

Views on the climate finance work programme

April 2026

1. Introduction

Japan appreciates the opportunity to submit its views on the two-year work programme on climate finance, including on Article 9, paragraph 1, of the Paris Agreement in the context of Article 9 of the Paris Agreement as a whole (hereinafter referred to as the “climate finance work programme”) based on the questions posed by the co-chairs. Japan believes that the climate finance work programme will be an important opportunity to improve financial flows for the steady implementation of the new collective quantified goal (NCQG). Japan would like to take this opportunity to deliver Japan’s position as follows.

2. Japan’s views on the questions posed by the co-chairs

(1) What are your overall expectations for the climate finance work programme? What concrete outputs and outcomes should the climate finance work programme deliver?

While developed countries will continue to fulfil their obligations on climate finance, it is also crucial to ensure appropriate contribution from capable non-developed countries and mobilize private finance as much as possible to meet the climate finance needs of developing countries for mitigation and adaptation. Now that the NCQG has been adopted, what is required are grounded solutions focused on the implementation of the NCQG and the other existing decisions and the delivery of support to the countries and people in need of climate finance. Therefore, it should be avoided to have polarized political discussions that will not directly contribute to an expansion of financial flows. We should focus on the implementation of NCQG instead of establishing new targets or new funds. The discussion on such political outcomes would further complicate the substantial discussions on the improvement of financial flows.

The climate finance work programme, which includes a comprehensive discussion of climate finance in the context of Article 9 of the Paris Agreement as a whole, presents an opportunity to identify and resolve cross-cutting issues that could not be addressed under existing agenda items. For example, it is desirable to aim for outcomes that improve climate finance flows by deepening mutual understanding through dialogue between donors and recipients on issues such as what kind of capacity is required for countries in need of support to access climate finance including climate funds (GEF, GCF, etc.) and how to understand and support the differing needs of mitigation and adaptation of each country.

(2) What are the thematic pillars of the climate finance work programme and the related subtopics that we should address within each pillar?

➤ Thematic pillar 1: Improving access to climate funds and MDBs

Access to climate funds and MDBs is important for particularly vulnerable developing countries, including SIDS and LDCs. We can discuss what initiatives are needed to improve their capacity to access climate finance from the existing funds, while respecting the existing forum on each fund and safeguarding the unique characteristics of each fund, as well as fiscal discipline and risk management.

For example, Japan has established Asia-Pacific Climate Change Adaptation Information Platform, so-called AP-PLAT, to provide latest climate risk information. This is to support developing countries to conduct

impact assessment of climate risks, as well as to prepare an adaptation plan. Such science-based impact assessments and policy making are essential from the perspective of enabling developing countries to demonstrate that their projects are scientifically sound and genuinely necessary when applying for financial support with the GEF, GCF and other institutions. The work programme can be a platform to share experiences and lessons on such support and to discuss further approaches which are needed from this perspective.

➤ Thematic pillar 2: Effective climate finance project design that reflects the needs of developing countries

Support is required to reflect the country-driven manner of each developing country, and should not be the imposition of mitigation and adaptation measures by donors. At the same time, it is essential to guarantee the effectiveness of climate change action and provide explanations regarding project risk management to taxpayers of donor countries in the case of public finance, and to shareholders in the case of private finance. In the work programme, we can discuss what is required to bridge the gap between needs and actual support by making maximum use of existing frameworks including NDCs, NAPs, BTRs and BCs.

(3) How should the climate finance work programme be organised to ensure that the format is inclusive, balanced, and technically robust, whilst addressing climate finance comprehensively and delivering outcomes that are actionable and meaningful?

To discuss practical outcomes, it is important to avoid the “politicisation” of the work programme, which has frequently occurred in climate finance negotiations. The principles and the scope of the discussions should be defined in advance. Japan would like to point out the annotation of the Mutirão Decision (Decision 1/CMA.7) which states that the work programme is established “without prejudging the process for the implementation of NCQG”. Based on this shared understanding, it is crucial to ensure that the discussions will not further complicate implementation of the NCQG and will avoid the imposition of new targets or goals or the establishment of new fund.

As a principle for the discussions, it is also important that frank opinions leading to improved financial flows are presented in an open atmosphere and in a spirit of mutual cooperation.

For example, agreeing in advance on language including the following elements as a guiding principle for this work programme would create a safe environment conducive to ensure above-mentioned discussions:

- The work programme will be a platform for exchanges of views, information and ideas.
- The work programme will be implemented in a facilitative, enabling, non-punitive and non-prescriptive manner, respect national sovereignty, and take into account different national circumstances.
- The work programme is not intended to consider or negotiate new targets.

Regarding the format of the discussion, our idea is that we could collectively identify and share feasible options for improving financial flows, including enhancing access to finance, in the context of existing decisions including the NCQG, through frank exchanges of views via dialogue amongst all actors.

Specifically, the involvement of all actors, including recipient countries such as SIDS and LDCs, donor countries, climate funds, MDBs and the private sector, is essential for the realisation of the NCQG. For example, on the occasion of the SB, a hybrid dialogue could be organised, similar to the Global Dialogue and Investment-focused Event under the MWP in which all actors participate to share opportunities, good practices, actionable solutions and barriers. Furthermore, to reflect these technical level voices, the co-chairs’ summary

of the dialogue could be submitted as input to the CMA, and the Parties will engage in discussions at CMA that fully consider the intent of this summary.

We hope that compiling practical outcomes based on the views of all actors in this way will lead to the improvement of the actual flow of climate finance.

Finally, since the climate finance work programme established under the Mutirão Decision at COP30 is a two-year work programme, we understand that this work programme will conclude at COP32. Furthermore, taking budgetary constraints into account, we believe that meetings related to the climate finance work programme should be held during the sessions of SB and COP.

(END)