OPEN CONTRACTING PARTNERSHIP

FROM PLEDGES TO PROJECTS

How to build a digital platform to manage climate finance

Table of contents

Section 1: The case for a digital platform to manage and track climate finance

Section 2: Business requirements for a digital platform to manage climate finance

SECTION 1

The case for a digital platform to manage and track climate finance

1. Introduction

The world's investments to address the climate crisis are falling short. On the one hand, the resources being mobilized are insufficient. But just as importantly, as climate leaders are increasingly recognizing, climate finance flows are not aligning to national priorities, global delivery is fragmented, and we lack the systems needed to manage and track where the funds are going. In 2023, global climate finance reached a total of US$1.9 trillion for the first time — an incredible sum, albeit well below the US$6 trillion or more that may be needed each year according to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

As communities across the world confront the daily realities of worsening climate impacts, governments are making encouraging plans to improve the coordination of global efforts to mobilize climate finance and place countries front-and-center in determining where these investments are best spent. In late 2025 at the COP30 climate summit in Belém, Brazil, a coalition of 13 countries and a regional grouping of African Islands announced their support for a country platform hub to strengthen country leadership of climate investments. The conference also launched a Belém Action Mechanism for a Global Just Transition (BAM) to break down silos, coordinate international finance and align finance to each national or subnational government's priorities.

The glaring gap remaining is an effective, modern system that supports governments to manage these investments, in a way that is: cost-effective and flexible enough to be adopted globally, inclusive of local communities and beneficiaries, and able to be scaled rapidly to meet these ambitious finance targets.

There is a pressing and urgent need for data-driven digital public infrastructure to support international finance commitments and implementation platforms.

In the absence of such digital infrastructure, most climate spending is currently being done in the dark. Analysis from the One Campaign reveals that two-thirds of climate-related funding is either unreported or unrelated to its stated purpose. The World Resources Institute notes there is a lack of consistent data on where climate funds are flowing and who makes decisions on them. Fewer than 20 countries have climate budget tagging systems, and only a few have a clear definition for what "counts" as climate finance.

Meanwhile, the World Bank notes that less than 17% of global climate finance supports local resilience efforts, and Indigenous communities receive only around 5% of environmental protection funding.

At Open Contracting Partnership, we are all about better public procurement for people and planet. We are experts in data and digital tools to track the flows of money and results across the entire cycle of planning, procurement and implementing public contracts.

Public procurement is an important strategic lever in public financial management. With governments spending over US$13 trillion a year worldwide through public contracting, making the right investments can transform supply chains and deliver better, greener, and cleaner goods, works and services to citizens.

We support transformation and innovation in this space. Our projects span the globe, from running the coordination office for Ukraine's digital reconstruction ecosystem DREAM, to assisting countries like Brazil, India, Lithuania, Poland and Tanzania on sustainable public procurement reforms. This work made us curious about how we can connect international climate-related financial flows from donor governments and international financial institutions like the World Bank to the actual spending on the ground in recipient countries.

Successful digital transformation relies on more than technology. It's one thing to draw up a list of data points that should be disclosed. It is much more complex, yet vital, to understand "what" and "how" systems need to change to bring data together sustainably, and to unpack the "why" of stakeholder incentives. With that in mind, this report covers our research on these important questions.

In the report's first section, we look at the climate finance gap in detail. What it is, why it exists and which incentives and challenges must be overcome to close it. Then we explain our design approach to bridge this gap, informed by our team's experience in digitalization reform, along with more than a dozen stakeholder interviews and research on existing investment tracking platforms.

In the second section, we get more technical and think deeply about the functionalities and approach for a digital platform to track climate finance flows and how such a digital platform should interconnect with other vital government and donor reporting systems.

We define the user needs and main use cases for such a platform, from tracking spending to reporting on climate targets. We discuss what should be in and out of scope for a minimum viable product and the key functional requirements for this approach. Lastly we look at other requirements needed to operate such a system. We conclude by proposing a Feasibility Study and Readiness Assessment as the structured first step toward implementation: a process that translates these requirements into a country-specific technical specification and deployment roadmap.

We stand on the shoulders of those who have already done great work in this space. As well as a detailed survey of the literature on climate finance and review of investment tracking systems and approaches that already exist, we tested our ideas with over 16 major stakeholder groups from government, multilateral institutions, civil society and private investors to inform this report. We took care to speak to stakeholders distributed across sectors, geographies and country income levels. Some asked to remain anonymous as they are heading their countries' own implementation efforts and wanted to give us an unvarnished view of the challenges. We really appreciate their candor and we hope that this report helps them in their important work.

A full bibliography of resources, platforms and standards reviewed and used as the basis of our digital platform thinking can be found in our appendices.

2. The opportunity

While there is a significant global effort ongoing to close the gap in climate finance sums pledged versus the amount still needed, much less attention has been paid to understanding how climate finance is spent, evaluating its impact and in learning from which investments deliver better returns, and which fall short of expectations.

The existing landscape of formal tracking and reporting has been designed, largely, for monitoring and evaluation of carbon targets for UNFCCC obligations. It does not, as yet, intersect with wider public investment management approaches other than rudimentary budget tagging. These reporting obligations do not cover overall climate finance impact in terms of return on investment.

That landscape, and its corresponding needs, may be evolving with the recent adoption of the Belém Action Mechanism for a Global Just Transition at the 30th Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC. The BAM aims to break down silos, coordinate international finance and

align finance to each national or subnational government's platform of priorities for a just energy transition. As the Climate Action Network said, the hope is that the BAM will catalyze momentum, mobilize further investment and technical assistance, reduce or remove debt barriers as a burden, join up efforts across sectors, ministries, agencies and state-owned enterprises, and "*make justice measurable by linking global ambition with social and economic outcomes.*"

To do this effectively, what's missing is a data and information architecture explicitly designed for investment project management.

Our vision is a **digital** platform that improves coordination and public oversight of the global just transition to a low-carbon economy.

It would achieve this by supporting governments to operationalize their climate policy commitments and country platforms under the UN Climate Change BAM framework.

A well-designed digital platform would enable end-to-end management of investments — across mobilization, coordination, measurement, control and public engagement. It would complement existing public financial management systems, bringing together data on financial flows and investment portfolios that is:

- disaggregated to the project- and transaction-level,
- high quality,
- timely, and
- grounded in input from local communities and beneficiaries.

The research in this report aims to uncover what it would take to build such a digital platform at a country-level, rooted not only in technical know-how, but human-centered design principles and change management practices.

