts meant that expectations were not always as clear as they could have been, and there were some observed variations and violations of the Global Assembly's values, norms and protocols: in some cases Assembly Member recruitment was not conducted according to the protocol (i.e. targeted recruitment, self-selection, and one case of unreported replacement after the process had started, which necessitated that the substitute Assembly Member be removed from the process, reducing the cohort to 98); some translators and hosting support staff intervened during deliberations in contexts where it was unclear whether they were translating for their Member or were attempting to represent themselves; and, there were at least two cases where Community Host organizations may have falsified documentation and signatures for the Assembly Member's receipt of their full (US\$600) stipend.

The Global Assembly community prioritized the welfare and support of each Assembly Member. Where discrepancies between expectations, value and practice were observed and/or reported, they were addressed on a case-by-case basis between Hosting Circle personnel, Cluster Facilitators and the Core Delivery Team. At the same time, we also recognize that it was not always possible to spot and address issues. For example, there was a notable blind spot for cases in which Community Hosts may have been influencing the interventions made by the Assembly Member, or providing unfaithful translations or documentation on behalf of illiterate members.

Given sufficient resources, we would have separated the duties of Community Hosts across three community organizations at each location, distributing responsibilities for Member recruitment, hosting, and

welfare. Moreover, we could imagine expanding independent oversight and evaluation capacity, to observe the global team and community to increase transparency, accountability, and learning.

7. The greatest barrier to Assembly Members' participation was internet connection

About 30% of Assembly Members expressed that connection issues at their end, or their peers' ends, severely or moderately impacted their ability to participate in deliberations (see Fig 67). This is despite the fact that, before and during the process, many Community Hosts made specific provision for an optimal internet connection with the support of the Core Delivery Team. Breakout Facilitators also managed situations on a case-by-case basis, for instance, facilitating certain sessions without video if required and by reinforcing deliberative norms around inclusion to ensure that a blank screen did not mean someone was left out. Despite these efforts, there were nevertheless connection issues at certain locations due to inclement weather or power outages that could not be resolved; here, the participation of Assembly Members was severely crippled. For future transnational or global citizens' assemblies, it is not only critical to establish agile and responsive support systems to mitigate connection issues, but equally important to foster inclusive deliberative norms in the inevitable case that certain members' participation is disrupted by their local digital infrastructure.

8. Digital tools worked well when the methods were rapidly adapted in response to challenges

Thanks to the preparation conducted in the Lab sessions, the digital tools selected to conduct the Core Assembly were, for the most part, incredibly effective. The main issues encountered were to do with internet connectivity which did hamper the participation of some Assembly Members (see Figure 67 and previous point), as well as some difficulties with collaborative participation on Miro. Patience was the primary solution to Zoom communication issues, while the difficulties with Miro interaction were addressed by adapting the process to minimize the need for the direct interaction of Assembly Members. This latter change required some alterations to the Process Plan and shifted the emphasis of the Notetaker role, but was well worth the effort in the end.

Miro was initially envisioned as the primary visual forum for the real-time collation of what was being discussed during sessions. Many participants found this challenging, especially those with unreliable internet connections. In response to this feedback, the role of Miro was de-emphasized to become more of a simple, static visualization tool. PDF versions of the same materials were also offered as a convenient

alternative. This change, however, did render some of the Notetaker training obsolete and added a burden of retraining for the refined process. Furthermore, had the lower emphasis on digital literacy been known from the outset, we could have focused recruitment criteria more closely on writing prowess, rather than technical proficiency.

Deliberation and facilitation

9. The combination of Breakout and Plenary Sessions worked well and generally suited Assembly Members' schedules

Overall, we think the combination of Breakout Rooms and Plenary Sessions were successful. In total, Assembly Members spent 36 hours in Breakout Rooms and 24 in Plenary. Breakout Rooms allowed for deep interpersonal connections to be made between Assembly Members, and for the group to work together to find a healthy balance and figure out how to deal with logistical problems that arose. Plenaries were important in energizing Assembly Members and connecting the entire group together. Three Plenary Sessions had mixed Breakout rooms, giving Assembly Members a chance to meet new peers in a smaller setting. Many Assembly Members and Hosting Circle personnel informally expressed satisfaction at these opportunities.

10. While English worked well as the 2021 exchange language, more inclusive formats should be considered in future

The use of English as the 'exchange language' throughout the Core Assembly likely reinforced pre-existing inequalities, as English language speakers had more direct access to information materials and dialogue. English language fluency is highly correlated with overall educational attainment and, therefore, socioeconomic status, which not only meant that English speakers may have had more pre-existing knowledge of the issues being discussed, but also that they likely had higher levels of agency already and therefore found it easier to engage in processes like this.

We also acknowledge there are justifiable moral and ethical critiques for using English as the primary exchange language throughout this process, since it is a process that aims to undo some of the issues found in our current systems, which are largely steeped in colonial history. Ideal approaches, given sufficient resources and/or technological advancement, would either offer simultaneous translation in which all members of the Assembly directly hear the language and dialect that they speak, or would utilize a neutral machine-generated exchange language to minimize inequalities in comprehension and participation.

**“
I would have liked
if sessions could be
translated as they
were happening.
It was a bit hard for
me to keep up to
pace because of the
language barriers/
translation delays.
That created a lot of
miscommunication
and it made me
struggle to understand
everything fully.”**

Ysaida, Assembly Member, Venezuela

11. Active, inclusive management of Hosting personnel was critical to maintaining deliberation quality

Despite many members of the Global Assembly team having prior experience as staff in citizens' assemblies, the global and multilingual aspect of the process presented numerous unprecedented challenges throughout its duration. To share, understand and respond appropriately to these conditions, it was critical for both the Hosting Circle and Cluster Facilitators to convene regularly. During the entire duration of the Core Assembly, the Hosting Circle met weekly to debrief on the previous week and discuss the coming process plans. It was during this space that best practices were generated and could be applied to improve the experience for Assembly Members. A number of Breakout Facilitators also made positive use of 'Family Groups,' smaller support circles in which to engage in peer-to-peer learning. Furthermore, as detailed in section "A week in the Core Assembly" (page 120), open lines of communication and an established workflow enabled the team to function smoothly and respond in real-time to new challenges.

Co-creation process

12. The co-creation approach for the People's Declaration was an innovative bottom-up attempt at consolidating outputs of a multilingual process

Assembly Members generally felt positively about the co-creation approach of the People's Declaration. Substantial majorities agreed or strongly agreed that the Declaration was "crafted in a fair manner" and that it would "reflect [their] own views;" all respondents indicated strong agreement or agreement that they had 'influenced the statement' (see Figure 74). While we cannot know for sure, we feel that the iterative nature of the co-creation process which sought to give Assembly Members ownership of the document may have supported Assembly Members' confidence in the process. All draft components of the People's Declaration underwent at least three rounds of iteration and review before being tabled for a vote, and the process was designed to be repeated in the event that any item did not secure a majority. Another important element of the process was the separation between the Process Team and Editor Team; the Editor Team was coordinated by an Editor Coordinator and remained independent from the Process Team. We felt this was critical to establish the integrity of the process, both to Assembly Members and external audiences, and to manifest our value of focusing "on the means and not the ends."

13. Future approaches to multilingual co-creation should consider how to factor in language nuances

There were concerns raised by select Assembly Members and external audiences (following the COP26 submission) about some of the language in the People's Declaration. Most notably, there was a concern around the characterization of 'developed' and 'developing' countries. During the iterative review process, Assembly Members who were not fluent in English commented on written or oral translations of the consolidated drafts. As such, discussions on the nuances of English-language terminology were either challenging to engage or seldom surfaced. While a guided discussion specifically on 'developed/developing' language was held following several Assembly Members' requests, there is scope in future to consider the place of and process for meaningful deliberation on terminology within multilingual settings.

Project management and implementation

14. Decentralization proved to be the greatest enabler of global implementation

Even before the global location lottery, we began building up a Community of Practice of interested volunteers around the world. For starters, it would have been impossible for us to implement the recruitment process without the decentralized infrastructure of the co-working calls (see "Decentralized recruitment of Community Hosts", page 63) and commitment of volunteers. Throughout the duration of the Assembly, too, Cluster Facilitators autonomously problem-solved and often employed local knowledge and relationships to support the Community Hosts in their Clusters. Beyond the immense practical benefits of decentralization, we feel that this way of working aligns with the values of the Global Assembly. There is also no doubt scope to improve the decentralized working structure of 2021, and we encourage future transnational citizens' assemblies to pursue internal governance systems that reflect their global ethos.

15. Delivering the process for COP26 acted as a significant time constraint

We made the decision to make sure this first assembly's initial output, the first version of the People's Declaration, would be complete in time for COP26. Had this deadline not existed, or were we able to start sooner, we would have made the process much longer and less dense. We would advise any future process to utilize a longer time window if possible, if only for the sake of alleviating pressure. However there were some positive aspects, such as the positivity generated from a persistently high energy atmosphere, and the fact that anyone joining Plenary Sessions at uncomfortably early or late hours would only have to do so for a shorter number of weeks.

16. Keeping the Core Assembly running relied on too few people doing too much work

Despite the overwhelming energy and commitment of team members, implementing the 2021 Core Assembly was precarious. Any short absence of key team members resulted in significant strain on top of already overwhelming workloads. To become a sustainable part of global governance infrastructure, the project requires a re-evaluation of roles and responsibilities, a more spacious timeline, and increased budget.

17. We find value in learning through practice

Despite the barriers and flaws shared above, the practice of piloting remains at the heart of the Global Assembly endeavor. At a micro scale, the trial elements of the project, such as the Deliberative Labs, played essential roles in the successes of their full-scale counterparts which followed. At a macro scale, when considering the whole of 2021 Global Assembly as a pilot in and of itself, its methodological learnings, from multilingual deliberation to global civic lotteries, can be applicable to the public, institutions, and deliberative democrats in the pursuit of improved models in the future.

Community Assemblies

03



Introduction

Why Community Assemblies?

The aim of the Global Assembly (GA) is to create the conditions for everyday people to deliberate and act on issues at the global level. The Core Assembly was an attempt to do this through the established citizens' assembly format which, due to the fact it was designed to pilot never before tried methodologies, was limited to 100 participants selected by civic lottery. The **Community Assemblies** were conceived to extend the Global Assembly beyond the walls of the Core Assembly. Running in parallel, they enabled anyone on Earth to participate in the process by organizing or participating in a local event and deliberating on the 2021 framing question: **“How can humanity address the climate and ecological crisis in a fair and effective way?”**

One aim of the Community Assemblies was to facilitate new relationships between citizens, communities, stakeholders, and power holders in local contexts. What sets them apart from many other community engagement initiatives was the vision to link local dialogues to a global conversation, and forge new connections, empathy, and common understandings between local events and a global community.

Community Assemblies reflect the Global Assembly's commitment to decentralization and grassroots engagement outlined in the Theory of Change (see page 29). In 2021, the Community Assemblies pilots garnered positive feedback from a small pool of Participants and Organizers. More importantly, the experience scoped several areas to improve upon in future iterations including: amendments to the Toolkit, supporting a greater diversity of Participants and Organizers, and exploring linkages to the Core Assembly. Looking forward, the Community Assemblies model has the potential to mobilize hundreds of thousands of voices to inform institutional decision making over the coming years.


Figure 81:
Community
Assembly in
Kerala, India



Scope of the 2021 Community Assemblies

“
People are touched
by what we are
doing. We care about
their concerns.”

Community Assembly Participant,
Mbulu, Manyara, Tanzania



The main focus of the 2021 Global Assembly was on the Core Assembly, but the potential of Community Assemblies to expand the voice of global citizens was a compelling prospect which was important to test, at least in pilot form.

To this end, the Community Assembly team focused on designing a Toolkit and supporting local organizers to use it to run community dialogues. This resource enabled participants to engage with the same learning materials as the Core Assembly and deliberate on the same framing question, joining a global conversation within their local contexts.

Developing the Community Assembly Toolkit

The primary aim of the Community Assembly Toolkit was to provide tools that supported Organizers from all backgrounds to plan, recruit for, and implement a dialogue on the 2021 framing question. This included outlines for how to recruit a diverse group of Participants, a selection of activities to help them explore the climate and ecological crisis, and several tips on how to facilitate deep conversations between them.

The Toolkit comprised:

1. Global Assembly Information Booklet on the climate and ecological crisis (the same booklet used by the Core Assembly)
2. Guidelines to run a Community Assembly at various scales and formats
3. Guidelines to share learnings and dialogues with the wider public

The Toolkit was provided alongside a custom built wiki. Organizers were invited to translate the Toolkit's content into their own language and add this version to the wiki. They were also encouraged to contextualize it for their community with additional local stories and examples to assist on the learning journey.

See full Toolkit in Annex 3.1.

Figure 83: Cover of the Community Assembly Toolkit – Portuguese version



Design approaches

Toolkit development was guided by a mission to create an understandable, accessible and inspiring tool. What emerged was a delivery approach which combined a series of guided exchanges, personal reflection exercises, open sharing, and role-playing, among other activities.

Information materials

The primary learning component of the Community Assemblies was the same Information Booklet used by the Core Assembly. The original English language version of this was available as a free download and the Global Assembly wiki provided a forum where organizers could browse existing translations and upload their own. In addition, recordings of speakers and witnesses used in the Core Assembly were uploaded to the Global Assembly website for use as supplementary learning materials.

Centering emotions and story-sharing

**“
It’s really amazing to see
people coming together
for a cause! This is the only
rent we could possibly pay
for staying on this planet!
The discussion was very
informative!”**

Participant, transnational Community Assembly

The emphasis of the Community Assemblies was placed on the sharing of emotions and the exchange of stories in response to the learning materials. The approach was human-centered, providing tools to encourage empathy among the Participants with the hope of adding breadth and color to the collective voice of the Global Assembly. As such, the Toolkit centered activities rooted in story sharing and emotions, to create a forum in which people with varying educational levels, professions, ages, languages, and cultures could co-create solutions to shared problems, whether they already knew each other or not.

Guided facilitation and activities

The activities described in the Toolkit were intended to be simple enough that anyone could facilitate them, without the need for facilitator training. To support this effort, a set of Facilitation Cards was included. These cards were divided into three sets:

1. Information cards containing material about the climate and ecological crisis, re-imagining global governance, and the principles of fairness and effectiveness.
2. Character cards (Figure 84) to guide a roleplay activity with the option for Participants to create their own character card. Some of these featured characters were based on the real life experiences of Deliberative Lab Participants, anonymised for privacy reasons.
3. Discussion cards which offer key questions to open up and guide the conversation.



