

SLYCAN Trust

Submission on Baku to Belém Roadmap to 1.3T

September 18th, 2025

SLYCAN Trust

Introduction

This submission is made by SLYCAN Trust in response to the Presidencies' call for inputs on the Baku to Belém Roadmap to 1.3T after the Presidencies' consultations at SB62. The submission shall be considered alongside the [submission made by SLYCAN Trust to the UNFCCC](#) on March 21st, 2025.

Mandate:

- Paragraph 7 of decision 1/CMA6 calls on all actors to work together to enable the scaling up of financing to developing country Parties for climate action from all public and private sources to at least USD 1.3 trillion per year by 2035.
- Paragraph 27 of decision 1/CMA6 decides to launch, under the guidance of the Presidencies of the sixth and seventh sessions of the CMA, in consultation with Parties, the Baku to Belém Roadmap to 1.3T aiming at scaling up climate finance to developing country Parties to support low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development pathways and implement the nationally determined contributions and national adaptation plans including through grants, concessional and non-debt creating instruments, and measures to create fiscal space, taking into account relevant multilateral initiatives as appropriate; also requests the Presidencies to produce a report summarizing the work as it concludes the work by CMA7.

Guiding questions

The CMA6 and CMA7 Presidencies call for submissions on August 6th, 2025, on the following questions:

- a) **What are priority short-term (by the end of 2028) and medium-to-long-term (beyond 2028) actions necessary to enable the scaling up of financing for climate action to developing countries? Based on experience to date and evidence, what can those actions contribute to in terms of progress in enabling the scaling up of financing?**

The Baku to Belém Roadmap should provide a pragmatic and practical path for scaling up to 1.3T. As mandated by Parties at CMA6, the CMA6 and CMA7 Presidencies need to ensure consistency with the overall aim of addressing priorities and needs of developing countries to address climate change, in recommending the modalities towards achieving the goal via the roadmap.

IPCC findings indicate with high confidence that finance and other means of implementation are critical in addressing climate change in developing countries. As countries are expected to submit ambitious Nationally Determined Contributions while taking into account the outcomes of the first Global Stocktake (GST1, see 1/CMA.5), it is crucial that finance is available in line with the evolving needs and priorities identified in climate plans.

Accessible climate finance in the short-term (by the end of 2028) is the first step to unlocking finance at the scale needed for transformational changes required to meet the overall goals of the Paris Agreement. SLYCAN Trust's recent work on access to climate finance (including our [2025 discussion brief](#), our [2024 primer](#), and our [2024 discussion brief](#) on this topic) indicates an increasing mismatch between the needs on the ground and local level access to climate finance.^{1,2,3} The roadmap must define how to address these critical gaps and scale up accessible finance in the short to medium term.

The roadmap should investigate options to enhance equitable access to climate finance for national and local actors, such as programmatic approaches, fast-track accreditation systems, capacity-building, and support for funding recipients, including through project preparation facilities, readiness funding, and enhanced support for reporting.

b. What strategies can be implemented to enhance and scale up public and private financing mechanisms for climate adaptation, especially in vulnerable regions?

Country ownership and the priority needs of developing countries must be at the heart of strategies to scale up public and private finance. While different Parties are at different levels of development, their needs and priorities are guided by their respective development pathways. To address these evolving needs and priorities, climate finance needs to be defined. This will lead to clarity with regards to what constitutes climate finance and development finance. In delivering climate finance, considerations relating to adequacy, predictability and sustainability need to be considered. Significantly scaled up public financing therefore remains a critical means to implement climate actions in line with the NDCs and NAPs of developing countries.

In cases where the private sector can contribute to scaling up adaptation finance or other relevant mechanisms (such as risk transfer solutions), public-private partnerships or blended finance facilities have been identified as a possible solution to ensure that private investment of funds or expertise remains aligned with national priorities and is utilized within a broader national policy framework. For example, [blended finance](#) and [insurance mechanisms](#) for the agriculture sector can be designed and implemented in collaboration between the government and other actors, as explored through SLYCAN Trust's research in the context of Sri Lanka.^{4,5}

b) What other experiences, proposals or approaches could help inform and accelerate efforts to mobilize USD 1.3 trillion in financing, including through grants, non-debt creating instruments, new sources of finance, and strategies to create fiscal space?

¹ SLYCAN Trust (2024). [Local-level access to Climate Finance for Adaptation and Loss and Damage](#).

² SLYCAN Trust (2024). [From Local to Global: Advancing Equitable Access to Climate Finance and Loss and Damage Funding](#).