We know first-hand from our own work and the innovations of many of our peers and partners that technology already exists that could be adapted to track and manage climate finance flows more effectively. International transparency portals (see Table 1 in Section 3.2) aggregate donor commitment data across countries. Multilateral climate funds publish their project portfolios. National Monitoring, Reporting & Verification (MRV) systems track greenhouse gas emissions against Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) targets. Spatial investment tools show citizens where public projects are being built.

The organizations behind these initiatives have done important work, as many of the experts we interviewed in the course of this research endorsed and acknowledged. But when we posed the question directly — **"Does a digital solution exist that provides granular, timely, publicly accessible data on climate finance flows across the full lifecycle from pledge to project to impact?"** — the answer from across our interviews was a consistent "no."

Our interviewees invariably pointed to the difficulties of breaking down silos and connecting investment flows to contracts and project execution. That connecting these data and information silos was so hard to achieve prompted us to think deeply about how to do that in an agile way.

To build this capability at the national and subnational level across diverse jurisdictions, we have to change the way we think about data and disclosure throughout the climate investment project lifecycle, and pivot from a focus on data only for transparency and monitoring *after* the funds have been disbursed and spent, to envisioning a more robust, end-to-end climate finance management ecosystem that generates useful, timely data *throughout* the planning, coordination, allocation and management phases too.

This mirrors the journey taken by governments that have adopted an open contracting approach for their general procurement. Many start by publishing tenders and contracts for open competition and retrospective audit and transparency goals, but later realize the value in expanding their capability to track the entire procurement lifecycle, from planning a request for proposals through to how a contractor performed in the project delivery phase. This allows governments to go from being transactional and static to dynamic, insight-driven and strategic — where digitalization becomes truly transformational.

If we can more reliably and credibly tie impact and return on investment to specific climate projects, appeals to mobilize additional financing should be more successful in attracting further investment. This will allow climate actors to better understand value for money across diverse categories of investment projects, learn from these projects for continuous improvement in how resources are deployed and allocated, and enable investors to more accurately assess the true risk profile of a country, sector or project. It is a common barrier cited by interviewees in bringing down the cost of capital.

Furthermore, our interviewees frequently said that community and local civic understanding of the nature of climate funds is very low, whether it be what is meant by adaptation or mitigation, how funds are prioritized and spent, or what impact these funds have on their livelihoods.

This is a problem. When communities are disconnected and disenfranchised from how these funds benefit them, it risks undermining trust and popular support for climate policy objectives, and faith that the money is allocated to the highest priority needs of climate victims. This low understanding of the scale of the challenge, nature of funding and “what’s in it for me?” was cited equally for high emission donor country citizens as well as low emission recipient country citizens.

Information is power, so any gap in information between donors or investors and the ultimate citizen beneficiaries is disempowering for citizens and hinders the ability of climate-affected communities to participate in the climate decisions that affect them with an authentic sense of agency and visibility that goes beyond routine tick-box consultations.

A digital platform to track and manage climate finance will not solve the narrative and public education gap on its own, but it will be a tool that improves governments’ ability to tell clear stories about how climate finance benefits communities, show concrete progress towards climate goals and create opportunities for citizens to contribute to and follow climate investment projects that are locally relevant to them.

3. The climate finance tracking gap in detail

To begin our research, we set out to understand the current gap in tracking and managing climate finance flows in more detail by mapping stakeholder incentives to the "user needs" of these stakeholders from their ideal digital platform.

We also reviewed existing digital platforms that track different types of public investments and contracts to see what we could learn and apply to climate. (It is important to note here that "climate" is in many ways cross-cutting and overlaps with other categories of investment and spending and there is no universal tagging methodology. We'll come back to this point below in the Challenges section.)

3.1 Stakeholder incentives and user needs

We deliberately prioritized a human-centered research and design approach. Our interviewees underlined this point, and the concept of an "ecosystem approach" came up frequently in our conversations.

From our experience of deploying digital solutions, we know that any digital platform has to be designed not just *for* the ecosystem it intends to operate in, but *with* the ecosystem actors it intends to serve. Digital innovation is a reflection of the explicit and implicit design choices, priorities, and incentives of the "designers" and "users" — the actual *humans* and the cultures, assumptions, biases, communities and ways of working they bring to developing the digital platform.

It was therefore important to consult our interviewees and refer to the existing thought leadership and research on climate finance for insights about the real world incentives and needs of the humans who would most likely benefit from our proposed digital platform.

In other words, what problems do people really need to solve? What data and information do they need and want in order to solve them? And why? What are their motivations?

The consensus of our interviewees was that the existing data focus in the climate ecosystem is heavily weighted towards reporting, and that the information collected on carbon reporting is siloed from tracking finance and investment flows. They also commented on the lack of reliable information on investment at the project level, and the

difficulty of tracking investment flows beyond the point of green tagging in a budget in the very best case scenarios.

Interviewees' incentives for adopting and using a digital platform to track climate finance included reducing their reporting time and burden, attracting more investment through impact demonstration, better coordinating and allocating investment flows to specific priority sectors or projects and building trust among the public.

With these incentives and gaps in mind, we identified four core use cases that we refined and tested with interviewees through questions about their incentives, needs and motivations:

- **Report:** government obligations to report on climate finance and NDCs
- **Coordinate and control:** coordinating climate finance funds from various sources and allocating these at the portfolio level
- **Engage:** engaging the public for oversight, participation and accountability
- **Mobilize and de-risk:** leverage data and information on portfolio investments to more accurately price risk, demonstrate ROI on projects and incentivize further investments

Interviewees varied on which use case was most valuable to their own daily work and objectives, but a consensus emerged that reporting currently ranks higher for many than it should, coordination and mobilization should be higher priorities to reach our climate goals in the medium to long-term, and that unfortunately, the public engagement use case is still far too often an afterthought and "nice-to-have" rather than an essential "must do". Interviewees felt that it is essential to bring the public along on the just transition journey more effectively to secure long-term support from both donor and recipient publics for increasing this investment as a shared human and economic development priority and responsibility for everyone.

We expand on each of these use cases in detail in our business requirements documentation where we outline in greater technical detail what a country should consider when designing its own digital platform to track and manage climate finance. We also explore what a typical user journey to use such a tracking system might look like.

3.2 Review of existing investment tracking platforms

As we could not find evidence of an existing digital platform to track and manage climate finance, we mapped the available digital solutions that do so for other forms of investment. That landscape is currently dominated by five distinct approaches. While each serves a specific reporting or transparency mandate, none provide a comprehensive end-to-end "pledge to project to impact" management view for climate finance.

Nonetheless, reviewing existing efforts gives us a good starting point to understand the technical gaps, contextual constraints, incentives and challenges to deliver on that pledge-to-project approach.