Figure 84:
Character cards
ready to be cut out

Location and time formats

**“
I’m glad to be part of
this amazing program,
I learnt many things
from this program like
environment, team
building, leadership,
personal skills
development.”**

Community Assembly Participant, Karachi, Pakistan

The Toolkit offered different timetable templates so that Organizers could adapt their Assembly to the most appropriate time frame and location setting to suit their communities. Community Assemblies could be conducted online, offline, or in a hybrid format and could last for three hours, eight hours, or a longer period if desired (in which case the Global Assembly team would provide further assistance beyond the scope of the Toolkit).

Sharing outcomes within your community

One of the components of the Toolkit was also to empower communities to build their own content to engage their communities. The Toolkit, therefore, invited organizers to customize their Community Assembly logo, as well as guidance on how to publicize it, both before and afterwards, on social networks and in the press.

Trialing the Toolkit

“
**Let everyone feel
that climate change,
like the epidemic, has
actually affected all
lives, not just farmers
or fishermen, nor is it
just the government
or large enterprises.”**

Community Assembly pilot test participant, Taiwan

In October 2021, the Community Assembly team partnered with practitioners in the National Taiwan University (NTU) to pilot the use of the Toolkit in community colleges. The aim of the pilots was to test and improve the user experience of the Toolkit, and to integrate learnings into a final draft for publication. Two pilot tests, lasting three hours each, were implemented by NTU partners in consultation with the Global Assembly team.

The pilot process yielded learnings on process-related outcomes, such as how much Participants’ learned about the climate and ecological crisis, and the effectiveness of Facilitation Cards in enhancing their engagement with the deliberative processes. Observed areas for improvement, such as the need to include an in-depth step-by-step guide for hosting community events, were integrated into the final Toolkit.

While the pilot process was critical to refine the user experience of the Toolkits before publication, one limitation was the lack of Participant diversity, as most of them were already quite well informed about the climate and ecological crisis and were all students of similar ages.

Outreach method

In order to attract changemakers and community organizers to the Community Assemblies, outreach was conducted in a decentralized manner through the personal and professional networks of the Global Assembly's international community.


The Community Assemblies were officially launched on October 5, 2021 during the Global Assembly Launch Event. Organizers were encouraged to register their event in advance of the publication of the Toolkit, and were notified when it was published.

Community Assembly grants

In an attempt to lower the barriers to entry and maximize engagement, microgrants of US\$500 were offered to any Organizers signing up after the Global Assembly Green Zone event at COP26 (see "Decentralization of Communications Work", page 237).

In a bid to support as much diversity as possible, the available budget was proportionally distributed across the UN regions and grant recipients were selected by random draw, with a maximum of one grant per country.

Figure 85: Twitter post announcing the launch of Community Assembly microgrants, coinciding with the Global Assembly's first COP26 event



Data Collection

Key to this first trial of the Community Assembly format was the collection of feedback, not only on the outputs of the community discussions, but also feedback about using the Toolkit in order to improve any future iterations. Two forms were provided — an Organizer Feedback Form and Participant Feedback Form — in order to understand the experience from both sides of a Community Assembly journey.

2021 Community Assemblies at-a-glance

While there were 408 registrations for Community Assemblies, only 37 Organizers completed feedback forms, though there may have been Community Assemblies conducted without registration. Furthermore, only 59 Participants completed the Participant survey (less than 5% of the 1,332 counted in Organizer forms).

It is therefore important to emphasize that the data described below has only been collected from a small sample and so should only be used to demonstrate the type of insights made available by the Community Assembly model, and not treated as a reliable source for any exhaustive or robust analysis.




Figure 86: Infographic summarizing key details about the reported Community Assemblies

Assembly formats

“

We did an activity with the Participants to relate them with climate through nature. We get them out into the environment and meditate with them to feel the sound of birds and the sound of plants. After meditation we allow them to take some time to think and take responsibility to work at other places where it needs to be worked.”

Community Assembly Organizer, Karachi, Pakistan

There was a wide variation in the number of Participants across the Community Assemblies that fed back data. Some Organizers opted for smaller events, engaging as few as four or five Participants. Other Organizers involved larger groups, including 50 Participants in Islamabad, Pakistan and 175 Participants in the District of Mbulu, Manyara, Tanzania.

More than half of Organizers selected the three-hour format and a little under a quarter opted to design their own time frame. The majority of Community Assemblies reported were conducted in-person, yet close to half took place wholly or partially online, indicating the importance of internet-mediated gatherings, particularly in a post-pandemic world.

“
The process itself is clear and works reasonably well. The session plans were appreciated and easily understood by the Participants”

Community Assembly Organizer, Netherlands


“
This program is good at bringing the community together to talk about the issues surrounding our environments, it is a welcome move, as it will educate on the dangers of climate change and this may lead to action change towards God’s creation.”

Community Assembly Participant, Central Province, Kabwe, Zambia

Languages used


According to the feedback collected, Community Assemblies were conducted in 10 different primary languages, while a total of 13 languages were recorded as being spoken at some point (see Figure 87). English was by far the most common language used, indicating that promotion of the Community Assemblies in other languages may have resulted in greater and more diverse uptake.

Figure 87:
 Languages used
 in Community
 Assemblies




Participants of 2021 Community Assemblies

Figure 88: Key demographics of Community Assembly Participants



Some Participant demographics are highlighted in Figure 88. The Organizers reported a participation of close to 50% for both men and women, with Participants who identify in other ways representing 2.2% of the total. Age-wise, Community Assemblies were dominated by Participants between the ages of 16 and 40 and, in terms of literacy, we see that the majority of reported Assemblies consisted of fully literate participants and that more than 90% featured a majority of literate Participants.

Figure 89: Participants' concern about the climate and ecological crisis after participating in a Community Assembly; according to 48 Participants and 37 Organizers




Participants' concern for climate change (Figure 89) maps quite closely to the proportion of them who report experiencing it themselves, both in the feedback provided by Participant respondents and Organizers (Figure 90). It may, however, be the case that those who claim to be experiencing the effects of climate change were more likely to be motivated to complete the survey, and this should color our interpretation of any outcomes.

Figure 90:
Proportion of
Participants
who report
experiencing the
impacts of climate
change

Are you experiencing the impacts of climate change?

(data from 46 Participants)



Occupation and socioeconomic backgrounds


As intended, Community Assembly Participants hailed from a great range of professions, cultures and socioeconomic backgrounds. The feedback received from Participants and Organizers is not exhaustive and often difficult to quantify, but Figure 91 provides a good summary.

“

The session was very informative and exciting as I got to hear the views of other people on climate change from different parts of the world, and how through partnerships and collaborations we will be able to push forward actions to address this emergent problem. I thank the Global Assembly for this opportunity and recommend that more youths should be engaged on this.”


Participant of a transnational Community Assembly

Figure 91:
Occupations
and incomes
of Community
Assembly
Participants



Most frequent words used by Organizers to describe Participants

parents	19
students	13
youth	8
school children	6
teacher	5
professionals	5
farmers	4
activists	3



2021 Community Assemblies highlights

Of the 37 Community Assemblies which reported back to the Global Assembly, many presented heartwarming moments and instructive learnings. The following section characterizes key highlights of the Community Assemblies using submissions from Organizers and Participants.

Expressing hopes and fears

The emphasis in these pilot Community Assemblies was on sharing stories, experiences and feelings. This focus was presented in the Toolkit as Activity 02: Expressing Hopes and Fears. A number of Community Assemblies engaged in this activity, sometimes deepening it with their own additions and interpretations of the activity.

Goma, Democratic Republic of Congo



“

My father is a breeder from Kiorirwe, a town in Masisi territory in North Kivu province. Thanks to livestock products, he feeds my whole family and educates the children in the best schools in my area. During the past five years, rain has become so scarce throughout the region and as a result of the blazing sun the grasses in the pastures are gradually drying out. Cows do not produce the same amount of milk as before. It disrupted my life and that of my family. Now, my family's food and the quality of my education has declined. I believe that would be the impact of climate change. I changed schools due to lack of money and so did my little brothers. I don't know what to do to restore the life of my family”


Participant of the Community Assembly,
Goma, Democratic Republic of Congo

Beijing, China

In order to give people on the ground a voice, a group of dynamic young people in Beijing decided to run a Community Assembly. On December 8, 2021, the Community Assembly was successfully facilitated with 15 volunteers as facilitators to welcome participants.



Organizers of the event recorded participants' responses to their major fears, and asked participants to share what elements of nature symbolize their hopes and fears.




Global Assembly Beijing 22

Elements symbolizing our hopes and fears

- turtle
- eye
- waves
- earth
- sun and stars
- moon
- trees / leaves
- hands
- coral reef

Piracicaba, Brazil

Organizers of a Community Assembly in Piracicaba, Brazil, implemented a twist of the Hopes and Fears Activity, “Bridging our fears to solutions for a sustainable future.”



Transnational events

While most Community Assemblies took place within local or national contents, some Organizers convened participants from multiple countries in online events.

A Community Assembly organized by someone in Georgia welcomed Participants from eight different countries including Bangladesh, Nigeria, Singapore, Argentina, Morocco, USA, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Canada.




“

This assembly was cohesively woven through the fabrication of personal and collective climate stories that fit together like pieces of a puzzle to portray a picture, I perceive as a snapshot of unfiltered human experience beyond all lines of discrimination including borders.”

Participant, transnational Community Assembly

Another transnational Assembly convened participants from the UK, Germany, Uganda, France, and Italy. Contributions from the session were recorded by Polly, a participant, in the following graphic.



Alignment with community initiatives

While the aim of the Core Assembly is to gather a representative snapshot of the global population, the flexibility of the Community Assembly format enables dialogue between individuals of similar backgrounds or experiences, including special interest groups or stakeholders. While this can be an opportunity to discuss particular impacts of climate change, it can also enable the Community Assembly to converge with other issues of interest in the community. Action arising from this type of cohesion could manifest as community-wide collaboration on climate adaptation solutions, or companies engaging with staff and supply chains to change working practices in line with good climate policy.

A number of Community Assemblies in 2021 were composed of, or hosted by, specific community groups such as women's networks, climate activists or minority and disabled communities. Similarly, some Assemblies were built around professional communities such as charcoal burners, homemakers, or local traders.

Charcoal burners in Zambia

A Community Assembly was conducted with a group of young men who depend on charcoal burning, who themselves said they have seen the negative impact of their activities which they recognized could have contributed to the little or no rainfall in most parts of the country. A second Community Assembly was hosted with the women of the province.



“

The process is awesome, runned in the local language.”

“If we can make time reaching out to people in the rural part of Zambia, it will bring more benefits because areas that are the more affected are not literate, and never have access to such opportunity.”

Community Assembly Organizer, Central Province, Zambia

“If the world leaders can work as a collective we can adapt and mitigate the impacts of climate change and ecological crisis. They have to affirm their commitment to this cause if we are to save Mother Earth.”

Community Assembly Participant, Central Province, Zambia

Sanitary support for women in Kenya

This Community Assembly in Kenya was one of those supported with a \$500 grant. Participants were all women. In addition to discussions on the climate and ecological crisis, the Assembly was an opportunity to support women from this community and sanitary towels were distributed at the event.



Art and culture campaigns

While not explicitly suggested in the Community Assemblies Toolkit, some Community Assemblies segued into art projects upon completion.

Mosaic project in Beijing, China

After the Community Assembly in Beijing on December 8, participants were very enthusiastic and engaged a lot on the group's social media channels. The Participants and Organizers decided to work with symbols to convey their concerns about climate change and produced a mosaic, along with 45 other contributors.

Coordinated by Gertrud Müller, an artist engaged with the Cultural Wave, citizens and schools were invited to widen the mosaic and its message, eventually installing it as a mural in a public space. Read more about this project on page 235.



Malappuram, Kerala, India

Organizers of a Community Assembly in Kerala, India, organized an icebreaker activity asking Participants to share stories about their families' past, and hopes and fears about their families' future. The contributions were expressed in a visual artwork following the event by one of the participants of the Assembly.



Outcomes of the Community Assemblies

**“
We need to be hosting
one another by creating
a sense of connection
from the places we are
located. Experiment with
our sense of agency.
Moving away from the
structures of power.
Radical tenderness.”**

Community Assembly Participant, Berlin, Germany

Participants' statements on the climate and ecological crisis

The comments supplied by Participants were mostly concerned with the climate and ecological crisis, expressing various priorities for action at all scales – from local to international. A smaller portion of Participants spoke to the process itself, variously emphasizing the value of learning and making connections with people in and beyond their communities, as well as the importance of fairness and the need to change our underlying human systems.

In this pilot year, no mechanism had been developed to aggregate the qualitative findings from the many Community Assemblies and develop these into recommendations or expressions of consensus that could be voted upon. This, and a mechanism by which to better integrate results with the Core Assembly, should be an aim of future iterations of the Global Assembly.

The following section includes a selection of statements expressed by Participants, and submitted by Organizers through the feedback form.

On governance and decision-making

“Enforcement of changes and decisions and accountability. There needs to be a balance of responsibility between individuals and governments. At the global level, there are forces striving for greed, consumption, and selfishness. Vested interests limit government scope to act too much. They limit governments’ pockets. Muslims believe each individual is responsible for their actions – there will always be corruption and it is hoped for individuals to address this. There needs to be more control at a local level. But also we are aware that many things happen to be beyond local control – geopolitics.”

Community Assembly Participant,
West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 5 of 6)

“Accountability – linked to the issue of enforcement. Balance of personal and corporate and government accountability. Businesses are often very wasteful – e.g. lights left on all night. There is a tendency so far to focus on the lowest level rather than the high, taking the easy path rather than making the difficult decisions that need to be made.”

Community Assembly Participant,
West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 5 of 6)

“The local authority could act as an agent for change and should consider the value of public private partnership arrangements in order to provide and promote certain types of green industry (either those that resonate with the area’s industrial legacy (e.g. textiles/ engineering?) or else follow promising new initiatives (e.g. green building technology?).”

Community Assembly Participant,
West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 1 of 6)

“Action our guilt to redress the imbalance in resource use and advance democracy.”

Community Assembly Participant, Powys, Wales, UK

“So much depends on central government and local government policy moving us (society/ people) in the directions needed. Unfortunately, we don’t feel that we are going to get much done with the current government while at the same time, the opportunity for local authority-led initiatives is likely to be stymied by a severe lack of funding.”

Community Assembly Participant,
West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 1 of 6)

On fairness

“Improve women’s awareness about climate and ecological crisis and engage more women in climate action. Use women’s time, energy and emotion in climate action. I love being a part of Global Assembly and bring more women into it by collaborating with women self-help groups such as Kudumbashree.”

Community Assembly Participant, Nawabshah, Pakistan

“I [am] concerned; can humanity really solve the problem, this crisis? The Global Assembly should create local action groups through Community Assemblies. These action groups also have to engage in collecting information from affected people, and help the Global Assembly in publishing this information at global and local level.”