³ SLYCAN Trust (2025). [Enhancing Access to Climate Finance for Responding to Loss and Damage](#).

⁴ SLYCAN Trust (2024). [Thematic Dialogue on Public-Private Partnerships for Optimising Sustainable Financing in the Agriculture Sector](#).

⁵ SLYCAN Trust (2023). [Strengthening Sri Lanka's Ecosystem for Climate and Disaster Risk Management and Finance](#).

According to global data, LDCs and SIDS combined debt repayments in 2021 amount to USD 33 billion while collectively only receiving USD 20 billion.⁶ Therefore, approaches and recommendations provided in the roadmap need to ensure that pathways to scale up finance to 1.3 trillion do not further exacerbate the debt burden of vulnerable developing countries.

Reforming the international financial architecture is important to ensure equitable, fair, transparent, and inclusive access to grant-based or highly concessional climate finance for developing countries. Opportunities exist for integrating climate action strategies with responses to debt challenges. Instruments like climate-resilient debt clauses offer potential benefits but require careful consideration and implementation to address challenges effectively. In addition, it would also be key to address systemic dis-enablers such as the high cost of capital, high transaction costs associated with access, limited fiscal space, unsustainable debt levels, or conditionalities for accessing climate finance.

Country case studies on Ghana and Fiji conducted by SLYCAN Trust indicate that there are a variety of relevant policies, mechanisms, and financial instruments at the national level that could be scaled up and expanded if international funding and support is made available. Identifying existing good practices and integrated approaches can help support the specific needs of countries as well as to address needs relevant to regional contexts while avoiding negative feedback loops and barriers to access.

Accessibility of finance provided is another key consideration. Support provided needs to be accessible, taking into consideration equitable geographic distribution, the capacity constraints of LDCs and SIDS, access for Indigenous Peoples and local communities, as well as the needs of fragile and conflict inflicted communities. Strategies to enhance accessibility include through simplification of access procedures for small scale, low risk investments; enhanced direct access; creation of dedicated windows; devolved decision making; and enhancing complementarity and coordination across funds to increase efficiency and minimize duplication.

c) What key actors and existing multilateral initiatives should be considered or involved, as appropriate, to support the delivery of the USD 1.3 trillion target?

There is value in building on existing initiatives that are locally owned by Global South to support delivery of the 1.3T. As paragraph 7 of decision 1/CMA.6 clearly calls for all actors, inclusivity is important to have meaningful, locally relevant climate action on the ground and where it is needed most. In this regard, actors beyond the UNFCCC process also need to be encouraged to participate in this delivery. However, such multilateral initiatives need to be also recognized within the process to ensure legitimacy. Following multilateral initiatives could be considered or involved in support of the delivery of the 1.3T target.

- **UNFCCC Financial Mechanism:** The funds and financial entities of the Financial Mechanism (FM) of UNFCCC is the primary mechanism for the delivery of climate finance for developing country Parties. The FM consists of Global Environment Facility (GEF), Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), Adaptation Fund (AF), and the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FRLD).⁷ Finance delivered through the FM would enable equitable access to resources, based on the principles of the Convention and the Paris

⁶ SLYCAN Trust (2023). [Understanding the Intersection of Sovereign Debt, Climate Finance, and Loss and Damage.](#)

⁷ [Funds and financial entities | UNFCCC](#)

Agreement Additionally, as operating entities of the financial mechanism, these funds operate under the guidance and are accountable to Parties, ensuring effectiveness and efficiency of implementation.

- **Adaptation Fund:** The AF was established under the Kyoto Protocol (KP) and now serves both KP and PA. It stands out for pioneering direct access modalities and has been frequently highlighted by developing countries for its effectiveness in delivering concrete, locally led adaptation actions. Importantly, the NCQG decision adopted at COP29 explicitly recognized the role of the AF, reaffirming its importance within the climate finance architecture. However, the adequacy of its resources remains a key constraint.
- **Multilateral Development Banks:** Climate finance is increasingly provided by MDBs to developing countries. Our [case study on the Republic of Fiji in 2023](#) indicated an increase in finance flows from all the sources such as Climate Investment Funds, MDBS, and other multilateral funds for addressing climate change. In this regard, a larger share of concessional financing below the market interest rate was being provided by MDBs.⁸ Furthermore, given the explicit recognition of the role of MDBs in the NCQG decision at CMA6, MDBs have the potential to significantly scale up the delivery of climate finance, with the advantage of having established procedures at national level for accessing support through these entities.

⁸ SLYCAN Trust (2023). [The Nexus of Climate Change, Sovereign Debt, and Climate Finance in Fiji](#).