Table 1. Existing investment tracking platforms

Category	Description	Examples	Primary audience	Limitations for tracking climate finance
International Transparency Portals	Third-party initiatives that aggregate data across various donors to provide a global overview of flows.	International Aid Transparency Initiative Standard	Donors, researchers, policymakers	Data is often several months old, which makes it rather historical than actionable. Data does not provide visibility beyond commitments and disbursements. Finance data is often disconnected from impact.
Donor & Fund-Specific Portals	Direct disclosure platforms where specific funds publish their own project portfolios, approval statuses, and high-level disbursement figures.	Green Climate Fund, Adaptation Fund	Recipient country focal points, researchers	Each dataset is specific to one fund. To get an overview of climate finance in a specific country, you have to combine data from multiple funds. Different funds might provide data collected using different methodologies to

				different levels of detail. Data is often time limited to disbursements, and does not provide details on project implementation (incuding procurement and actual spending).
National Monitoring, Reporting & Verification (MRV) Systems	Designed to fulfill the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) under the Paris Agreement. Used for Greenhouse Gases (GHG) inventory and formal Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) reporting.	Colombia MRV, various ICAT-supported national systems	UNFCCC reporting teams, Ministry of Environment officials	Data is often primarily focused on GHG Inventories rather than climate finance itself. Most MRV systems are typically internal tools for formal reporting rather than open platforms for civic oversight and engagement. Data updates are tied to reporting cycles, which makes data rather historical than actionable.
Sector-Specific Country Platforms	Designed to coordinate large-scale energy transition deals in specific emerging economies.	Just Energy Transition Partnership Indonesia (JETPI)	Donors, Multilateral Development Banks	Data is often limited to aggregate financial commitments and strategic planning, with little or no data on project-level financial flows, disbursements, and outcomes. Data is often published in non-machine-readable formats and not fully integrated into national climate finance tracking systems.

Spatial Investment Tools	Provide geographic / spatial visibility for public investment projects, show "where" money is going.	MapaInversiones	Civil Society, General Public	Focused primarily on collecting and consolidating all information available at the country level on the implementation of infrastructure investment projects, combined with IDB project finance information. Not climate-centric.

In addition to these tracking platforms, we have taken inspiration from Ukraine's public investment management system DREAM. The first of its kind, DREAM is an end-to-end public investment management ecosystem that enables local community governments to input their reconstruction needs from the bottom up and for the central government to coordinate donor and investor funds from the top down. A forthcoming OCP publication will document the planning, business requirements, technical requirements and workflow behind DREAM as a digital public good.

These tools and products show that tracking and managing investment finance is possible from a technical capability standpoint.

And yet, with the exception of DREAM, none of the existing tools could provide a national government or a donor with a complete end-to-end picture of what happened after financing was committed and disbursed. This leaves many stakeholders lacking critical information and insights they need to mobilize, allocate, track and assess the impact of climate funds.

This led us to a critical research question: if stakeholders need this information and feel that an easily accessible, user-friendly interface to access it is such a valuable idea, why hasn't it already been done? What is stopping us from building a digital, data-driven solution that could provide us with better, more complete insights that help us make the most of these funds?

We try to answer that in the next section.

4. Challenges

Our research and interviews found that the barriers to change may fall into two categories:

- Technical gaps that require digital solutions, workflows, tools, data standards or data improvements
- Contextual constraints and gaps in incentive alignment that require human, cultural, political, change management or other mitigation strategies.

We describe these in more detail below. Both sets of challenges shed light on why it has proven difficult to incentivize better tracking and management of climate finance flows through to final implementation and impact. And both should be considered in order for a dynamic digital solution layer to country platforms to reach its full potential.

4.1 Technical gap analysis

Alongside the contextual constraints and incentive gaps, the existing landscape of digital tracking tools falls short of the capability to track and manage climate finance through to the investment project level. The following gaps describe precisely where the existing digital and technical landscape falls short. Each represents a specific technical deficiency that the proposed platform is designed to address.

The financial lifecycle breaks off at disbursement

The most consistent finding across all five categories of existing platforms in the table above is a cliff edge in financial visibility: almost all of them stop at disbursement. International transparency portals like IATI track pledges and the release of funds from donor to recipient government. Donor-specific fund portals (GCF, Adaptation Fund) track approval and disbursement to implementing entities. What happens after — the conversion of disbursed funds into contracts, the spending of those contracts through the supply chain, the flow of money to the firms and workers who actually deliver the project — is largely invisible in any publicly available system.

Data granularity is insufficient for management or investment decisions

Where data exists, it is typically presented in a level of aggregation that limits its usefulness for any purpose beyond headline reporting. Cumulative disbursement totals by sector or country, high-level project summaries with no breakdown of funding streams, percentage-of-NDC figures with no underlying indicator data are sufficient for a biennial

transparency report but not for the decisions that governments and investors need to make.

Data is structured for compliance, not decision-making

The design goal of most existing climate finance platforms is to fulfill an external reporting obligation: the Biennial Transparency Report, the annual donor report, the GCF performance update. This goal shapes the data that gets collected, the frequency with which it is updated, and the form in which it is presented.

Data collected for compliance is often collected retrospectively (once a project cycle closes rather than as it unfolds), at the level of detail required by the framework (which is typically sector-level or program-level aggregates not the project or transaction level detail required for decision making), and formatted for a specific report template rather than for general-purpose analysis.

National and international data systems do not connect

Climate finance arrives in a country from multiple sources — bilateral donors, multilateral development banks, dedicated climate funds, domestic budget allocations — each of which maintains its own data system, its own project identification codes, its own reporting timeline, and its own level of disclosure. At no point do these streams converge into a unified national view.

This fragmentation also affects the private sector. An investor conducting due diligence on a country's track record with climate investments cannot obtain a unified, comparable dataset across projects without commissioning proprietary research. The absence of machine-readable, interoperable data is itself a risk premium.

No consistent national climate classification standard is applied

A prerequisite for meaningful climate finance tracking widely acknowledged in the literature and confirmed across our interviews is a clear national definition of what counts as climate finance and a standardized methodology for identifying it within the budget. Without this, data produced by different ministries cannot be compared or aggregated, tagged expenditures cannot be verified, and the climate share of the national budget cannot be reliably calculated.

International standards such as the OECD Rio Markers system provides a baseline, and the IMF's C-PIMA framework offers a more operationally grounded approach to climate budget tagging exist, but their application at the national level is inconsistent.