Community Assembly Participant, Kerala, India

“I am very much concerned about the life of my children in 2040. I witnessed the water level increase in the river, how people became helpless and forced to move to relief camps. As a person who constantly engaged in a relief program at the time of flood, I have a hope that, to some extent, we can adapt to some impact to climate change. But it is doubtful how effective climate action will be as climate change worsens in the coming years.”

Community Assembly Participant, Kerala, India

“The process of decolonising our thoughts and cultures. The indigenous cultures we in Europe have erased and keep erasing. A deep moment of reflection and reconciliation. Rebirthing from outside of the world. Migrants’ right to move and live where they want. The Global North is destroying the lands of the Global South countries. Weapon production in Germany, Italy. Need to become aware and raise awareness.”

Participant from a transnational Community Assembly,
Berlin, Germany

“Climate justice will be about connection, not violence. Connection – joined up lines. Non-violence. Joy. Inner drive. Connected to our Earth.”

Participant from a transnational Community Assembly,
London, UK

“Cultivation of tropical agricultural crops in Mediterranean countries, converting to permaculture and obliging the Mediterranean countries to recycle 100% of their wastewater, taking into account the biological flow of the courts.”

Participant from a transnational Community Assembly,
East Morocco


On effectiveness	On climate action
<p>“Audit of effectiveness and a more unified approach.” Community Assembly Participant, Dewsbury, England, UK</p> <p>“More support, local vocational training in order for us to be better able to engage with and develop a green economy in our towns with new jobs. This means anticipating the new skills that will be required and engaging business and technology.” Community Assembly Participant, West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 1 of 6)</p> <p>“Technology can be used to help reduce carbon emissions and we need to make the best use of this technology as quickly and as widely as possible.” Community Assembly Participant, West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 3 of 6)</p>	<p>“Due to the possible impacts of climate change, the students mentioned that we cannot depend on the generation of energy from hydroelectric plants and that we must vary our energy matrix, for example, using solar and wind energy. The students also cited the high price of ethanol as a concern, the need to use more bicycles and expand existing bike paths in the city, and the need for recycling incentives.” Community Assembly Organizer, São Paulo State, Brazil</p> <p>“Concern at knowledge that contents of recycling bins are sent abroad, e.g. Turkey, to be burned. Some countries, e.g. Japan, do much more recycling. The whole issue of recycling and sending waste abroad needs to be properly addressed by both national and local governments. Think globally, act locally.” Community Assembly Participant, West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 5 of 6)</p> <p>“Plastic packaging. There is more pressure on supermarkets in relation to plastic packaging. In the U.S. and Japan, there is more use of paper bags. The use of plastic bags can be ended completely by enforcement at government level. There is too much mixed messaging about packaging. There is too much use of plastic for home deliveries.” Community Assembly Participant, West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 5 of 6)</p> <p>“Forestation. We need to plant more trees and reduce habits and behaviors that encourage deforestation, such as palm oil, for example.” Community Assembly Participant, West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 5 of 6)</p> <p>“Increase use of electric vehicles when without a corresponding much greater use of active mobility and public transport.” Community Assembly Participant, West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 1 of 6)</p> <p>“Subsidies for solar roof panels and ensuring non-regressive energy price tariffs.” Community Assembly Participant, West Yorkshire, England, UK (Event 1 of 6)</p> <p>“Improved efficiency of hydroelectric power plants.” Community Assembly Participant, São Paulo State, Brazil</p> <p>“Use of rainwater in agriculture.” Community Assembly Participant, São Paulo State, Brazil</p> <p>“Recycling incentives for communities.” Community Assembly Participant, São Paulo State, Brazil</p> <p>“Awareness Campaigns” Community Assembly Participant, São Paulo State, Brazil</p>

Quantitative learnings

In this section we present Organizer and Participant feedback which can be easily counted. As with the demographic data, please approach these numbers with caution in line with the very low response rate; all figures indicate the number of respondents from whom the data was drawn.


When asked about specific governance needs (Figure 92), Participants showed similarly high support to Core Assembly Members (Figure 45) for scientific expertise, multilateral collaboration and citizen involvement, also emphasizing the local over the global. In addition to these, additional needs expressed by Participants in subsequent comments included a need for more education and awareness amongst both the public and politicians, a greater emphasis on local action and developing connections between people, and more citizen-led participatory processes influencing politics directly.

Figure 92: Participants' levels of agreement for four types of action on the climate and ecological crisis



When it came to assigning responsibility for addressing the climate and ecological crisis (Figure 93), results also concur with the collective voice of the Core Assembly (Figure 44). Governments at all scales and businesses are deemed to be the most responsible, while civil society organizations have a larger role than that of individuals or charities.

Figure 93: Participants' opinions about who is most responsible for addressing the climate and ecological crisis



**“
Government is not
listening to the
people’s views and
wishes, and our voices
raised in protest are
unheard and unnoticed
by actors with power
to effect change.”**


**“
Transparency and accountability
by the governing powers are
needed to move forward.”**

**“
Need for decentralization
and localisation of power.”**

Community Assembly Participants, UK

Regarding their emotions (Figure 94), Community Assembly Participants felt similarly high levels of anxiety to Core Assembly Members (Figure 40) (around half of responses were 'quite' or 'very much' anxious) and were similarly overwhelmed (35-40% 'quite' or 'very much'). Notably, however, these respondents felt much less excited, hopeful and empowered than Core Assembly members, who tended to register these emotions most highly. This result provides some hints to the limitations of the concise Community Assembly formats and a potential area of focus for future iterations.

Figure 94: Levels of seven emotions felt by Participants after participating in a Community Assembly




“
**Out of the chaos confusion
 and uncertainty are coming
 different things that do give
 me hope.**”

Participant of an international Community Assembly

If the curtailed formats are responsible for a lack of hopefulness and empowerment, it may not be surprising to also see that respondents' confidence in their understanding of the subject matter was somewhat limited (see Figure 95). It would have been interesting to have a snapshot of their understanding before participation in order to assess how this was or wasn't changed by engaging with the process.

Figure 95: Participants' self-reported levels of knowledge around five areas of climate governance




“
Most of the participants were not very interested in climate change and the degradation of Nature before we began the reflection about those topics. But as we developed the different concepts and activities from the Global Assembly’s tools relating to climate and biodiversity, they were more and more interested.”

Community Assembly Organizer,
 Democratic Republic of the Congo

Respondents’ perception of their own influence falls (Figure 96) roughly in line with members of the Core Assembly (Figure 46), except that feelings of influence around local decision making are rather more pronounced. This may simply be a result of the community context in which these events took place, but could also be indicative of the power of and need for such locally-grounded formats as a component of a broader move towards direct citizen engagement.


Figure 96: Participants’ feelings of influence at different scales of climate governance (CEC = climate and ecological crisis)



Participant activation

According to Figure 97, around one third of respondents reported being ‘hardly’ or ‘not at all interested’ in politics. While we do not have a comparable answer to such a question from before the Assemblies, we can see that the number of respondents likely to attend a government meeting after participation is almost the same as the number who did so in the previous three years. This appears to be rather a poor outcome in terms of political activation and indicates that this abbreviated assembly format may not be enough to encourage most people to become more politically active. Aside from the limited time, other reasons for this could include the English language materials making it difficult to run high quality events in other languages, or the fact that the Toolkit did not contain any compulsion or supporting materials to set out possible pathways for action after the Assembly.

Figure 97: Four measures of Participants’ interest in politics




We do see, however, that for around half of respondents, their participation in a Community Assembly caused a change in their concern about the climate and ecological crisis (see Figure 98), their interest in discussing it and their perception of what is needed to address it, as well as their perception of influence. Given the self-selection effect, it is possible that many of those whose opinions did not change were already quite well informed and had a more accurate or more cemented opinion. Consideration could be given in the future to how to guide Community Assembly Organizers to recruit participants with a wide range of backgrounds and perspectives, in greater alignment with the approach of the Core Assembly recruitment.



The participants said that they were unaware about climate change actions and crises. They were unaware about COP and international and national developments to reduce greenhouse gasses. They took interest to be part of future discussions on climate change to increase their knowledge and prevention from the climate change crisis.”

Community Assembly Organizer, Nawabshah, Pakistan

Figure 98: Levels of Participants’ opinion change in four key areas (CEC = climate and ecological crisis)



Perception of the process

As the delivery of Community of Assemblies was decentralized, much of the implementation was beyond the control of the Global Assembly Core Delivery Team. Survey responses do, however, reveal that most respondents thought the content was pitched at an appropriate level (Figure 99). We also observe a healthy, but not overwhelmingly positive, feeling that the Global Assembly will make a difference (Figure 100).

Figure 99: Participants’ evaluation of the complexity level of information materials

The information materials were...
(data from 51 Participants)





Figure 100 (graph right): Participants’ opinion as to whether the GA will make a difference

Do you think the Global Assembly will make a difference?
(data from 47 Participants)



“

We want to connect more. Move out of the box and connect more with people across the planet. Enriching to meet people in this space from across the planet.”

Participant from an international Community Assembly

“

Very much thankful to the Global Assembly for giving this valuable knowledge and I am requesting the Global Assembly to expand Community Assemblies to the people who are deprived of education, and the Community Assemblies have to collaborate with local civil society organizations. If so, it will reach more people.”

Community Assembly Participant, Kerala, India

Learnings from the Community Assembly team

Successes

Based on the responses received from Organizers and Participants, the Community Assemblies were a valuable experience by several measures. The format proved attractive to people all over the world and was amenable to locally contextualized delivery in many different settings and through many different languages. Most Participants found the materials accessible and appropriately pitched, and expressed the belief that the Global Assembly could make a difference, even though they were not directly involved in the primary process of the Core Assembly.

While the uptake of Community Assemblies appears to have been limited, those which were reported, plus the large number of initial registrations gained through localized outreach, show that decentralized Organizer recruitment may be the most promising route for outreach if pursued more rigorously. A majority of Organizers heard about the opportunity through the outreach work of the Cluster Facilitator and Community Hosts in their region, who disseminated translated flyers and social media content, and spoke about the Community Assemblies at webinars and on radio shows.

The 37 Assemblies which reported back were able to leverage the Toolkit and other materials to make the connection between local and global challenges, providing a framework to approach overwhelming issues in the comfort of a familiar setting. This constitutes a powerful mechanism for raising awareness of global issues which differs from news or social media, in that the knowledge is filtered through a peer group setting. In this setting, Participants can consider information collectively and co-produce potential solutions which might compliment or improve upon those mentioned in the materials. Many Participants were activated politically (the disinterested third mentioned above notwithstanding), expressed confidence in their collective agency, and came to see the format as a useful tool to manifest collective agency and make better decisions.

Community Assemblies have the potential to increase the breadth and legitimacy of global citizens' assemblies beyond a space-limited Core Assembly. They enable a far wider range of voices to be represented and provide a mechanism for community learning, engagement and action, which can lead to direct benefits (such as communities working together on climate adaptation solutions), but also empower informed citizens to push for greater political action.

The Community Assemblies have gestured towards a new possible norm in global governance in which multiple engagements at the most local of scales

can reach beyond the confines of their geographical, language and cultural contexts, accumulating into a coherent, collective voice.

Areas for improvement

Based on feedback from Organizers and Participants, this section highlights the main areas which need to be addressed to improve Community Assemblies in the future.

Improvements to the Toolkit

The feedback received highlights the need to continue refining the Toolkit. Potential areas for improvement include the provision of a more immersive and interactive learning experience. While organizers were provided with the Information Booklet and expert speeches, there seems to be a need to develop a training process which prepares them to present an overview of the Information Booklet to participants. These dialogues could also have benefited from more creative forms of learning, such as those in the Core Assembly's Supplemental Workbook.

Future iterations of the Toolkit could benefit from more guidance on how Organizers and Participants can customize the session for their own community. Guidelines could cover the co-creation of a bespoke agenda, concluding activities through which to agree upon community-based actions or simply, more scope in the process plan for adaptation to allow for longer discussions when needed. On more practical fronts, it was clear that the three-hour formats would have benefited from a break and that Participant surveys should have been administered during sessions to enable the collection of more responses.

Recruitment of Organizers and Participants

The long-term vision of Community Assemblies is to enable anyone on Earth to engage in the Global Assembly, even if they are not selected by civic lottery. However, the outsized number of highly-educated people in the 2021 Community Assemblies reflects a common concern of self-selected events: the inclusion of 'usual suspects' and exclusion of underprivileged profiles, such as unconnected communities, uneducated or illiterate people, and minorities. Insofar as structural barriers to participation, not just exclusion from sortition, impact everyday peoples' engagement in deliberative processes, future iterations of the Community Assemblies will require a more rigorous and intentional approach to the recruitment of more diverse Organizers and Participants. For example, future Community Assembly Toolkits might include a guide on recruiting a diverse group of Participants, or more substantial grants could be offered to enable Organizers from all walks of life to engage. Furthermore, there are significant opportunities to partner with organizations who could contextualize and promote Community Assemblies to their audiences, with a view to addressing community concerns and developing action plans. Such organizations could include workplaces,

movements, civil society organizations, and schools where there may also be opportunities to integrate with the curriculum.

Accessibility of engagement

Feedback from Organizers and Participants revealed a number of barriers to engagement. One major factor which likely contributed to the low survey response rate was voiced by several people in a request for feedback forms in other languages, so it would have been useful (and ultimately more inclusive) to have made provision for the translation of these. In addition, it might be helpful to develop guidance for more format and time options and offer more resources for facilitation skills and methods. The Global Assembly team could also offer support to more Organizers for Participant recruitment and data collection.

Follow-up to Community Assemblies

Even if the experience during a Community Assembly is positive, it was not always clear to Participants and Organizers what might happen next. While follow-up actions are necessarily context-specific to each community, the Global Assembly can also provide resources centrally. For example, it may be prudent to supply an editable flyer to Participants to encourage them to hold another Community Assembly themselves with other people. It may also be helpful to provide a list of suggested activities for Participants to engage in after the Community Assembly. For instance, some Participants proposed convening “Coffee Assembly tables,” or shorter discussions between interested Participants to continue the dialogue.

Integration of Community Assemblies

Community Assemblies were piloted in 2021. In the future, it would be interesting to explore linkages between Community Assemblies and Core Assemblies, and to schedule Community Assemblies to let them integrate outcomes into COP proceedings or similar events, as was achieved with the 2021 Core Assembly and COP26. Worthwhile possibilities also exist to explore specific functions and roles within the overall deliberative process where distributed Community Assemblies could contribute meaningfully. For example, Community Assemblies could take place following a Core Assembly to review and contextualize the outcome (such as the People’s Declaration) or to surface issues and topics as an agenda setting exercise ahead of a future Global Assembly. One might also imagine deeper, more synchronous integrations, for example, where Community Assemblies are invited to review outcomes developed during the Core Assembly and to provide comments and considerations that are deliberated upon by Core Assembly Members. Community Assemblies could also support the development of information materials, such as the identification of local insights and witnesses, which could offer testimony to Core Assemblies. Furthermore, Community Assemblies could be a useful vehicle to take forward recommendations and statements from a Core Assembly to develop localized statements and to identify concrete actions towards their implementation.

