

**Philippines - CFPG Preliminary Inputs to the
Climate Finance Work Programme under the UNFCCC Paris Agreement
(as of 27 April 2026)**

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

The Philippines expects the Climate Finance Work Programme (CFWP) to go beyond debate and provide a platform for constructive dialogue, with a sharp focus on concrete, tangible steps (such as low-hanging fruits) for implementation and operations.

The CFWP must escape the trappings of circuitous and digressive negotiations and must already be structured in a way that moves and transforms meaningful and impactful progress from negotiations to operations/actions.

The CFWP should translate the discussions and outcomes into specific operational output/s and useful or practical guideline/s or methodology/ies, if any, for practical use of the Parties, particularly its ministries of finance or public sector bodies assigned or designated to oversee climate finance works streams (*e.g., if these are gaps in methodologies, gaps in application, then we expect specific actions to resolve these gaps and bridge the understanding between concept to practice or operational guidelines or procedures*).

For insurance, we anticipate that methodologies to quantify or consider CF inflows and investments will be delivered as a concrete output of the CFWP. We note the use of available or prevailing methodologies by which CF are being counted or quantified (e.g., OECD DAC, MDB reports, bilateral DFI definition)

The CFWP cites a special mention of **Article 9.1**, subject to the broader context of Article 9. We expect that Article 9.1 of the Paris Agreement will primarily be operationalized under the work programme. While we do recognize the decision to discuss such within the context of Article 9 as a whole, we expect the programme to maintain a clear functional separation between the clear legal obligation of the provision of resources under Article 9.1, and the mobilization of broader finance under Article 9.3.

The Philippines anticipates the work programme to establish a needs-based quantum that reflects the actual or projected climate finance requirements in the context of the at least USD 1.3 trillion call to scale up, to meet the 1.5°C climate goal and adequately finance the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) (and their respective Implementation Plans) and National Adaptation Plans (NAP). In addition, we also expect the CFWP to deliver a clear and transparent burden-sharing methodology that translates collective financial targets into individual, quantifiable obligations for developed country Parties in order to meet the at least USD 1.3 trillion climate finance needs.

Climate Finance must not exacerbate the fiscal distress of vulnerable nations and must remove the structural barriers to the implementation of the development priorities of these nations.

This is why we expect the work programme to establish clear safeguards against the debt traps by prioritizing non-debt-creating financial instruments as the primary vehicle for Article 9.1 support, specifically, grant-based and ultra and/or highly concessional forms of financing.

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

The Philippines seeks to focus on the following areas, in the context of the discussions of the CFWP: transparency, accessibility, predictability, efficiency, and thematic balance.

- **Transparency.** There is a need to establish what can be considered as climate finance to support governments, Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), and financial institutions in properly tagging climate programs, projects and initiatives; thereby making it possible to measure, monitor, and assess the current mobilization and flow of climate finance as well as the achievement of the New Collective Quantified Goal on Climate Finance (NCQG) and the progress of the Baku to Belem Roadmap.
- **Accessibility.** Inclusive financing for all the least developed, developing, and climate-vulnerable countries that can be readily tapped from broad sources of financing (e.g., public, private, MDBs, innovative financing), especially those that were created under the international climate treaties with the core mandates (or expanded mandates) to support countries in mitigating and adapting to climate change and its adverse effects (loss and damage), taking also into consideration

the need of the aforementioned countries in achieving their own sustainable socio-economic development.

There must be clear guidance for the multilateral climate funds: The GCF, AF, GEF, and FRLD, on access procedures and financial instruments to simplify, hasten, and provide scaled-up direct access. This should have a consideration for a fit-for-purpose approach that integrates each country's unique circumstances. The work program must include guidance for ensuring firm multi-year commitments from developed countries to secure the funds' robust and sustainable operations in the midst of active replenishment cycles. Lastly, ensuring that the enhancement of enabling environments is supported is critical.

- **Predictability.** The unprecedented and increasing costs attributed to climate change require clarity of time frames and climate finance commitments to place greater accountability on developed country Parties, MDBs, and other financial/private institutions that deliver climate finance, which highly relates to the need for a transparent architecture to monitor/assess finance flows.
- **Efficiency.** Ample financing that is timely delivered, readily available, and corresponds to the increasing financial needs and priorities of least developed, developing, and climate-vulnerable countries is necessary while delivering viable and effective technologies and knowledge to such countries in need of such capacities in order to enable a contextual fit to a country's situation and needs.
- **Thematic Balance.** Achieving a balance between mitigation, adaptation, and loss and damage to undertake appropriate country-driven climate actions.

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

The Philippines views that the CFWP must be a strictly Party-driven process, utilizing the needs and priorities identified in the NDCIPs and NAPs of the parties.

Further, in the interest of moving negotiations to implementation and meaningful progress in a coherent and strategic manner, the CFWP must have direct cooperation with the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) and the Adaptation Committee (AC), and other similar UNFCCC or PA-established entities, committees, bodies structures, and

mechanisms that **deal with or discuss finance, capacity building and technology**, to ensure that the technical outputs and discussions in the various work programs or outputs are grounded in verified data rather than political accommodation and compromise.

To avoid the pitfalls of previous work programmes that have concluded with non-binding summaries and repetitive dialogues, the Philippines recommends that this programme be oriented toward decision-ready outputs to maximize available resources and expert discussions. There must be a tangible delivery roadmap with an implementation-ready architecture to operationalize the outcomes of the CFWP.