Public access is an afterthought, not a design feature

Across the five categories of existing platforms, public accessibility is either absent or treated as a secondary audience — a reporting output rather than a design requirement. National MRV systems are described by their own administrators as internal tools for formal reporting rather than open platforms for civic oversight. Fund-specific portals are designed for donor and implementing agency audiences. International transparency portals are accessible in principle but structured in ways that require significant technical capability to use meaningfully.

The result is that the citizens most directly affected by climate investments — the communities in whose names adaptation and mitigation projects are funded — have no structured, accessible channel through which to observe whether those investments are being delivered, or to raise concerns if they are not.

4.2 Contextual constraint mapping

Every digital solution exists to solve problems, but also exists in an ecosystem of actors with differing incentives, and a context of constraints that cannot be addressed by technology alone. In this section, we outline the constraints that must be mitigated and the incentives that must be aligned for our proposed digital platform to reach its full transformational impact.

Through our interviews we identified five primary contextual constraints that cannot be solved by a digital solution alone. These challenges are cultural, political, bureaucratic and mitigating them is a question of thoughtful change management and incentive alignment to mitigate and ideally overcome them.

As budgets come under pressure and more countries look to take greater ownership and control of their development agendas, including on climate, there is an opportunity presented by an increased incentive to maximize domestic resources and demonstrate maximum impact for the financing available. This creates an increasingly compelling case for better data disclosure as a tool for mobilizing more investment through better insights on climate investment opportunities and more accurately priced risk profiles that could bring down the cost of capital for sound investments.

1. A clear data standard and methodology

Constraint: The way different government bodies understand and categorize climate spending varies across countries, and even between agencies and ministries even within the same government. There is a lack of universal definitions of what counts as “climate”, or what counts as adaptation or mitigation, and proposed systems of standardized methodology to categorize and tag from budget allocation through to spending and implementation are still at an early stage. The overlap between climate and development finance also creates tension.

Mitigation: National governments cannot unilaterally address the lack of common international standard, but they can mandate a domestic methodology and monitor for international initiatives in this regard.

2. Willingness to bridge or break down data and stakeholder silos

Constraint: The data needed to track climate finance sits across different government ministries, departments and agencies who do not always trust sharing data. And it is unusual for a government to assign a cross cutting agency or role to join the dots between data sets and data users in ministries of finance, environment, energy, natural resources and so on.

Mitigation: Trust must be built between government agencies and stakeholders over time. Beginning with a small pilot of a subset of data that helps responsible ministries to better do their jobs can help demonstrate the value of data sharing and incentivize stakeholders to see the cost of these silos leading to a loss in revenue and impact as the greater risk than the perceived loss of control. Clear robust policies on cybersecurity, data protection and data governance can address concerns around the risks of data sharing.

3. Intentional investment in internal capacity and ownership

Constraint: Many data dashboards or monitoring tools are designed by external consultants without strong internal involvement from the outset and ownership of the tool. The government employees using the tool are not involved in its conception through user-centered design, and are not adequately trained or incentivized to use and maintain it over time. Digital solutions risk becoming short-term flashy check box projects instead of living, iteratively improved processes, workflows and systems.

Mitigation: Governments and multilateral development partners should insist on local ownership and co-creation of all digital solutions, with adequate onboarding and capacity building so that governments build and maintain the skill set to ensure digital solutions are sustainable, and built *with* — not *for* — the people who will ultimately use the tools to make change management and stakeholder buy-in from the outset.

4. The fungible nature of climate finance

Constraint: Some actors push to earmark financing for specific uses such as climate, but this does not always result in a net increase in total investment to the climate sector given that other budget lines with fewer restrictions can be moved around. Other sources of financing affected by the tension between earmarking and fungibility are for example fast-dispersing financing instruments for sustainable growth and in response to climate-related disasters issued by multilateral development banks.

Mitigation: Educate actors on pros and cons of different levels of conditions and specificity onto what financing should be used for. Make sure the digital solutions to track and manage climate finance help improve the overall understanding of how much financing is available to avoid double counting, or simply reorganizing the same

funds in different categories without attracting new investment overall. This is why going beyond climate or green tagging alone is so important. As budgets are reallocated or funds are redirected, they may be tagged as green or climate related, but “new” funds for a project might not truly be adding to the overall sum of investment in climate goals.

5. Public sector risk aversion

Constraint: The risk-averse nature of the public sector results in a hesitation to publish data and information for reasons of politics and hierarchy or for fear of exposing waste, fraud, or mismanagement that could discourage investment, while investor groups argue that greater disclosure would assist them in identifying more viable climate projects for investment and more accurately price their risk, allowing them to lower the cost of capital where transparency and governance is higher. In many cases, funds are not managed by country systems, but by parallel systems led, for example, by multilateral development banks.

Mitigation: Data experts and climate experts must be exposed to each other’s perspective and expertise to build a consensus on the importance of investing in high quality data and disclosing that data. Together, stakeholders with a shared interest in better climate finance data must make the case to political stakeholders in finance ministries and line ministries to invest in data collection and digital tools. Collaboration and constructive engagement lowers the threat level on publishing even partial data that may contain errors. Multilateral development banks have pledged to invest more in country procurement systems following the findings of the Making Procurement Work Better Independent Evaluation Group report, and can provide support.

5. Our design approach

We made some deliberate conceptual choices in both narrowing our research scope and designing the business requirements for a digital solution.

First, we have focused our approach on the country level (national and/or subnational) as this was the major gap identified in our stakeholder interviews. Organizations such as International Aid Transparency Index and the OECD's tracking of climate finance commitments and private finance mobilized for development cover the donor commitment side, the challenge is following those funds through to the project implementation level.

Investing in capacity at the country level is also important for effective long-term financial management and ownership of investment projects. Country systems for tracking finance should directly align to country platform commitments on climate, development and nationally determined contributions (NDCs) for carbon reduction. This maximizes their usefulness and ensures the data collected enhances existing monitoring and reporting rather than duplicating efforts.

And importantly, local input, accountability and oversight by citizens through civic and community groups is essential both to identify needs and allocate resources in a way that matches up with citizens expectations and needs. Local accountability and participation provides national level governments with insight, data and information that is difficult to get without being on the ground and informs healthy feedback loops. Public monitoring can build trust that resources are spent effectively on quality climate investment projects that tangibly benefit citizens' lives.

Second, we have chosen to develop higher level business requirements rather than overly detailed or prescriptive technical specifications for a digital platform. The reason being that each national or subnational entity will have its own approach, and its own country platform commitments as well as existing plans they want to build on.