Communications and Cultural Wave

04

Introduction

Creating, platforming and disseminating content and messaging about the Global Assembly through multiple avenues and global perspectives.

Central to the Global Assembly (GA) Theory of Change (see page 29 and Annex 1.4 for more information) is mass engagement with the global population. From the first meetings in 2019, was part of the fabric of the Global Assembly to develop robust, decentralized pathways for communications and media work. The primary communications objective was to raise awareness of the Global Assembly and to provide a platform to share the stories of all those involved.

Over the course of two years, the Communications Team grew out from the Central Circle and cultivated a global network of artists, influencers and creatives, alongside people from the Global Assembly's broader community, such as Assembly Members, Community Hosts and Cluster Facilitators.

Within the Global Assembly's Communications strategy was a key pillar of the vision: the **Cultural Wave** (see page 231). The Cultural Wave was an experiment to maximize engagement with the Global Assembly, and other citizens' assemblies, beyond the confines of academia and mainstream media; bringing awareness of the Assembly to the masses through popular culture. In removing the barriers to knowledge that are intrinsically built into these traditional outlets, it aimed to provide an educational platform of creative responses to the concept of the Global Assembly, and to the climate and ecological crisis.

As well as publicity, the Communications Team also engaged in **relationship building**. This manifested not only in the creation of a group of globally engaged cultural influencers, but also in cementing the growing global network into a Community of Practice, building relationships with media outlets and creating conversations with change-making people and institutions around the world.

A great deal has been learnt during this pilot year about the messaging required to make these processes popular in the future. There are a myriad of challenges that come with international communications work which must traverse languages, cultures, and digital barriers, and much work needs to be done in the world of deliberative democracy about how to communicate these processes in an approachable and attractive way.

“
What we need
to do here is to
create an actual
new genre for
the idea of the
Global Assembly,
including fashion,
music, food, film,
our own sort of
language.”

Kim XP, filmmaker, Uganda

Communications

A primary learning from previous citizens' assemblies is that many largely fail to become major stories in the media, generally being relegated to sections like special interest or progressive politics. However, those that do, such as the French *Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat*, can become a prominent, sometimes contentious, part of public debate.^[25, 26] Therefore, from the beginning, the Communications Team wanted to find ways of promoting the Global Assembly to the public and find creative ways of messaging that move beyond the typical methods often found in other social change movements.

In particular, it was critical for Global Assembly communications to tell the stories of the Assembly Members themselves, and provide the platforms for them to speak about their own experiences. This was done by curating filmed content and opportunities for Assembly Members to speak at events, as well as also opening doors to engage with the press and media.

“

It should become a mass movement. Today we are 100 assembly members, tomorrow maybe 1000, then 10,000... people of the world will listen, adhere to and act.”

Anil Yadav, Community Host, Uttar Pradesh, India

“

What if a new system of governance were possible, where politicians and business leaders did not set the policies? Recently, the world's first ever global citizens' assembly on the climate and ecological crisis has been formed and it gives me great hope.”

Sir Mark Rylance, Academy Award winning actor, UK

Summary of the Global Assembly communications strategy

Aims	Primary target audiences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Demonstrate the potential for a citizen-led form of global decision-making by showing the power of citizens’ assemblies in generating empathy, activation and ambition in comparison with ‘politics-as-usual’ — Make a strong case for a future where this form of decision-making holds a permanent place in the international system — Ensure Assembly Members’ proposals are heard by decision-makers and other influencers, particularly at COP26 and other conferences — Grow awareness of the Global Assembly and establish credibility through key media placement — Build and maintain relationships, both internally and externally — Recruit global partners to deliver the Core Assembly, such as Community Hosts and Cluster Facilitators — Recruit global citizens to participate in pilot Community Assemblies to be run in parallel with the Core Assembly in order to broaden engagement with the question at the heart of the 2021 Global Assembly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — UN, UN member states, climate/environment practitioners, global decision-making forums — Citizens — Civil society and community organizations — Democracy innovation practitioners
Working principles	Messaging themes
<p>The Communications team, like all involved in the Global Assembly, strove to work in line with the Assembly’s values (see page 33)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Empower citizens to speak for themselves, rather than be represented by a delivery team (with safety considerations and support in place) — Maintain a global perspective and presence — Maintain integrity by being non-partisan and non-ideological in all activities (e.g. do not presuppose the outcomes of the Global Assembly or the opinions of Assembly Members) — Embody openness by sharing what we are doing — Bring the Global Assembly to people through popular culture, rather than simply within the academic/intellectual realm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — The climate crisis is a symptom of the governance crisis, and we can no longer leave climate solutions to politicians, we must support them to make the decisions necessary — When people are supported with the knowledge, tools, and space to deliberate with others from different walks of life they come up with solutions far more ambitious than politicians — Assemblies can change people profoundly, they support citizens to realize their power, build their agency and be inspired to act — This is the world’s first global citizens’ assembly and anyone on Earth can participate — Rather than simply a one-off event, we are building a new infrastructure for global governance
Approach	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Reach public through distributed networks with a clear call to action (e.g. run a Community Assembly) — Make relationships with influencers to amplify content via social media and cultural expression — Support Assembly Members to feel empowered to speak at events and in the media — Share the human stories of the Global Assembly community via all of our channels — Identify specific press targets and offer media packages with Assembly Members where they could speak about their experiences and views — Share our vision and methodological approach to reach institutions, through speaking at events and writing — Build the Cultural Wave with a global network of creatives to bring the Global Assembly to people’s lives through popular culture 	
Tools	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Social media Twitter: @_GlobalAssembly Facebook: Global Assembly Instagram: @globalassembly LinkedIn: Global Assembly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Newsletter — Emails — Videos — Website — Events

Press and media coverage

External coverage

The primary goals, as outlined above, revolved around telling the story of the Global Assembly, the work being done, and providing a platform for the voices of the Global Assembly community. To do this, the Communications Team established relationships with individuals, organizations, and platforms who could amplify the Global Assembly story across their international networks.

The team is aware of **more than 50 media stories** about the Global Assembly around the world, however there have likely been many more that the team are not aware of.

This included written stories and mentions in:

- [Forbes](#), International
- [Reuters](#), International
- [The Guardian](#), UK
- [Le Monde](#), France
- [The BBC](#), UK
- [The Hindustan Times](#), India
- [WIRED Italy](#), Italy
- [Morocco World News](#), Morocco
- [The Helsinki Times](#), Finland
- [UN Brasil](#), Brazil

Audio and video media coverage, including:

- [BBC](#), World News
- [LBC](#), UK
- [TVC-22 Rockland](#), Canada
- [BBC Radio Scotland](#)

“

The Global Assembly has given all of us the opportunity to have our collective voice heard. That will make the Global Assembly, which is us, successful.”


Bob Eccles in Forbes

WORLD'S FIRST GLOBAL CITIZENS' ASSEMBLY CALLS FOR ECOCIDE TO BE ENFORCED

Last month, a new operating system for global governance was launched: the Global Assembly. After a month of learning and discussing key issues around the climate crisis, the Core Assembly presented their key messages at COP26.

The Global Citizens' Assembly voted that the crime of Ecocide should be enshrined in international and national laws, and that it should be firmly enforced. The Global Assembly's declaration, which was presented to world leaders at the COP26 Climate Conference, says Ecocide should be "firmly enforced alongside existing environmental protection laws".

STORIES GENERATED
36
 POTENTIAL REACH
238,209,539
 ADVERTISING VALUE EQUIVALENT
USD \$2,203,438.2



SOCIAL MEDIA POSTS
90
 REACH OVER TIME
506.1K
 TOP HASHTAG
#GlobalAssembly

MOST SHARED ARTICLES

Article Title	Facebook engagements	Twitter shares	Total engagements
World's first Global Citizens' Assembly calls for ecocide to be enforced — Stop Ecocide International (UK)	189	60	250
Citizens call for international laws to punish crime of 'ecocide' (UK)	47	32	312

Data sources:
Meltwater
Buzzsumo
Talkwalker

Figure 101: COP26 press coverage report produced by press partner GSCC

Internally produced media

Written media

Members of the Global Assembly team were asked by multiple organizations and platforms to write about the theory and practice of the Global Assembly, for example:

- [‘Getting Climate Citizens’ Assemblies Right](#), Carnegie Europe
- [Defibrillating Democracy](#), New Internationalist
- [Hope from the extraordinary is power for ordinary people](#), Hindustan time
- [Arab Voices Play Crucial Role in Democracy Activism Against Climate Change](#), Inside Arabia

Video production

As part of the effort to share the voices of the Global Assembly, video assets were produced featuring members of the community from around the world. These were shared on social media and incorporated them into videos released at events.

For the ‘soft launch’ in December 2020, the Communications Team produced a [launch video](#), which was narrated by UK actor Sir Mark Rylance.

For the launch event and events at COP26 two videos were produced:

- [GA LAUNCH: ‘THE CHALLENGE’](#)
- [Global Assembly “THE JOURNEY”](#)

The Communications Team also commissioned nine videos made by local film crew documenting the lives and Global Assembly experiences of Assembly Members, planned for release in 2022. The films cover Assembly Members in countries including:

- [Yemen](#)
- [Cote D’Ivoire](#)
- [Thailand](#)
- [The Democratic Republic of Congo](#)
- [China](#)
- [Italy](#)
- [India](#)
- [Brazil](#)

Digital media

The Communications Team supported and collated the creation of audio and visual content from the wider Global Assembly community, from Assembly Members and Community Hosts to expert witnesses, Facilitators, Notetakers and translators. These were presented in an interactive [map](#) where the user can choose to click on what content they are interested in geographically.

For a full list of all Global Assembly press stories and coverage please see Annex 4.1.

Spokesperson training

- **50 spokespeople trained**
- **36 Community Hosts and Cluster Facilitators**
- **Eight Assembly Members**
- **Six Core Delivery Team members**

All those who were going to engage in any public facing work were offered spokesperson training by an experienced trainer in the team. The first priority of training sessions was outlining the risk associated with engaging on public facing platforms. As the Global Assembly was operating in many different political contexts around the world, it was critical to prompt spokespeople to be aware of potential risks with publicly outlining their involvement in the process. Secondly, the training provided practical advice on media appearances and activities to surface personal messaging in advance of appearances.

Spokesperson training sessions were open twice a week for three weeks in September, taking place in different time zones, with an additional and focused training in October for those Assembly Members who were speaking at COP26.

In 2021, spokesperson training was conducted centrally by a member of the Communications Team. Looking forward, the goal is to decentralize spokesperson training by training the trainers, so that the work can be better attuned to cultural nuances and language needs.

Events

Members of the Global Assembly, both delivery team and wider community, have engaged in and run events around the world, both online and in-person. This included events at conferences such as COP26 (UK), Peace One Day (Online), Global Conversation 2021 (Estonia), and Climate Ambition Summit (Online).

Global Assembly Events 2021

December 9, 2020: Global Assembly Soft Launch

At the end of 2020, members of the original Delivery Team ran an event to share the idea of the Global Assembly and the plan to run it in the build up to COP26. This was an online event attended by people around the world and was picked up by media outlets including Reuters and the Guardian.

June 24, 2021: Live Sortition Event

The Central Circle ran a live sortition event which saw the 100 points generated around the world, indicating the locations where the 100 Core Assembly Members would come from. The event was live streamed^f and attended by journalists, artists, leaders in the field of deliberative democracy, and members of the public. For more information see “Step 1: Global Location Lottery” section.

October 5, 2021: Official Global Assembly Launch

The Launch Event^g was aimed primarily at journalists from around the world. It officially announced the Global Assembly and explained the vision, goal, and design of the project.

This event was run twice in one day to provide options for people from different time zones around the world to attend. More than 250 people tuned in across both events. It was covered by the Guardian, Le Monde and other media outlets (see Annex 4.1 for a full list of events and media coverage).

“

Advocates say citizens’ assemblies can provide a counterweight to hyper-partisanship and disinformation on social media by convening people outside of adversarial political systems to call in expert testimony.”

Footnote

f. [Link to recording.](#)

g. [Link to recording.](#)

Matthew Green, Reuters

COP26 engagement

Eight members of the Global Assembly Core Delivery Team attended COP26 in Glasgow in November 2021. This in-person team engaged with individuals, organizations and events at COP26 and around the city. Assembly Members joined the team via video link to present at official COP26 events, and invited speakers joined online or in-person.

November 1, 2021: COP26 Green Zone Launch Event

On the first day of COP26, the Global Assembly team held its first event in the Imax cinema in the public facing 'Green Zone' of the conference^h. This event was open to the public and is where the People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth, which had been composed and ratified by the Core Assembly in the weeks leading up to COP26, was officially launched. Members of the Central Circle presented the different aspects of the Global Assembly, and five Assembly Members presented their Declaration via online connection. It became one of the most-watched films from the conference, with more than 7,800 online views.


Figure 102:
UNA-UK shares
the GA's opening
Green Zone event
on Twitter



UNA-UK  @UNAUK · 01/11/2021

Members of the [#GlobalAssembly](#) speak about the [#PeoplesDeclaration](#), global collaboration and more at [#COP26](#) 📌

youtube.com/watch?v=fmmOsS...



Footnote

h. [Link to recording.](#)

In addition, guest speakers advocated for the Global Assembly:

- Nicola Sturgeon, First Minister of Scotland
- Vanessa Nakate, Activist and Founder of Youth for Future Africa and the Rise Up Movement
- Laurence Tubiana, CEO of the European Climate Foundation and key architect of the Paris Climate Accords
- Natalie Samarasinghe, CEO, United Nations Association UK
- Professor Sir Bob Watson, Chair of the Global Assembly's Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee and former Chair of IPCC and IPBES

Figure 103: A GA tweet about the opening Green Zone event



“

The best memory would be the honor to represent the Global Assembly at the COP26 of the United Nations. I have never thought I would have such an opportunity in my life. I went there to speak about the People's Declaration on raising public awareness and education on climate change.”

Chom Chaiyabut, Assembly Member, Thailand

November 2, 2021: COP26 Green Zone event 2

Great Recovery Dialogues: Bridging Climate and Social Justice

In this Green Zone session, Core Delivery Team member Flynn Devine sat on a panel with activists and thinkers from around the world discussing the role the Global Assembly might play in bringing social and climate justice together.

November 5, 2021: COP26 Blue Zone event 1

Engagement For Harnessing Climate action: stories and lessons of empowerment from around the worldⁱ

One Core Delivery Team member, Susan Lee, spoke live at this event. She gave an overview of the Global Assembly process, an account of why the Assembly is a natural progression from current 'operating systems,' what it means to young people and the importance of intergenerational learning.

Figure 104: Core Delivery Team member Susan Lee joins a panel in the Blue Zone



Footnote

- i. [Link to recording.](#)

November 5, 2021: COP26 Blue Zone event 2

We Have Agreed, Will You?: citizens explain their vision for climate justice

This event included two Assembly Members, Mary Nassr from Syria and Kevin Archundia from Ecuador, who sat on a panel with members from other citizens' assemblies around the world and explained their experience of the Global Assembly, and why they designed and now support the People's Declaration.

Figure 105:
Assembly
Members Mary
Nassr and Kevin
Archundia
speak alongside
members of
other citizens'
assemblies in the
Blue Zone



November 8, 2021: COP26 Blue Zone event 3

Futures Lab at COP26^j

Member of the Core Delivery Team, Claire Mellier, joined a panel to discuss the design and inner workings of the Global Assembly and its potential future, linking to the role this process could play in the future of decision-making.

November 9, 2021: COP26 Blue Zone event 4

COP26 Science Innovation Day: Making Science Work for Solutions^k

Core Delivery Team member Susan Lee joined a COP Presidency Event on Innovation Day to discuss how innovation in governance must accompany innovation in science to address the climate and ecological crisis.

Footnotes

j. [Link to recording.](#)

k. [Link to recording.](#)

November 11, 2021: COP26 Blue Zone event 5

World Wildlife Fund on the Climate Crisis

Another member of the Core Delivery Team, Rich Wilson, discussed the Global Assembly, the argument that the crisis in climate can really be seen as a crisis in international governance, and the role citizens' assemblies could play in addressing this.

Global Assembly Events 2022

This year, some resources have been dedicated to support Assembly Members and Global Assembly team members to advocate for the People's Declaration at various conferences. Conference events organized and coordinated by the Core Delivery Team include UNEA-5 (Kenya), Stockholm+50 (Sweden)¹ and PeaceOneDay Climate Action Live (Online).

Figure 106:
Assembly Members and staff collaborated to present the process and Declaration during a registered event at the UN Environment Assembly in March 2022



Global Assembly

Members of the Global Assembly Present the People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth

Join the people involved in the Global Assembly, to find out more about how a snapshot of the world population can be brought together to learn and deliberate on the climate and ecological crisis.

Speakers:
Subodh Adhikari, Assembly Member | Clarence Gio, Breakout Facilitator
Yeshialem Lemma, Assembly Member | Sanskriti Menon, India Cluster Facilitator
Phoolchandra Prajapati, Assembly Member | Parisa Soltanpour, Assembly Member
Jon Stever, Central Circle Lead

Thursday March 3rd 2022 | from 15:30 - 16:45 EAT

Join us live in the Green Room, UN Environment Assembly, Nairobi, or online at https://bit.ly/ga_declaration

For a full list of all Global Assembly events and associated press coverage please see Appendix 4.1.

Footnote

1. [Link to event recording.](#)

Core Assembly delivery support

In order to deliver the Core Assembly, the Global Assembly team had to expand and decentralize rapidly. Communication channels were vital in this endeavor. Personal networks, the newsletter and social media channels were used to promote:

- Lab Partner opportunities
- The opportunity to join the Community of Practice and help recruit Community Hosts
- The openings for the Community Host positions and the points around the world where extra support finding Community Hosts was required

The Communications Team also provided various resources to help with the decentralization process. For example, during Community Host recruitment the Community of Practice was furnished with:

- Fully translatable flyers to share in their languages to their own network
- Email templates for contacting potential Community Hosts
- Phone scripts for contacting potential Community Hosts

Cultural Wave

The Cultural Wave was envisioned as the third major pillar of the Global Assembly, alongside the Core Assembly and Community Assemblies. Its aim was to engage the world through popular culture with the help of high profile artists and grass roots participation. As noted above, previous citizens' assemblies have often lacked media presence and have rarely crossed over in significant ways to popular culture, with the media coverage they gain generally confined to academic platforms. The Citizen's Convention for the Climate (CCC) held in France in 2020 was an exception, where organizers engaged a team who worked closely with cultural influencers and artists. The awareness of the French Assembly amongst the public was over 70% of the population,^[16] which suggests that working with artists and creatives is a key component in ensuring high levels of engagement and interest from the public.

The Cultural Wave was further inspired by the successful [#DontGoViral campaign](#)^[27] run across the African continent by one of the delivery partners, Innovation for Policy Foundation, where artists and musicians provided creative responses to the COVID-19 pandemic to combat false understandings, encouraging people to follow health guidelines.

The Cultural Wave global network

Visioning for the Cultural Wave began in May 2020, with initial discussions involving community leaders from 17 countries which informed the design of a global facing process. The development phase continued with a period of direct outreach to creatives around the world to attend co-creation sessions and discuss what the Cultural Wave could look like. These efforts resulted in a series of co-working meetings featuring creatives from more than 22 countries.

Cultural influencers involved included:

- Kim XP, filmmaker (Uganda)
- Hiroko Kikuchi, artist (Japan)
- Arundhati Ghosh, Executive Director to India Foundation of the Arts (India)
- Brian Eno, musician and producer (UK)
- Nirmika Singh, Executive Editor, Rolling Stone India (India)
- Sir Mark Rylance, Academy Award winning actor (UK)
- Asif Kapadia, Academy Award winning director (UK)
- Stephen Fry, actor and writer (UK)
- Nelly Ben Hayoun, artist (France)
- Ralph Eya, artist (Philippines)
- Marcus Lyon, artist (UK)
- Kristina Borg, artist (Malta)

Organizations and networks involved included:

- India Foundation for the Arts
- Arab Fund for Art and Culture
- Invisible Tokyo
- Earth Percent

“
**This has been amazing, how
on Earth did you manage to
get together so many artists?”**

Nelly Ben Hayoun, artist, France

Artistic responses to the Global Assembly so far

A number of open calls for submissions of artistic work prompted creative responses to the Global Assembly and the climate and ecological crisis. Members of the Cultural Wave network were able to support some projects directly. Invitations and prompts for contributions were disseminated through social media networks and the Global Assembly's email lists. Flyers (see Figure 107) were provided for people to share more widely with their personal and professional networks.

Figure 107: Social media advertisement for Cultural Wave's open call for submissions



As already outlined, a limited budget meant that funds were weighted towards the Core Assembly in 2021. As a result, Communications and Cultural Wave work only started to scratch the surface of what would be possible with international voices, shared visions and a powerful narrative to drive forward the idea of global citizens' assemblies.

Figure 108: Quilt making project organized by Melissa Barrera (France/Philippines). Villagers worked with Melissa to capture their experiences of climate change through traditional quilt making.



Figure 109: Community art project organized by Siphwe Ngwenya (South Africa). A local community painted an entire street after their discussions of lived experience of climate change, and the need to bring everybody together to address the crisis.



Figure 110: Youth community project organized by Angely Chi (Philippines). A community of street children created work in reaction to climate change and the industrialization of their area.



Figure 111: Painting by Oliver Hunter as part of an exhibition organized by Anna Wiggs (Australia). 24 pieces were exhibited in Darwin, Australia, commissioned by the Cultural Wave.



THERE IS NO ART ON A DEAD PLANET Artist statements

1. Oliver Hunter

My working process is variable and gradual. It's not linear or inevitable. I start with a rough sketch, which feels awkward and unrealistic, and through building up layers of revision and correction, eventually I reach a point where something resembling a more authentic presence emerges. The discomfort and awkwardness is just part of the process. This is a small way for me to unlearn habitual visual stereotypes and re-learn how to see depth and complexity. Or at least see my own biases externalised with some more clarity. Drawing from life is best for this, but photography is useful here also.

Octavia E. Butler's writing is playing in the background as I work. A Torresian pigeon sits on the roof of the studio, eating seeds from the fan palm and dropping them on the streets of corrugated iron above me. This goes on for days.

I think about the ubiquitous seeds in Butler's writing, taking root among the stars, with earth rising in an alien sky. I think about how strange tentacles or tentacles emerge from the stories and embed themselves in my mind. I stitch silver thread into the flesh of the canvas.

I think about the fan palms of southern California where Butler grew up, and the evolutionary history of this plant species that grew to spread across all continents in deep time (to reach a high level of diversity in Australia). I think about the many birds that evolved in Australia, including at songbirds and pigeons, before spreading out across the world in their own way. I think about migration and colonisation, diasporas and disconnections.

I think about the unending process of growth and change that is Butler's obsession (and by extension, my obsession), the unexpected mutation of our bodies and minds as life flourishes from non-life.

I think about decolonisation, and the need to dream beyond the categories that have been built for us to inhabit and maintain.

I dream.

Figure 112:
Actor Sir Mark
Rylance (UK),
reading a script
he developed in
collaboration with
the Cultural Wave
Team^m



Figure 113:
A mosaic made
by a group,
coordinated by
Gertrud Müller
(China). The group
was inspired
after running
a Community
Assembly
and created
this mosaic in
response. They
partnered with a
German language
school in the city,
and the mosaic
was built onto
their building.



“
When I became aware of the Global
Assembly and its Creative Wave initiative
I really felt this is made for me: I believe in
citizens’ participation and I am an artist”.

Gertrud Müller, Community Artist

Footnote
m. [Link to video.](#)

Figure 114:
A poem inspired
by the Global
Assembly,
written by a
young woman in
the Democratic
Republic of
Congo after she
had attended
a Community
Assembly. Sheda
Grace has gone
on to write a
full blog for the
Cultural Wave,
based on her
reflections on
climate change as
she experiences it
in her community.

“People of the World”

People of Africa
People of Europe
People of Asia
People of America
People of Australia and everywhere in the world
You are abusively exploiting our soil
You violently destroy our flora and fauna
You deplete our natural resources without remorse
And your incessant waste accumulates rubbish that pollutes the air and water
Our bushes are burnt and our forests are decimated
Why this pressure on nature?
Why this indifference for the heritage of humanity?
Oh! What will you bequeath to future generations?
You, people of Industrial Civilization
You accelerate greenhouse gas emissions
And today the heat is suffocating animate beings across the planet
Epidemics are knocking on our doors and carrying way innocent people
From North to south from the East to the west of our Earth, famine is increasing
Even the rains are now scarce:
Rain here, there is a long drought
People, you are the cause of these pangs.
Soon our life will no longer be life
Our land will no longer be land
Shall we still exist without land?
No! No! No! It's enough!
Enough with the damage to our land
Enough with the damage to our seas, flora and fauna
It's time for a lifestyle change to alleviate the drama that awaits us all
People of the world, isn't it that your economic growth has changed our climate?
Isn't it that your economic growth has a negative impact on our ecology?
Do not close your eyes any more to the desertification of our planet
Be aware of the danger that your current production mechanism represents for the
future of humanity!
Otherwise tomorrow is our hell
Tomorrow is the grave for our children.
Women, men, girls, boys, young and old, let us all stand up against global warming
Let us reforest our meadows and make our environment healthy
Let's substitute our polluting energies with green energies
Let's well manage our waste and especially, do not pollute our waters by throwing
anything into it.
Let us now live in harmony with Nature as our ancestors did
And you world decision-makers, governments, researchers, international organizations
and people of good will.
Like you are doing against COVID-19,
Put global warming at the first plan
Altogether, let's say No to the disappearance of green spaces,
No to bush fires
No to tree felling and deforestation
No to the extermination of animal and vegetal spaces
No to air and water pollution.
So be it! So may it be done!

By Miss Sheda GRACE
Member of Human Peace Care
Youth Peace Club of Goma-Democratic Republic of Congo



Learnings and reflections

Even though communications work was limited in 2021, there were some key takeaways from these pilot activities.

Decentralization of Communications work

To be truly global, decentralization should be designed into communications (as it was into the implementation of the Core Assembly and Community Assemblies).

Limited resources required the Global Assembly to prioritize budget and time for Cluster Facilitators and Community Hosts to deliver the Core Assembly (the primary objective for 2021). As a consequence, there was limited capacity in these decentralized groups to commit to communications work, which was led by members of the Central Circle as the Communications Team. Had the Global Assembly's communications function been designed to be decentralized (for example, if there had been a communications lead in each Cluster or each of the 100 Core Assembly locations), then perhaps the project could have developed far more authentically global content, telling a richer story of the participants, and the teams supporting them.


Although English was not the first language of all members of the team, it was the most commonly spoken language, and therefore the primary language of communication internally and externally. To counter this, two main avenues were pursued to try to ensure that the Global Assembly reached citizens in multiple languages:

- Publication of a [wiki](#) to crowdsource translations of learning and Toolkit materials from the global community. The Information Booklet was translated into 19 languages.
- Creation of a WhatsApp channel which included around 30 spokespeople from across the global community, including Cluster Facilitators and Assembly Members. The Communications Team shared social media content and invited spokespeople to publish their own adapted/translated versions. The community was encouraged to generate and share media coverage, which was celebrated through the WhatsApp group (and re-shared on Global Assembly social media channels) to inspire others to create content. This group remains active.

As the Core Assembly drew to a close, members of the wider global team had more capacity to get involved in communications. It was clear that this had the potential to create a far greater impact than could be achieved by a centralized Communications team.


For example, the following Community Assembly grant announcement was translated and shared by spokespeople to their respective networks:

Figure 115:
Twitter post
advertising the
microgrants
available for
Community
Assembly
Organizers



Despite sharing this on the official Global Assembly Twitter account, and promoting it at COP26 live on November 1, only 15 people signed up to run a Community Assembly on that date. In contrast, locally contextualized outreach (Figure 116) by a Cluster Facilitator triggered 44 people in Pakistan to sign up on November 7.

Figure 116:
Locally
contextualized
outreach by a
Cluster Facilitator
in India



Finding the stories that resonate

Communicating the story before it has happened is challenging

To keep the Core Assembly Members as free as possible from external influence, their identities were not published until they presented their Declaration at COP26. This created a challenge for the Communications team: until Assembly Members were able to tell their stories, and communicate the impact of the Global Assembly on them personally, there was limited content with which to inspire participation and interest.

More creativity is needed to engage people outside of the deliberative community

In this pilot year, engagement came mainly from those already working in the deliberative field. This is understandable, given that sufficient budget was not available to invest in a broad public engagement campaign. Furthermore, the main ‘call to action’ for the public was to run Community Assemblies, an activity that may not have been easily approachable for those unfamiliar with deliberative or community dialogues.