Business requirements set out a blueprint for a digital platform that includes: technical gaps, objectives, user groups and needs, and the core functional requirements to enable individual governments to work with technical teams to develop a platform that operates

with existing data, systems and digital public infrastructure, as well as with analogue workflows and processes.

One size doesn't fit all when it comes to digital tools. Because laws and IT systems vary by country, it's better to focus on the ultimate goals and the people using the tech. It's important not to expect people to change their habits for a new system and instead design the technology to fit the way people actually work.

To that end, we have set out a clear idea of objectives, desired functionalities, and a human-centric approach that considers both digital user interface and data needs and human workflows behind the data. We also outline country selection criteria and propose a feasibility study and readiness assessment that can help governments map out a realistic adoption plan.

6. The way forward

Through our research we feel confident that existing technology and frameworks can be adapted to improve how climate finance is tracked and managed. As emerging technologies improve our ability to work with large amounts of data, we believe we will continue to identify new and better solutions, even for challenging contexts.

At a moment when finances are tight, supply chains are a priority, and the imperative to transition our economy grows more urgent, it is vital to prioritize improving our ability to generate deep, meaningful insights on climate finance and its impact.

The next section outlines the business requirements for such a digital platform's possible prototype. We hope to engage early adopter countries who are willing to begin with a Feasibility Study and Readiness Assessment before proceeding to a pilot built through a scalable, modular approach that meets countries where they are. We believe this will enhance their ability to attract, coordinate and manage climate finance, and ensure it is used efficiently to deliver the policies and promises in country platforms.

SECTION 2

Business requirements for a digital platform to manage climate finance

Business requirements for a digital platform to manage climate finance

In our investment case for a climate finance management ecosystem, we outlined the current state of digital tools and products that shed light on climate finance flows, and identified a gap between data on climate finance commitments and data on the ultimate impact of climate finance at the investment project level. This business requirements section identifies the users of a climate finance management ecosystem and the most important use cases for data on climate finance flows, from disbursement to project level implementation. It provides the scope and functional requirements to help us conceptualize what a climate finance management ecosystem would look like and the value it would provide in practice.

Based on the gaps identified during market research, we propose to develop a **Climate Finance Management Platform** — a national-level digital system that transforms how governments track, manage, report on, evaluate the impact of, and make accountable their climate investment portfolio.

The platform should operate on two interconnected layers.

The first is an **internal government management layer**: a structured tool for finance ministries, environment ministries, planning bodies, and implementing agencies to tag climate-relevant budget lines, track projects through the full implementation lifecycle, monitor disbursements and spending against commitments, link financial flows to climate outcomes and NDC targets, and generate consolidated reports for the multiple institutional audiences they are accountable to.

This layer reduces the administrative burden of multi-stakeholder reporting by producing all required report formats from a single underlying data set, and gives decision-makers the portfolio-level visibility needed to reallocate resources, identify bottlenecks, and demonstrate performance.

The second is a **public transparency portal**: a publicly accessible interface through which civil society organizations, investors, researchers, journalists, and communities can see where climate investment is going, monitor project progress, and in a structured way interact by submitting observations about projects in their area.

This layer operationalizes the accountability ecosystem: it gives the local organizations and civic actors who are closest to the impacts of climate investments a window into the decisions being made in their name, and creates a governance track record that reduces the risk profile and cost of capital for investor-ready countries.

These two layers are not separate systems. They are a single data environment, with the access control model determining what each user group can see. Government users see the full internal management view; the public sees what the government has elected to publish. One data source, multiple views: This design is the technical mechanism for the "single source of truth" that so many of our interviewees described as missing.

1. Design principles

Several deliberate design choices distinguish this approach from previous attempts in the space. These are not technical preferences; they are lessons learned from what we have seen work well, and what has fallen short in other digital platforms designed to track and manage investment projects and financial flows.

- **Integration over creation.** The platform will pull data from systems that already exist — the integrated financial management information system (IFMIS), the e-procurement system, international financial institution (IFI) portals — rather than create new data entry workflows that duplicate existing processes. Every manual data entry requirement is a sustainability risk. Where integration is not technically possible in the short term, structured upload templates will provide a fallback, with the expectation that system integration is the medium-term target.

- **Process alongside technology**. The platform should serve as a tool for improving institutional processes, not a substitute for them. A ministry that does not have an agreed methodology for tagging climate expenditure will not benefit from a sophisticated budget-tagging module. The platform's deployment model therefore includes a process design and capacity building phase that precedes or runs alongside technical implementation. The technology surfaces and structures decisions that institutional processes must first make.

- **Workflows structured for user friendliness, not digitizing existing bureaucracy**. Digitizing an existing workflow does not automatically improve it. A badly designed paper process produces a badly designed digital process. The platform's workflows are designed around what users actually need to accomplish. Where existing administrative processes add friction without adding governance value, the

platform's design should prompt a conversation about redesigning those processes rather than replicating them in digital form.

- **Country-adapted, not one-size-fits-all**. The platform's architecture is modular: countries can deploy a core transparency and reporting layer first, and add budget tagging, portfolio management, and public engagement capabilities as institutional readiness develops. Requirements are stated at the business level, not the technical specification level, precisely to allow each country's technical team to design the implementation that fits their existing infrastructure.
- **Sustainability by design**. Every deployment commitment includes: mandatory government counterpart involvement in design and testing; institutional mandate or legislative backing for the data flows the platform requires; training requirements met before go-live; and an identified government team responsible for ongoing operation. Open-source licensing is the default, to prevent vendor lock-in and allow local technical teams to maintain and extend the system without dependency on any single external partner.
- **Transparency as a governance tool, not a reporting burden**. The platform is designed around the cases where transparency creates value: the “watching effect” that improves execution quality, the reporting efficiency that reduces the cost of compliance, the governance track record that improves access to capital, and the community feedback that catches implementation problems before they become political liabilities. These are the incentives that sustain a platform after the launch event.

2. Stakeholders and use cases

Understanding who the platform is designed to serve, and what specific jobs they need it to do, is a prerequisite for any meaningful requirement. This section maps the primary stakeholder groups across the climate finance ecosystem to the platform and describes the situations in which the platform would make their work better.

Stakeholder needs also drive the scope and priority of the platform's functional modules. The use cases in the second half of this section correspond directly to the module architecture described in the Functional Requirements.

2.1 Primary stakeholders

The following groups represent the primary people who will either use the platform directly, provide data to it, or consume data from it in ways that the platform's design must accommodate. This list is not exhaustive. It covers the groups whose needs have most directly shaped the requirements.

1. National public sector

This is the group the platform must serve first and whose adoption is a precondition for the platform delivering value to any other stakeholder. It is not a monolithic group: within any national government, several distinct entities interact with climate finance in different ways and have different needs from the platform.