In the future, there is an important role for communicators to play in bringing to life the often academic language around deliberative democracy. Anecdotally, the narrative strand that has resonated most with non-specialist audiences is that the climate and ecological crisis (and indeed many other crises) is a symptom of a governance crisis, and that there is a better way of finding solutions which centers citizens.

This narrative is a shift away from the often-heard stories from the front line of climate change, which focus on practical ways communities can act (such as tree-planting schemes), and the need for existing power-holders to listen to citizens. Instead, it communicates the bigger-picture need to reboot the entire system and put citizens at the heart of decision-making.

Since the Global Assembly 2021 took place, this idea has grown, with the IPCC being more explicit about the role for citizens in governance around climate.ⁿ Hopefully, this can be explored more fully through future citizens’ assemblies, generating powerful content from participants that would inspire more citizens to realize their self-efficacy in driving change.

Footnote

n. See IPCC WGII Sixth Assessment Report,^[10] page 30, section SPM.C.5.6: “Inclusive governance that prioritises equity and justice in adaptation planning and implementation leads to more effective and sustainable adaptation outcomes (high confidence). Vulnerabilities and climate risks are often reduced through carefully designed and implemented laws, policies, processes, and interventions that address context specific inequities such as based on gender, ethnicity, disability, age, location and income (high confidence). These approaches, which include multi-stakeholder co-learning platforms, transboundary collaborations, community-based adaptation and participatory scenario planning, focus on capacity-building, and meaningful participation of the most vulnerable and marginalised groups, and their access to key resources to adapt (high confidence).”

There is a role for thought leadership alongside citizen-led communication

The main priority of Global Assembly communications was to create space for Assembly Members and the rest of the community to express their own views and experiences. While this remains important, it made it difficult to convey the importance of the Global Assembly process itself as distinct from the value gained through the process. For example, for citizens who had never heard of climate change, the education around the science, which explained what they were seeing in their communities, was often the most impactful thing about their Global Assembly experience. This meant that, at times Global Assembly content, centered as it was on Assembly Members' experiences, was indistinct from other campaigning and activist organizations who work on climate issues. Parallel to this is a need for thought leaders to draw lines between the wisdom emerging from citizens, and the bigger picture context of why and how that wisdom can be applied to global governance.

Finance

05

Raising funds

In addition to significant in-kind contributions from partners worldwide, the Global Assembly for COP26 received a total of US\$972,535 from five funders:

- Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation UK Branch (£100k)
- Climate Emergency Collaboration Group (CECG; \$300k)
- European Climate Foundation (ECF; £100k)
- One Project (\$250k)
- Scottish Government (£100k)

The Global Assembly also received donations from a number of individuals (see “Special thanks”, page 249).

None of the funders had any influence over any aspect of the Global Assembly whatsoever. This was a key condition communicated to funders, and aligned with the Global Assembly’s values of emphasizing the process of decision-making and its insistence on maintaining independence.

Managing the funds

The Global Assembly’s funds were contracted, held and managed by Innovation for Policy Foundation (i4Policy). i4Policy was responsible for developing the Global Assembly’s accounting design and detailed budget, which was approved by the Central Circle and regularly reviewed.

Fundraising activities took place while the Global Assembly was being designed and implemented. To compensate for this, the budget was anchored by four impact and funding scenarios ranging from what was considered to be the minimum possible budget of US\$750k to an ideal target budget of US\$2m (see Financial Procedures in Annex 5.1).

Overall expenditure for the Global Assembly for COP26 reached **US\$ 972,246.84**.

Table 10:
Breakdown of
expenditure for
GA2021

Consolidated Total Budget	\$972,247
Assembly Member Participation and Support	\$444,651
— Cluster Facilitators	\$29,200
— Community Hosts	\$278,481
— Assembly Member Stipends	\$59,700
— Information Materials Development	\$11,909
— Core Assembly Facilitators	\$43,641
— Core Assembly Editors	\$6,500
— Core Assembly Technical Support & Notetakers	\$15,220
Organization of the Assembly	\$416,847
— Coordination Team	\$335,189
— Professional Services and Software	\$59,097
— Assembly Labs	\$22,561
Communications & Outreach	\$97,086
— Events	\$14,924
— Brand Development, Website & Materials	\$27,205
— Community Assembly & Cultural Wave grants	\$32,050
— Film	\$22,908
Financial Transaction Costs	\$13,663

The Global Assembly applied its value of “equal compensation” – that everyone who participates will be compensated and valued equally – and applied the principle across the organization of the Global Assembly, establishing transparent compensation ranges for contributors, partners, and members globally.

For example, all Assembly Members were provided a stipend of US\$600 for their participation in the Global Assembly, irrespective of where they lived or their local living standard variations. Community Hosts also, for example, received a common stipend of US\$2,800 for their work leading local participant recruitment, contextualizing and translating information materials, and supporting Assembly Members through the Core Assembly with translation and access to the Internet and devices.

Reflections and future outlook

The budget for the Global Assembly was very limited, considering the scope of the work. The average cost per Assembly Member in the Global Assembly for COP26, for example, was almost four times lower than the cost per member of the French Citizens' Climate Convention (which was roughly €36k). It was possible to deliver the Global Assembly within these constraints due to the strong culture of collaboration between partners and contributors, shared commitments to the vision and values, and often the extreme (and unsustainable) work ethic of staff.

What went well

- The transparent and equal compensation for contributors and partners and Assembly Members is deeply aligned with Global Assembly values, and established a strong culture of egalitarianism, mutual responsibility, and trust within the Core Delivery Team and broader community.
- Trust enabled collective problem-solving, in a remote-work and high-pressure environment.

What didn't go well

- Some countries and regions of the world are excluded from global financial markets, resulting in difficulty of transacting and/or delays.
- Bank transfer fees, compounded with currency exchange transactions, were often extremely burdensome for our community of partners and contributors, ranging from US\$30 to over US\$150 per transaction.
- It would have been preferable to offer higher compensation for staff, contributors, and partners.

Conclusions and future outlook

06

Giving everyone a seat at the global governance table

Key conclusions

The conclusions of the Global Assembly (GA) 2021 prototyping year are:

- A global citizens' assembly is possible.
- A global citizens' assembly has the potential to be an important component of the COPs, both accelerating climate action and improving global climate governance. It may also be a suitable format for feeding into other global governance forums and addressing other topics.
- Citizen-generated recommendations were a valuable contribution to COP26.
- Global citizens' deliberation can generate deep understanding between diverse citizens as the basis for better global decision-making.
- Citizens' sense of self and collective efficacy was increased.
- Many public and professional audiences found the idea of a global citizens' assembly inspiring.

2021 impact: revisiting the Theory of Change

New governance model

The centerpiece of the Global Assembly's 2021 impact is that it provides the first **proof of concept** that a global citizens' assembly is possible. The technical progress made on implementing a multilingual, worldwide, deliberative mini-public, alongside distributed local assemblies, as described in this report, will support other practitioners to replicate and improve the process. In parallel, the communications and advocacy shared in public and institutional spaces has provided inspiration for what alternative governance for humanity might look like. On a macro scale, the Global Assembly attempted to pilot a new governance chamber with citizens at its center within the existing ecosystem of global governance. It has expanded the role for citizens in the COP setting beyond the status of witnesses or advocates, and transformed them into deliberators and policymakers themselves. Most importantly, this pilot has stress-tested these ideas such that they might be refined by others in the future.

Institutional actions

In terms of impact on institutional 'policy' or 'action' impact, it is too early to say whether the initial assumptions in the Global Assembly Theory of Change — such as the assertion that institutions will not act on recommendations and nations will continue to struggle with the policy impact gap *unless there is external pressure* — proved correct. This is partially due to the timing of the Global Assembly occurring at a late stage in the COP negotiation cycle, as well as limited visibility in decision-making spaces at COP26. In 2021, it is fair to reflect that the focus was on building up the methodological qualities of a global citizens' assembly which would endow it with legitimacy in the public eye, such as neutrality, transparency, and informed and reasoned deliberation. While these elements were honed internally, the team had difficulty transmitting them effectively and building public support for recommendations.

Given the timings, the main pathways chosen to engage with COP26 were Blue Zone and Green Zone events, communications, and advocacy. While these engagements inspired various audiences, they were largely composed of civil society actors and not the primary holders of political, corporate, or media power. Critically, while activities around COP26 might have resulted in substantial reach, it is standard practice for many of the policy decisions to be made prior to the COP conferences, thus limiting the ability of the Global Assembly to have an immediate impact. As such, COP26 may have been an

appropriate space to advocate for the *methodology* of a global citizens' assembly, but not the best place to inject new recommendations into the decision-making process of the 2021 conference.

It will be critical for a future global citizens' assembly focused on climate governance to dedicate significant resources to a deeper integration, weaving and docking into both the formal annual COP negotiating cycle and other climate governance processes such as the World Economic Forum, Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) negotiations and accountability mechanisms, and others. These activities might take the form of building greater popular advocacy or interfacing with diverse institutional actors, such as national delegations, in the lead-up to COPs.

Citizens' actions

The key assumption that participants' confidence in themselves to participate in political activity, both individually and collectively, would be increased through the process proved to be true. As observed in responses to their surveys, Assembly Members participants were more likely to engage in the public sphere themselves and also developed a positive outlook toward the implementation of global citizens' assemblies writ large (see section "Activation and engagement", page 139). A similar increase in perceived efficacy and interest in deliberative mini-publics was also found amongst the local organizations which acted as Community Hosts, indicating a supplemental focus point to participant activation for future citizens' assemblies.

Unfortunately, it was more difficult to sustain this energy after the close of the process. While there were no follow-up surveys to gauge the level of or interest in future actions, the Core Delivery Team did not provide an ample scaffold of resources for further action (apart from advocacy of the People's Declaration) in 2022. Despite limited resources, there is no doubt energy amongst Assembly Members; among others, we have been notified that a Member from the Democratic Republic of the Congo has set up a tree nursery, Members in Thailand and Yemen have begun running awareness-raising sessions within their communities, and a Member in the UK set up a nationwide tree planting project. In future, it may be useful to provide additional deliberation time for Assembly Members themselves to plot future action items before the close of the Assembly.

2022 and beyond

In 2022, the Global Assembly has focused on advocating for the People's Declaration for the Sustainable Future of Planet Earth, and seeking platforms for Assembly Members themselves to speak on behalf of their recommendations. Furthermore, the team is undergoing an organizational development process to determine an internal governance structure that is fit for the purpose of building the new global governance model we hope the Global Assembly can become.

In November 2022, the formal evaluation of the Global Assembly will be published by a team of academic researchers. This will provide the basis for informing the next iteration of the Global Assembly. At this stage, it is anticipated that any future global citizens' assembly will need to consider how it can become a more powerful driver of change by:

- **Influencing the actions of power holders** such as nation states, global institutions and corporations;
- **Influencing the official UNFCCC COP** decision-making process;
- Ensuring **many more people know about the assembly**, and others like it, and are inspired to get involved;
- Dramatically **increasing the number of people** who can be involved in, and experience the benefits of, participating in it;
- Developing **robust internal governance mechanisms** to ensure transparency and accountability of decision making;
- Ensuring that principles of **decolonization and depatriarchalization** are institutionalized in its operations;
- Providing **a model of global governance that inspires** others as to what effective global governance looks like;
- Supporting many more **citizens to take action** based on assemblies' outcomes.

The authors of this report, all members of the Core Delivery Team, hope that readers can celebrate the work of the 2021 Global Assembly as the first sketch of a new phase in the evolution of how humanity governs itself and prepares for the challenges we collectively face. Most importantly, we hope that this report supplements the public's understanding of the approach and methodology behind the Global Assembly (not only its successes but also its flaws), and that other actors can learn from our experiences to build new projects that take humanity one step closer to **giving everyone a seat at the global governance table**.

Acknowledgements

07

Special thanks

The Core Delivery Team would like to extend special thanks to:

- **Lab Partner organizations:** Asian Energy Studies Center (Hong Kong), Center for Climate Assemblies (Poland), Center for Environmental Education (India), Climate Science (Brazil), Community Voices (Zimbabwe), Consumidores (Ecuador), CURE India (India), Delibera Brasil (Brazil), Democracia en Red (Argentina), Fudan University (China), G1000.nu (Netherlands), Healthy Democracy (USA), HONF Foundation (Indonesia), House of Africa (Chad), iDeemos (Colombia), Madaniya (Sudan), Mindanao State University-Iligan Center for Local Governance Studies (Philippines), National Taiwan University (Taiwan), Mohammed VI Polytechnic University School of Collective Intelligence (Morocco), SERAC-Bangladesh (Bangladesh), SocLab Foundation (Poland), UDaan (Pakistan), Wedu (Thailand)
- **Cluster Facilitators from:** Center for Environment Education (India), Community Organisers (UK), Delibera (Brazil), G1000.nu (Netherlands), iDeemos (Colombia), MSU-Iligan Institute of Technology Center for Local Governance Studies (Philippines), School of Collective Intelligence (Morocco), Shimmer SDG Hub (China), UDaan (Pakistan)
- **Members of the governance advisory committees**
(see section “Governance”, page 36, and Appendices 1.1 and 1.2)
- **All representatives of international institutions** who provided advice
- **All funding organizations:** Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation UK Branch, Climate Emergency Collaboration Group, European Climate Foundation, One Project, Scottish Government
- **All individual donors to the Global Assembly, including:**
A.J. Bomans, Anita Nickerson, Bob Bollen, Charlie Waterhouse, Claire Neale, David Midgley, G. R. Barrie Webster, Juan M. Artes, Marialuisa Mazzocchi, Paddy Loughman, Paul Sheeky, Rick Orser
- **All volunteers of the Community of Practice**
(see pages 269-271)

Global Assembly organizational roster

Any process to retroactively characterize a dynamic organizational structure is fraught with difficulty. This section is an attempt to offer a picture of the complex and interrelated working teams and contributors who designed and delivered the Global Assembly in 2021.

Core Delivery Team

The Core Delivery Team was composed of individuals who were responsible for the practical execution of the Global Assembly across multiple teams and circles.

Central Circle		
Responsible for overall design and coordination of the Global Assembly: strategy, budgeting, work planning, values co-creation and longer-term vision.		
Jon Stever (Lead)	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Claire Mellier	Iswe Foundation	France
Eva Sow Ebion	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Senegal
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Islam Elbeiti	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Sudan
Jamie Kelsey-Fry	Rax Consultancy	United Kingdom
Rich Wilson	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Sarah Whitley	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Susan Nakyung Lee	Deliberativa	South Korea
Yago Bermejo	Deliberativa	Spain

Pre Central Circle streams of project development		
Designing methodology (global sortition, hosting, and agenda setting), running pilot tests on virtual multilingual deliberation.		
Susan Nakyung Lee	Deliberativa	South Korea
Yago Bermejo	Deliberativa	Spain

Designing decentralized implementation and community hosting models; preparing dynamic budgeting and operational structure; and, developing the co-creation approach.

Eva Sow Ebion	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Senegal
Jon Stever	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Lorenzo Banno	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Mozambique

Fundraising, brand development, establishing partnerships and institutional support, designing the three-component initiative.

Rich Wilson (Lead)	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Claire Mellier	Iswe Foundation	France
Bjørn Bedsted	Danish Board of Technology	Denmark
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Jamie Kelsey-Fry	Rax Consultancy	United Kingdom
Lars Klüver	Danish Board of Technology	Denmark

With thanks to Brett Henning, Esther Hughes, Esther Stanford-Xosei, Gail Bradbrook, Kofi Mawuli Klu, Liam Garcia, Nina Alexandersen, Panthea Lee, Poonam Joshi, Sarah Bradley, Sarah Greenfield Clark, Sayo Ayodele, Skeena Rathor, and Smári McCarthy.

Communications Circle

Coordinated communications, including press, social media, and public engagement. Also designed and piloted the Cultural Wave.

Jamie Kelsey-Fry (Co-Lead, Communications & Cultural Wave)	Rax Consultancy	United Kingdom
Sarah Whitley (Co-Lead, Communications)	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Islam Elbeiti (Co-Lead, Cultural Wave)	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Sudan
Chirag Gupta		India
Claire Mellier	Iswe Foundation	France
Eva Sow Ebion	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Senegal
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom

Jeff Waters		Australia
Jon Stever	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Marius Kamugisha	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Rich Wilson	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Susan Nakyung Lee	Deliberativa	South Korea

With thanks to Asif Kapadia, Ben Tolhurst, Brian Eno, Dave Randall, Dorka Bauer, Ed King, Everywhere+, Honest Studio, Hope & May, Jamie Lowe, Katongole Abdu Hakim (Kim XP), Lara Stein, Lisa Goldapple, Lorna Greenwood, Mark Borkowski, Sir Mark Rylance, Matthew Green, Patrick Chalmers, Peter Jenkinson, Ralph Eya, Rebecca Gibbs, Rhodium Creative, Shelagh Wright, Steve Becket, and Zoe Cohen.

Community Assemblies

Developed the Community Assembly Toolkit and methodology

Eva Sow Ebion (Lead)	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Senegal
Claire Mellier	Iswe Foundation	France
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Jon Stever	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Marius Kamugisha	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Rich Wilson	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Sarah Whitley	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Susan Nakyung Lee	Deliberativa	South Korea

With thanks to Chia Hua Lu, Honest Studio, National Taiwan University, and Shu Yang Li.

Developer Circle

Developed and maintained the Global Assembly website, wiki, and coordinated software development and applications.

Jon Stever (Co-Lead)	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
----------------------	----------------------------------	--------

Michael Bumann (Co-Lead)		Germany
Sarah Whitley (Co-Lead)	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Dave Wood	Duet	United Kingdom
Felix Ishimwe	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Marius Kamugisha	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Jehad Oumer	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Libya

With thanks to Ben Kero, Eli Johnson, Kenneth Peiruza and FLOSS, and Honest Studio.

Finance Circle

Responsible for budget monitoring and administration.

Jon Stever (Lead)	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Margot Becker	Iswe Foundation	United States of America
Massamba Fall	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Senegal
Oussema Ksia	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Tunisia
Rich Wilson	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom

With thanks to Axis Fiduciary Ltd, Roger Brugger, Sandrine Uwase, and Visions Africa.

Knowledge & Wisdom Circle

Hosted the Global Knowledge and Wisdom Advisory Committee, coordinated the drafting of the information materials, the Global Assembly wiki, invited witnesses and speakers, and coordinated the external evaluation community of researchers.

Claire Mellier (Lead)	Iswe Foundation	France
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Jehad Oumer	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Libya
Jon Stever	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda

Rich Wilson	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Susan Nakyung Lee	Deliberativa	South Korea

With thanks to Alok Sharma, Amiera Sawas (Climate Outreach), Atlanta Global Shapers, Bridgers To The Future, Casa per la Pace Milano, Center for Contemporary Art “Typography” Krasnodar, Cerana Foundation, Chandrama Kalyan Kendra Gopalganj, Chidi Oti-Obihara, Consejo para la transición democrática en Cuba, Christopher Jackson, Dalitso Banda, Democracy International, El Ateneo Asociación Civil, Elizabeth Abroziekeya Utobore, Equi Youth Zambia, Farhana Yamin, Farhat Parveen, Go Agenciya Lokal’nykh Inciatyv Gromads’ka Organizaciya, Hazel Healy, Honest Studio, Humatera, Ipshita Chaturvedi, James Dyke, Jan Grygoruk, Joeri Rogelj, Jojo Mehta, Jordan Raine (Faculty for a Future), Karkhana Samuha, Koon Space Madagascar, La Prossima Cultura, Musungidi DRC, National Disability & Development Forum (NDF), NEER Foundation, PDO Education, PI Collective, Julia Steinberger, Pulang Kampong Foundation, Jyoti Ma, Laura Muwanguzi, Lyceum Training Services, Lydia Messling (Willis Towers Watson), Michael N. Oti, Monique Nikolov, Nafeez Ahmed, Natalie Marchant, Paul Ekin, Purnamita Dasgupta, Robert T. Watson, Rural Education & Economic Development Society (REEDS), Saad Alfarargi, Saleemul Huq, Sanjay Jagatia, Sharon Nabwire, Society for Sustainable Development, Soren Cardon, Stuart Capstick, Tarn Rogers John, Trainee+Up, UMAMI, Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo, Vaine Wichman, Vayalo Foundation, Welfare India, and WILPF Cameroon.

Stewardship Circle

Responsible for institutional relationships and fundraising.

Rich Wilson (Lead)	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Claire Mellier	Iswe Foundation	France
Eva Sow Ebion	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Senegal
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Jamie Kelsey-Fry	Rax Consultancy	United Kingdom
Jon Stever	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Liam Garcia	Climate 2025	United Kingdom
Margot Becker	Iswe Foundation	United States of America
Sarah Bradley	Climate 2025	United States of America
Sarah Whitley	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Susan Nakyung Lee	Deliberativa	South Korea

With thanks to Ben Donaldson, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation UK Branch, Charmian Love, Climate Emergency Collaboration Group, David Bent, David Steven, David Woolcombe, Emma Williams, European Climate Foundation, Nigel Topping, One Project, and Scottish Government.

Governance and Process Design (Core Assembly) Circle

Convened and hosted the Global Governance and Participation Advisory Committee, and deliberated on high-level process and governance; During the implementation of the Core Assembly, a subset of this Circle, known as the Process Team, worked on the translation of the high-level process plan into daily Session Plans.

Claire Mellier (Co-Lead)	Iswe Foundation	France
Jon Stever (Co-Lead)	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Rich Wilson (Co-Lead)	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Susan Nakyung Lee (Co-Lead)	Deliberativa	South Korea
Bjorn Bedsted	Danish Board of Technology	Denmark
Eva Sow Ebion	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Senegal
Yago Bermejo	Deliberativa	Spain

With thanks to Baogang He, Bonny Ibhawoh, H el ene Landemore, Natalie Samarasinghe, Nicole Curato, Poonam Joshi, Tiago Peixoto, and Vijayendra (Biju) Rao.

Sortition Circle

Designed, developed and implemented the four-step global sortition methodology.

Brett Hennig (Lead)	Sortition Foundation	Hungary
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Jon Stever	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Rich Wilson	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Susan Nakyung Lee	Deliberativa	South Korea
Yago Bermejo	Deliberativa	Spain

Global Support Team

Recruitment of the global Hosting Circle members, onboarding, coordinating the co-creation of values and ways of working, facilitating peer learning, preparing functional circles for sessions and general support.

Johnny Stormonth-Darling (Co-Lead)		United Kingdom
Jon Stever (Co-Lead)	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Susan Nakyung Lee (Co-Lead)	Deliberativa	South Korea
Claire Mellier	Iswe Foundation	France
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Marius Kamugisha	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Rich Wilson	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom

Hosting Circle

The Hosting Circle was responsible for many aspects of the Core Assembly's practical implementation and supporting Assembly Members through the experience.

Facilitation Circle

Facilitators supported and guided Assembly Members through the Core Assembly process.

Jon Stever (Co-Coordinator)	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Susan Nakyung Lee (Co-Coordinator)	Deliberativa	South Korea
Adela Li		China
Brenda Cariz		Spain
Charo Lanao		Peru
Clarence Gio Almoite		Philippines
Deborah Tien		USA

Esther Owido		Kenya
Hamidah Marican		Malaysia
Ian McDonnel		Canada
Jelena Brbora		Croatia
John Erwin Larosa		Philippines
Joseph Edward Alegado		Philippines
Joy Mukasa		Uganda
Liz Goold		United Kingdom
Maria Szephegyi		Uruguay
Ramsay Shonge		South Africa
Renelle Sarjeant		Trinidad and Tobago
Samuel Martinez		Spain
Sebastian Calderon		Columbia
Shalaka Gundi		India
Susan Kiamba		Kenya
Sven Schulte		Cambodia
Tina Puryear		United Kingdom

With thanks to Leila Hoballah, Manel Heredero, Patricia Nunes, and Sara Huang.

Notetaking Circle

Notetakers were responsible for recording the proceedings of Assembly Member deliberations in the Core Assembly, and supporting logistics for sessions.

Johnny Stormonth-Darling (Coordinator)		United Kingdom
Aldo Adomati		Uganda
Akinyi Osanjo		Kenya
Arwa Sultan		Lebanon
Azeez Adewale Hamzat		Morocco
Abdullahi Babatunde		Morocco

戴逸程 David Chen		China
Eileen Cejas		Argentina
Emma Obermair		United Kingdom
Erioluwa Adeyinka		Nigeria
Fawz Elbeshti		Libya
郭昊瑜 Guo Haoyu		China
Jesika Kamau		Kenya
Lea Bou Salman		Lebanon
Li Yongqi		Japan
Lucas Henrique Nigri Veloso		Brazil
Maria Andrea Joshua Riño		Philippines
Mariam Belgounche		Morocco
Marilo Meta		Albania
Michael Dacha		Kenya
Midori Yajima		Italy
Namandla Mpunganyi		Zimbabwe
Nurul Hasnat Ove		Bangladesh
Rachel Puentes		Cuba
Ruben Herrera		Cuba
Tinomutenda Mpunganyi		Zimbabwe
Tonio Flores		Philippines
Ude Agbai James		Nigeria
Venessa Dacha		Kenya

With thanks to Ahmed Ibrahim, Charles Ikem, Jinchen Li, and Joke ter Stege.

Editing Circle

Editors were responsible for consolidating and copy-editing the written outputs from the Core Assembly. Editors operated independently of the Core Delivery Team and the Global Support Team.

Susan Nakyung Lee (Liaison)	Deliberativa	South Korea
Elif İnci Ünal (Editor Coordinator)		Turkey
Amy Campbell (Editor Coordinator)		United Kingdom
Hector Alejandro Villarreal Lozoya		Dominican Republic
Kudzai Mubaiwa		Zimbabwe
Pato Kelesitse		Botswana
Theodora Cadbury		United Kingdom

Decentralization Circle

The Decentralization Circle comprised individuals and organizations all around the world who made the majority of the practical aspects of the Global Assembly possible.

Cluster Facilitator Circle

Coordinated Community Host recruitment, onboarding, training and support.

Jon Stever (Co-Lead)	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Susan Nakyung Lee (Co-Lead)	Deliberativa	South Korea
Ana Lucia Lima	Delibera Brasil	Brazil
Diana Sandoval Arenas	iDeemos	Colombia
Eva Sow Ebion	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Senegal
Fatima Zamba	School of Collective Intelligence, UM6P	Morocco

Felipe Rey	iDeemos	Colombia
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Granaz Baloch	UDaan	Pakistan
Hazel Jovita	Center for Local Governance Studies, Mindanao State University	Philippines
Indira Latorre	iDeemos	Colombia
Jehad Oumer	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Libya
Joke ter Stege	G1000.nu	Netherlands
Kunal Jaiswal	CEE	India
Lex Paulson	School of Collective Intelligence, UM6P	United States of America
Madison Mu	Shimmer SDG Hub	China
Millie	Shimmer SDG Hub	China
Mohcine Abad	School of Collective Intelligence, UM6P	Morocco
Nick Gardham	Community OrganiseXrs	United Kingdom
Oussema Ksiaa	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Tunisia
Peilin Chen	Shimmer SDG Hub	China
Raashi Saxena	Innovation for Policy Foundation	India
Remco van der Stoep	G1000.nu	Netherlands
Richard Wang	Shimmer SDG Hub	China
Sanskriti Menon	CEE	India
Septrin Calamba	Center for Local Governance Studies, Mindanao State University	Philippines
Silvia Cervillini	Delibera Brasil	Brazil
Stacy Gardham	Community Organisers	United Kingdom

Yasmira Moner	Center for Local Governance Studies, Mindanao State University	Philippines
---------------	--	-------------

With thanks to Arwa Emhemed, China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation, Lorenzo Banno, and Qin Xuan.