- **Ministry of Finance** owns the budget, manages the national treasury, and is responsible for fiscal management and accountability.
- **Ministry of Environment** (or equivalent) owns the NDC commitments, manages the national climate strategy, and is responsible for UNFCCC reporting.
- **National Planning Commission** (or equivalent) is responsible for investment prioritization and portfolio management across the national budget.
- **Line ministries** are responsible for sectoral climate investments — the adaptation and mitigation projects that constitute the bulk of climate finance activity at the implementation level.

2. Subnational public sector

This group includes regional governments and municipalities who are frequently the implementing entities for climate investment projects. Their role in the platform is dual: they are both data providers (reporting project progress upward to the national system) and data consumers (accessing disbursement status and portfolio data from the central system to manage their own project pipelines).

3. Development & international finance

This group includes multilateral development banks (World Bank, ADB, AfDB, IDB, and others), dedicated multilateral climate funds (Green Climate Fund, Adaptation Fund, Climate Investment Funds), bilateral donors, and UN agencies. Their relationship to the platform is primarily as data providers and data consumers.

As data providers, IFIs and climate funds hold data on commitments, approvals, and disbursements for a significant share of international climate finance. As data consumers, development finance partners need the platform to generate reporting information in formats that align to their own accountability requirements.

4. **Private sector**

This group includes the firms (contractors, service providers, economic operators) that execute the projects. As data providers, firms are required to demonstrate their capabilities as well as compliance with applicable regulations and climate and sustainability standards. As data consumers, they mostly use the platform for forecasting and assessing market opportunities. Other private sector users include financiers (commercial banks, insurers) who provide capital and primarily rely on the platform as an investment screening and portfolio monitoring tool.

5. **Civil society and communities**

This group includes civil society organizations and NGOs working on climate, environment, and development advocacy that use financial transparency data to monitor whether climate commitments are being honored, track project outcomes against promises, and hold governments and donors accountable.

They need a public, searchable, and downloadable project database with sufficient granularity and timeliness to conduct independent, real-time analysis.

6. **Accountability and oversight bodies**

This group includes audit institutions, anticorruption agencies and independent oversight bodies who need access to a structured, immutable audit trail of financial flows and data management decisions, with sufficient granularity to trace individual transactions, flag anomalies, and draw conclusions about institutional conduct.

3. Use cases

The four use cases below describe the distinct ways in which the digital platform creates value — organized by the objective of the government or stakeholder using it, not by the technical module they are accessing. Each use case maps to one or more functional modules (cross-referenced in the Functional Requirements section) and to one or more primary stakeholder groups.

3.1 Coordinate and control

Objective: Improve the quality of government decision making in the allocation, disbursement and execution of climate investment resources.

Primary Stakeholders: Ministry of Finance, National Planning Commission, Ministry of Environment, multilateral development banks, climate donors.

An example of a user here would be a finance ministry or other control entity in the government that wants to plan, manage, and monitor the spending of climate funds by diverse country actors to deliver on its own political objectives or mandates for fiscal governance.

Example user personas:

- **National government:** When faced with limited funding and competing sectoral priorities, I want to compare the projected climate impact and cost-effectiveness of various projects so that I can allocate resources to the initiatives that offer the highest resilience or mitigation returns.
- **National government:** When I am under pressure to meet NDC targets, I want to see which projects are stalled, so I can reallocate resources or unblock bottlenecks.
- **National government:** When multiple donors fund parallel initiatives, I want a single record of disbursement to prevent double-counting and ensure that "new and additional" finance is truly additive to our national climate goals.
- **Local government:** When I am implementing a local climate adaptation project, I want to see disbursement status from the central treasury, so I can manage contractor expectations and project timelines.

3.2 Mobilize and de-risk

Objective: Enable governments to attract new climate investment — from international donors, development finance institutions, and private sector — by demonstrating the quality of their climate governance, the track record of their climate investments, and the reliability of their reporting.

Primary stakeholders: Ministry of Finance, National Planning Commission, development finance institutions, international donors, private investors.

The incentive for the government entity tracking climate funds here is to mobilize new or additional resources, attracting new investment from donors and the private sector by more clearly articulating the return on investment on existing funds and more accurately assessing the risk profile of projects.

Investors require two main types of information:

- **Contractual and auditable:** mandated disclosures tied to verifiable key performance indicators in a bond's legal covenant.
- **Investment details:** Specific information at the project level about implementation plans, budgets, spending to date, how the bidding system will be organized, the policy goals met through the project to deliver return on investment, and so on.

Example user personas:

- **Donor:** When I disburse millions of dollars into a national fund, I want to see the specific contract and transaction trail to local implementers, so I can prove to my board that money was spent on the actual work without any funds being lost or diverted.
- **Private investor:** When I evaluate a potential Public-Private Partnership, I want to see the historical financial performance and impact data of similar projects, so I can accurately assess the risks.
- **National government:** When I seek to attract financing for climate projects, I want to be able to showcase successful projects and a track record of sound financial stewardship, so I can negotiate a lower risk premium and cost of capital.

3.3 Report

Objective: Reduce the administrative burden of multi-stakeholder climate finance reporting by generating all required report formats from a single, authoritative data source.

Primary stakeholders: Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Environment, international reporting bodies (UNFCCC, GCF, bilateral donors), auditors and oversight bodies.

In practice, the incentive might be to streamline the reporting burden as every international donor will ask for reports and data. Having a “single source of truth” could reduce friction with these multiple lines of reporting and accountability to donors and international organizations and agreements. External independent oversight from audit bodies and/or civic actors might generate a similar incentive.

- **Project manager:** When I am managing multiple projects with different funding sources, I want a single dashboard that automates my reporting for different donors, so I can spend more time on project implementation, and less on filling out spreadsheets.
- **International steward:** When I need to consolidate information on progress towards climate targets and analyze how climate funds have been used to meet these, I want countries to provide clear reporting aligned to my framework in a timely manner, so I can save time.
- **Oversight official:** When I am reviewing budgetary plans and policy commitments against expenditures, I want to have a clear through line to where funds were allocated and if investment projects were concluded, so I can verify that funds were spent as budgeted.

3.4 Engage

Objective: Increase public buy-in and support for climate investments by showing their effectiveness and aligning investment priorities to public needs. Improve accountability by disclosing data that communities and civil society monitors can use to verify funds were spent as planned.

Primary stakeholders: Civil society, community and place-based citizen groups, government officials with a public affairs or liaison role.