Community Hosts

Responsible for the recruitment of Assembly Members, contextualization and translation of information materials, promotion of the Global Assembly, and supporting the participation of Assembly Members

Name	Location	Name	Location
A World Institute for a Sustainable Humanity (AWISH)	Sierra Leone	National Disability & Development Forum (NDF)	Pakistan
Bridges to the future	Morocco	Neer Foundation	India
Casa per la Pace Milano and La Prossima Cultura	Italy	Noble Delta Women 4 Peace and Development International	Nigeria
Centre for Environment Education	India	Oppmakr Institute	Iran
Cerana Foundation	India	Organisation for Social Advancement and Cultural Activities (OSACA)	Bangladesh
Chad innovation Hub	Chad	PAFT Cakrawala	Indonesia
Chandrama Kalyan Kendra	India	PI COLLECTIVE	Indonesia
Center for Contemporary Art "Typography"	Russia	Politize	Brazil
Consejo para la Transición Democrática en Cuba	Cuba	Pragati Path	India

Consumidores Ecuador	Ecuador	Pulang Kampong Foundation	Thailand
Creative Space Startups	Nigeria	Radeza	Mozambique
DCN Global (Uzbekistan Chapter)	Uzbekistan	Rural Education & Economic Development Society (REEDS)	Pakistan
De Stuyverij	Belgium	Samaritan Health and Education Support Center	Ethiopia
Deen Bandhu Samaj Sahyog Samiti	India	Samvardhan Samaj Vikas Sanstha	India
Democracy International	Germany	Saranalayam	India
Deriba Center for Environmental Studies	Sudan	SEWEN	France
Dr Bhimrao Ambedkar Seva Parishad (BRASS SANSTHAN)	India	Sharon Nabwire & Danbi Hong	Republic of Korea
Eklavya Foundation	India	Shimmer Youth SDG Hub	For seven locations in China
El Ateneo Asociación Civil	Argentina	Society for Welfare & Advancement of Rural Generations	India
Equi Youth Zambia	Zambia	Socotra Women's Foundation for Response & Development	Yemen
Fundación Váyalo	Venezuela	South Bend Civic Theater	USA
FYT Media - Lyf.	Philippines	Sunrise SWWA	USA
Ghoghardiha Prakhand Swarajya Vikas Sangh (GPSVS)	India	Sweet Youth	China

Global Shapers Atlanta Hub	USA	Tanggol Kalikasan Inc.	Philippines
Go Agenciya Lokal'nykh Iniciatyv Gromads'ka Organizaciya (Agency of Local Initiatives)	Ukraine	TEDxLahore	Pakistan
Go forward institute/ FJPM	Democratic Republic of the Congo	TEDxSingapore/ Women In Asia	Singapore
GO Platform	Algeria	The Techvillage Innovation Hub	Zimbabwe
Gramyasheel	India	The USEducated Azerbaijani Alumnl Association (AAA)	Azerbaijan
Grapevine	UK	Toru Institute	Bangladesh
Guardiões do Meia Ponte	Brazil	Trainee+Up	Spain
Humatera	Indonesia	Umami	Egypt
Hunar Kashmir	India	Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo	Indonesia
Instituto Ipê	Brazil	Watchmen Youth Services	China
International Climate Change Development Initiative	Nigeria	Weifang Gaoxin District Xinzhiqiao Culture Communication Centre	China
Jan Nirman Kendra	India	WELFARE INDIA	India
Karkhana Pvt Ltd	Nepal	WILPF Cameroon	Cameroon
Koon space	Madagascar	Xian Sustainable Network	China
Laboratory Research and Social Actions "SocLab" Foundation	Poland	Xuzhou Hantang Charity	China

Lok Shakti Samiti	India	YIC Youth innovators	China
Los Angeles Global Shapers Hub (hosted two Assembly Members)	USA	Youth education	Côte d'Ivoire
Lyceum Training Services	Syria	Yunnan parallel	China
Lyuye Youth	China	Yuva Association	Turkey
Maverick 特立独行	China	Zhuhai Consulting Company	China
Musungidi DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo		

With additional thanks to those who chose to remain anonymous.

Labs Circle

Co-designed and coordinated the implementation of the Deliberative Labs

Susan Nakyung Lee (Co-Lead)	Deliberativa	South Korea
Yago Bermejo (Co-Lead)	Deliberativa	Spain
Claire Mellier	Iswe Foundation	France
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Jon Stever	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Rich Wilson	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Martín Carrascoso	Deliberativa	Spain

Lab Partners

Co-designed and supported one-two Participant(s) each in the Deliberative Labs

Asian Energy Studies Center	Hong Kong
Centre for Environmental Education	India
Climate Science	Brazil

Community Voices Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe
Consumidores	Ecuador
CURE India	India
Delibera Brasil	Brazil
Democracia en Red	Argentina
Fudan University	China
G1000.nu	Netherlands
Healthy Democracy	USA
HONF Foundation	Indonesia
House of Africa	Chad
iDeemos	Colombia
Madaniya	Sudan
Mindanao State University-Iligan Center for Local Governance Studies	Philippines
National Taiwan University	Taiwan
Qin Xuan	China
School of Collective Intelligence	Morocco
SERAC-Bangladesh	Bangladesh
SocLab Foundation	Poland
UDaan	Pakistan
Wedu	India

Lab Participants

Engaged as a Participant in the Deliberative Labs

Berry Grutters	Netherlands
Chung Tsz Ying, Angela (TBD- re-emailed)	Hong Kong
Elena	Spain
Emeldah Mzeziwa	Zimbabwe

Eugenia	Poland
Evelyn	Brazil
Joan Cheng	China
Jonathan Avalos	Argentina
Juancho	Colombia
Mahgul	Pakistan
Mariuxi Delgado	Ecuador
Mohcine Zamba	Morocco
Renyu Shuang	China
Rey	Philippines
Salma Albokhari	Sudan
Shreenanda Gaikwad	India
Zero Zero	Taiwan

With additional thanks to those who chose to remain anonymous.

Onboarding Circle

Organized the outreach and welcome meetings for volunteers and Community of Practice members.

Rachel Ward Lilley (Lead)		United Kingdom
Flynn Devine	Iswe Foundation	United Kingdom
Jehad Oumer	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Libya
Jon Stever	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Rwanda
Oussema Ksiao	Innovation for Policy Foundation	Tunisia
Raashi Saxena	Innovation for Policy Foundation	India
Susan Nakyung Lee	Deliberativa	South Korea

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With thanks to Bob Bollen and Seydi Ndiaye.

Community of Practice

A group of individual and organizational volunteers who supported Community Host recruitment, and additional decentralized tasks

Adaku Ann Efuribe	Lift Humanity Foundation
Afifa Foundation	Lions Clubs International
Africa Alliance for Health Research Economy Development	Lyuye Youth
African Child Agape Foundation (ACAF)	Mark Dick
Arctic Institute of North America, University of Calgary	Maryam Mohiuddin Ahmed, Social Innovation Lab
Arewa Research & Development Project	Movilizatorio
Association For Promotion Sustainable Development	Musungidi DRC
Benjamin Clousier	National Disability & Development Forum (NDF)
Bob Bollen	Nyuma Desmond Mhango, Executive Director, Centre for Youth and Children's Affairs (CEYCA)
Building-community Initiatives for Development & Self-reliance (BIDS) Foundation	Pagan Federation International Foundation
Caritas Ghana	Pale Blue Dot Initiative
Center for Wise Democracy	Pato Kelesitse
Children and Young People Living for Peace (CYPLP)	People's Vigilance Committee on Human Rights
Clarence Gio Almoite, Sustainable Energy and Enterprise Development for Communities (SEED4Com)	PolicyLab Africa
Consejo para la Transición Democrática en Cuba	Rachel Puentes González
Consumidores Ecuador	Reem, Wesca
CSYM Huduma Mbuenet Coalitions TZ	Riaan Kämpfer, Citizens' Democracy
Democracia en Red	Ricardo Ruiz Freire

Earthforce Fight Squad	SciCBN
Eco-Clean Cycle	Shimmer Youth SDG Hub
ECOLISE	Shipyard Foundation
Elena Ferreras (Soil and Soul Initiative)	SM Shaikat, SERAC-Bangladesh
Emma Obermair	Soulace Africa
Extinction Rebellion	Sustainable Delaware Ohio
Extituto de Política Abierta	Sweet Youth
Faria Uqaili, PCMU Government of Sindh	Trust Democracy (New Zealand)
Fundación Multitudes	Udyama
Global Youth Network Benin	Umami
Go forward institute/FJPM	Wedu
Health Environment and Climate Action Foundation (HECAF 360)	Weifang Gaoxin District Xinzhiqiao Culture Communication Centre
Host Hub Uganda	Westnile Center for Justice & Conciliation (WCJC)
Indigenous Peoples Global Forum for Sustainable Development (IPGFforSD) / International Indigenous Platform	Yingjie Tian From Maverick
Instituto panameño de derecho y nuevas tecnologías (IPANDETEC)	Young World Federalists
Joseph Edward B. Alegado	Youth education
Leadership Development Association Balkan	Yunnan Parallel
Learning for Sustainability Scotland	Zixtech HUB

With additional thanks to those who chose to remain anonymous.

Community of Practice logos



References

- [1] Participedia (no date). *Citizens' Assembly – Participedia*. <https://participedia.net/method/4258> (accessed Jul 29, 2022).
- [2] Participedia (no date). *Civic Lottery – Participedia*. <https://participedia.net/method/154> (accessed Jul 29, 2022).
- [3] Büergerrat (no date). *Citizens' Assemblies worldwide*. <https://www.buergerrat.de/en/background/citizens-assemblies-worldwide/> (accessed Jul 29, 2022).
- [4] KNOCA (no date). *Publications*. https://knoqa.eu/publications/?_subjects=impact (accessed Jul 29, 2022).
- [5] Cherry, C.; Capstick, S.; Demski, C.; Mellier, C.; Stone, L.; Verfuert, C. (2022). *Citizens' Climate Assemblies: Understanding Public Deliberation for Climate Policy*; University of Cardiff: The Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations: Cardiff. <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/145771/>
- [6] Duvic-Paoli, L.-A. (2022). *Re-Imagining the Making of Climate Law and Policy in Citizens' Assemblies*. *Transnational Environmental Law*, 11 (2), 235–261. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2047102521000339>.
- [7] Andrews, N.; Elstub, S.; McVean, S.; Sandie, G. (2022). *Scotland's Climate Assembly Research Report - Process, Impact and Assembly Member Experience*; Scottish Government Research: Edinburgh. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/research-report-citizens-assembly-scotland/pages/5/>
- [8] Dean, R.; Hoffmann, F.; Geissel, B.; Jung, S.; Wipfler, B. (2022). *Citizen Deliberation in Germany: Lessons from the 'Bürgerrat Demokratie'*. *German Politics*, 0 (0), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2022.2088732>.
- [9] Wells, R.; Howarth, C.; Brand-Correa, L. I. (2021). *Are Citizen Juries and Assemblies on Climate Change Driving Democratic Climate Policymaking? An Exploration of Two Case Studies in the UK*. *Climatic Change*, 168 (1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03218-6>.
- [10] IPCC (2022). *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*; Pörtner, H.-O., Roberts, D. C., Tignor, M., Poloczanska, E. S., Mintenbeck, K., Alegría, A., Craig, M., Langsdorf, S., Lösschke, S., Möller, V., et al., Series Eds.; Cambridge University Press. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-working-group-ii/>

- [11] Elstub, S.; Farrell, D. M.; Carrick, J.; Mockler, P. (2021) *Evaluation of Climate Assembly UK*; Newcastle University: Newcastle. <https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/get-involved2/climate-assembly-uk/evaluation-of-climate-assembly-uk.pdf>
- [12] Anderson, A. A. (no date). *The Community Builder's Approach to Theory of Change: A Practical Guide to Theory Development*; The Aspen Institute. https://www.theoryofchange.org/pdf/TOC_fac_guide.pdf
- [13] Thorman, D.; Capstick, S. (2022). *Planning and Assessing the Impact and Legacy of Climate Assemblies*; Briefing 4; KNOCA, Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations, Cardiff University: Cardiff. <https://knoca.eu/the-legacy-and-impact-of-climate-assemblies/>
- [14] Lafont, C. (2015). Deliberation, Participation, and Democratic Legitimacy: Should Deliberative Mini-Publics Shape Public Policy? *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 23 (1), 40–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12031>.
- [15] Curato, N.; Vrydagh, J.; Bächtiger, A. (2020). *Democracy without Shortcuts: Introduction to the Special Issue*. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 16 (2). <https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.413>.
- [16] Réseau Action Climat France; ELABE (2020). *Convention Citoyenne Pour Le Climat, Qu'en Pensez Les Français?* <https://reseauactionclimat.org/sondage-des-gaulois-pas-si-refractaires-a-laction-climatique/>
- [17] Stasiak, D.; Averchenkova, A.; Morán, A.; Renn, O. (2021) *How Can the Legitimacy and Resonance of Climate Assemblies in Wider Society Be Ensured*; Briefing 3; KNOCA, Centre for Climate Change and Social Transformations, Cardiff University: Cardiff. <https://knoca.eu/legitimacy-and-resonance-of-climate-assemblies-in-wider-society/>
- [18] Flanigan, B.; Gölz, P.; Gupta, A.; Hennig, B.; Procaccia, A. D. (2021). *Fair Algorithms for Selecting Citizens' Assemblies*. *Nature*, 596 (7873), 548–552. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03788-6>.
- [19] NASA (no date). *Gridded Population of the World (GPW), v4 | SEDAC*. <https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/data/collection/gpw-v4> (accessed Aug 12, 2022).
- [20] UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division (2022). *World Population Prospects - Population Division - United Nations*. <https://population.un.org/wpp/> (accessed Aug 12, 2022).
- [21] Wittgenstein Centre (2018). *Wittgenstein Centre Human Capital Data Explorer*. <http://dataexplorer.wittgensteincentre.org/wcde-v2/> (accessed Aug 12, 2022).

- [22] Flynn, C.; Yamasumi, E.; Fisher, S.; Snow, D.; Grant, Z.; Kirby, M.; Browning, P.; Rommerskirchen, M.; Russell, I. (2021). *Peoples' Climate Vote: Results*; UNDP and University of Oxford. <https://www.undp.org/publications/peoples-climate-vote>
- [23] Ball, J. (2019). *The Double Diamond: A universally accepted depiction of the design process*. <https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/news-opinion/double-diamond-universally-accepted-depiction-design-process/> (accessed Aug 23, 2022).
- [24] Andrews, N.; Elstub, S.; McVean, S.; Sandie, G. (2022). *Chapter 1: Members' Experiences of the Assembly*. In *Scotland's Climate Assembly Research Report - process, impact and Assembly member experience*; Scottish Government Research: Edinburgh. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/research-report-citizens-assembly-scotland/pages/5/>
- [25] Vernailen, C. (2020). *French Citizens want a referendum on climate measures*. <https://www.democracy-international.org/french-citizens-want-referendum-climate-measures> (accessed Jul 29, 2022).
- [26] Giraudet, L.-G.; Apouey, B.; Arab, H.; Baeckelandt, S.; Bégout, P.; Berghmans, N.; Blanc, N.; Boulin, J.-Y.; Buge, E.; Courant, D.; et al. (2022). "Co-Construction" in *Deliberative Democracy: Lessons from the French Citizens' Convention for Climate*. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9 (1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01212-6>.
- [27] Neiman, S. 2020. *Africa Goes to War on COVID Misinformation – with Song*. *Christian Science Monitor*. <https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Africa/2020/0428/Africa-goes-to-war-on-COVID-misinformation-with-song>

Core delivery partners



Global delivery partners



Other founding partners





Global
Assembly

Design and layout by [Honest Studio](#).

© Copyright Global Assembly 2022

Deliberativa (Spain), Innovation for Policy Foundation (pan-African), Iswe Foundation (UK), Rax Consultancy (UK), Centre for Environment Education (India), Community Organisers (UK), Delibera (Brazil), G1000.nu (Netherlands), iDeemos (Colombia), MSU-Iligan Institute of Technology Center for Local Governance Studies (Philippines), Mohammed VI Polytechnic University School of Collective Intelligence (Morocco), Shimmer SDG Hub (China), and UDaan (Pakistan).