In this use case, government and/or climate actors recognize that there are multiple local actors and communities to involve, consult or inform when raising or allocating climate funds in order to build and maintain public trust in the climate projects and ensure resource deployment aligns to citizen priorities, needs and expectations.

- **Citizen:** When a new climate project is planned for my community, I want to understand its intended outcomes and how they address our local needs, so I can ensure that the investment aligns with our local priorities.
- **NGO:** When I hear about a new climate adaptation project in my region, I want to see the contract details and verified impact data, so I can hold my local leaders accountable.

3.5 Prioritizing use cases

The four use cases are not equally weighted in terms of deployment strategy.

- **Report** represents the most immediate and universally accessible entry point: almost every government already has an obligation to report and can see direct administrative savings from a consolidated reporting tool.
- **Coordinate and control** represents the operational foundation — without reliable data at the portfolio level, the other use cases rest on weak ground.
- **Engage** requires a functioning public transparency layer but has relatively modest technical complexity.
- **Mobilize and de-risk** is the highest-value use case in the medium term — the one most likely to attract new investment and lower the cost of capital for participating countries — but it depends on the quality and credibility of the data produced by the other three use cases first.

Taken together, they form a reinforcing cycle: better internal coordination produces better data; better data enables better reporting; better reporting builds the governance track record; a better governance track record mobilizes new investment; new investment raises the stakes for accountability, which strengthens engagement.

4. Defining the scope of the platform

The scope of the Climate Finance Platform is defined by the four use cases established in the previous section (Coordinate and control, Mobilize and de-risk, Report, and Engage) and is deliberately bounded to avoid duplicating capabilities that already exist within a country's public financial management infrastructure.

The platform is designed to sit alongside existing national systems (budget, treasury, procurement, etc.) and draw data from them, rather than to replace or replicate their core functions.

This distinction is foundational: scope boundaries were shaped by the consistent finding across our stakeholder interviews that previous efforts in this space failed in part by trying to do too much, building bespoke tools that could not be sustained when external consultants left.

4.1 In-scope functionality

1. Climate budget tagging and tracking

Applying standardized methodologies to identify, classify, and assign relevance weightings to climate-relevant expenditures across the national budget. This includes tagging at the budget line level using internationally recognized frameworks — primarily the Rio Markers system and the IMF's Climate-Public Investment Management Assessment (C-PIMA) taxonomy — as well as country-defined national climate classifications where these exist.

The platform will support multi-dimensional tagging across:

- **Purpose:** mitigation, adaptation, or cross-cutting
- **Alignment:** NDC actions, national climate plans, sectoral strategies
- **Source:** domestic budget, international grant, concessional loan, co-financing

2. Full-lifecycle project and portfolio management

End-to-end tracking and management of climate investments from the point of government commitment through to physical implementation and impact evaluation. This covers:

- **Planning and appraisal:** climate-lens screening and scoring of new projects, alignment check against NDC actions and national climate plans
- **Pipeline management:** a live registry of planned, approved, active, and completed climate projects across all public funding sources

- **Implementation monitoring:** milestone tracking, disbursement status, absorption rates, and identification of stalled or underperforming projects
- **Outcome and impact recording:** linking financial inputs and project outputs to measurable climate outcomes (emissions reduced, hectares restored, beneficiaries reached), structured to align with the country's NDC indicator framework

The platform will not replicate project management workflows that already sit within sectoral ministries or implementing agencies; it should aggregate and surface project-level data for cross-cutting visibility at the portfolio level.

3. Financial flow tracking: pledges to spending

Granular tracking of climate finance flows across the complete financial lifecycle, connecting data that currently sits across disconnected systems:

- **Commitments and pledges:** international donor commitments, national budget allocations, co-financing agreements
- **Disbursements:** transfers from IFIs, multilateral climate funds (GCF, Adaptation Fund, etc.), and domestic treasury to implementing entities
- **Expenditures and transactions:** actual spending at the project and activity level, drawn from national treasury or IFMIS data
- **On-budget and off-budget reconciliation:** identifying where international climate finance flows through national systems versus parallel channels, and flagging discrepancies

The purpose of this full-lifecycle view is to close the most consistent gap identified in our research: the disconnect between what is pledged at the international level and what is verifiably spent at the project implementation level.

4. NDC and carbon budget alignment view

A cross-cutting analytical layer that links financial data to the country's NDC targets and, where applicable, its carbon budget. This allows users to toggle between a financial view ("how much has been spent on mitigation and adaptation?") and a climate commitments

view ("how does this spending align to our NDC targets and projected emissions pathway?").

This does not include the operation of a national carbon registry or emissions trading system (see Out-of-scope functionality section below).

5. Disclosure and reporting

Structured reporting capabilities that reduce the administrative burden of multi-stakeholder reporting, including:

- **Automated report generation:** pre-configured templates for recurring international obligations (UNFCCC Biennial Transparency Reports, GCF Annual Performance Reports) and domestic accountability requirements
- **Custom reporting:** a configurable reporting layer that allows government users to generate reports for specific donors or oversight bodies without manual aggregation
- **Donor coordination dashboard:** a consolidated view of all active donor commitments, disbursement schedules, and reporting obligations for a given country, to prevent duplication and reduce the risk of double-counting "new and additional" finance
- **Single source of truth:** a unified data environment that allows one set of underlying data to feed multiple report formats, directly addressing the feedback from multiple interview respondents about the burden of maintaining parallel reporting spreadsheets for different audiences

6. Integration with IFI and/or national financial system

The platform's value depends on its ability to aggregate data from existing national systems rather than require manual re-entry. In-scope integration targets include:

- **National IFMIS/Treasury:** budget allocation data, execution status, and transaction-level expenditure data (read-only integration; the platform will not write back to IFMIS)

- **National e-GP (electronic Government Procurement):** contract award data, supplier information, and procurement milestone data to connect spending to actual work being done on the ground
- **International Financial Institution portals:** automated or semi-automated import of project data and disbursement records from IFI systems (GCF, World Bank, ADB, etc.) using IATI standard where available
- **Open data publication:** the platform will publish a machine-readable open data feed (using IATI and OC4IDS when possible) of the public dataset, enabling researchers, journalists, and downstream tools to access the data programmatically

7. Public transparency portal and civic engagement

A publicly accessible layer of the platform that makes climate finance data visible to civil society, communities, researchers, and the general public. This includes:

- **Project registry:** a searchable, filterable public database of climate investment projects, including location, sector, funding source, status, and summary impact data
- **Geographic visualization:** spatial display of projects and investment flows, showing where climate finance is reaching (and where it is not)
- **Progress and results summaries:** plain-language summaries of project outcomes and NDC progress, designed for non-specialist readers
- **Feedback and engagement mechanism:** a structured channel for citizens and community organizations to report observations or concerns about climate projects in their area, creating a documented accountability loop

The public portal is designed primarily for the Engage use case, but also serves the Mobilize and De-risk use case by demonstrating to prospective investors the track record and transparency standards of the implementing country.

4.2 Out-of-scope functionality

The following functions are explicitly excluded from the platform's scope. In each case, **the platform may integrate data from systems that perform these functions**, but will not replicate or replace them.

- **Budget formulation and management**. All budget planning, formulation, and execution functions remain within the country's existing Public Financial Management framework and IFMIS. The platform integrates approved allocation and execution data but does not provide budget management tools.
- **Payments and core accounting.** All payments, transfers, and accounting functions remain within the country's treasury and financial management systems. The platform integrates payment and transaction data to provide visibility, but does not initiate or process financial transactions.
- **Public procurement.** All procurement workflows (tender publication, bid evaluation, contract award) remain within the country's existing e-government procurement system. The platform integrates procurement data (contract details, award values, supplier information) to connect spending to project activity.
- **Engineering design documentation and construction permits management.** Development, approval, and archiving of engineering design documents and construction permits remain within the relevant planning and construction authority. The platform may integrate key permit status data as a project milestone indicator.
- **Private sector financial instruments.** Climate-labeled bonds, green equity instruments, and private investment flows undertaken under national financial regulation are out of scope. The platform tracks public climate finance (domestic budget and international public finance). Where a public-private partnership involves a public financing component, that public component is in scope; the private financing component is not.
- **Carbon market and emissions trading registry operations.** The registration, issuance, transfer, and retirement of carbon credits and the operation of a national or sectoral emissions trading system are out of scope. The platform may integrate aggregate carbon credit data as an input to the NDC alignment view, but does not function as a carbon registry.
- **GHG inventory and direct emissions measurement.** The production, verification, and management of national GHG inventories remain within the country's designated MRV authority (typically the Ministry of Environment). The platform integrates published GHG inventory data as a reference layer for the NDC alignment view but does not generate or validate emissions data.

- **Development of project appraisal and evaluation methodology.** The platform implements an agreed project appraisal methodology — applying defined screening criteria, scoring indicators, and alignment checks as a part of project registration and approval workflow. However, the design of that methodology — determining which appraisal criteria apply, how to weigh different factors, and which standards or frameworks to adopt — is out of scope and is a prerequisite that the deploying government must establish before or alongside the platform's deployment.

5. Functional requirements

The functional requirements are organized into six modules and one integration framework. Each module maps to one or more of the four strategic use cases (Coordinate and control, Mobilize and de-risk, Report, and Engage) established in the Use Cases section.

Table 2. Platform modules and use cases

Module	Use cases
Climate budget tagging and tracking	Coordinate and control, Report
Full-lifecycle project and portfolio management	Coordinate and control, Mobilize and de-risk
Reporting and donor coordination	Report, Mobilize and de-risk
Public transparency portal	Engage, Mobilize and de-risk
Data analytics	Coordinate and control, Mobilize and de-risk, Report, Engage
Open data	Mobilize and de-risk, Engage
Interoperability and integrations	Coordinate and control, Mobilize and de-risk, Report, Engage

5.1 Climate budget tagging and tracking

Purpose: Enable government users to systematically identify, classify, and monitor climate-relevant expenditures across the national budget, producing a structured evidence base for internal resource management and external reporting.

1. Budget classification and tagging

The platform shall enable government users to apply a standardized climate tagging methodology to national budget lines and expenditure records. The tagging system shall support classification across at least the following dimensions:

- **Purpose:** mitigation, adaptation, or cross-cutting (enabling both)
- **Relevance weight:** principal objective (the activity would not be undertaken without the climate objective) or significant objective (climate is a co-benefit of a broader activity), consistent with Rio Markers methodology
- **NDC alignment:** which specific NDC action, sectoral strategy, or national climate plan commitment the expenditure supports
- **Funding source:** domestic budget, international grant, concessional loan, or co-financing arrangement
    - Policy-based lending instrument granted by MDBs that are linked to specific country reforms should also be tagged and counted toward total climate finance investment

The tagging methodology shall be configurable to accommodate a country's own national climate taxonomy where one exists, with a defined mapping between national categories and international standards (Rio Markers, IMF C-PIMA) to enable cross-country comparability.

2. Climate expenditure review

The platform shall provide government users with aggregate and disaggregated views of climate-tagged expenditure across the national budget, supporting:

- **Year-on-year trend analysis** of climate budget share by sector, ministry, funding source, and mitigation/adaptation split
- **Budget vs. actual execution analysis:** planned climate allocations versus executed climate expenditure, with absorption rate tracking by sector and project
- **Cross-ministry visibility:** a consolidated view of climate spending across all line ministries, addressing the siloed nature of climate data described by multiple interview respondents

3. Climate budget tracking against NDC commitments

The platform shall enable users to track whether budget allocations and actual expenditures are keeping pace with the financing requirements implied by the country's NDC commitments. This includes:

- **Mapping of tagged expenditures** to specific NDC actions and sectoral targets
- **Identification of underfunded NDC commitments** — where allocated finance falls short of modeled or agreed financing requirements
- **Time-series view** of financing progress against NDC milestone years

5.2 Full-lifecycle project and portfolio management

Purpose: Provide government users with end-to-end visibility and management capability over the portfolio of climate investment projects, from initiation through implementation to outcome recording, replacing fragmented spreadsheets and siloed ministry-level tools with a unified project management layer.

1. Project registry and pipeline management

The platform shall maintain a live registry of all climate investment projects, covering planned, approved, active, and completed projects across all public funding sources (domestic budget, IFI financing, bilateral grants, and co-financed arrangements). Each project record shall capture at minimum:

- **Project identification:** title, implementing ministry/agency, sector, geographic scope, funding source(s), start and end dates, responsible government official and (if applicable) donor focal point
- **Budget and finance:** total project value, breakdown by funding source, approved budget, disbursements to date, expenditure to date
- **Status and milestones:** current implementation phase, key milestones, scheduled and actual completion dates
- **NDC alignment:** which NDC actions or national climate plan commitments the project contributes to

The registry shall be the authoritative source of record for the government's climate project portfolio and shall be kept current through integration with financial and procurement systems as well as structured data entry workflows for information not available through system integration.

The data entry workflow for project submissions is an area where AI-assisted guidance could add significant value, supporting users who create projects to select correct classifications and interpret field requirements.

2. Project appraisal and climate screening

The platform shall support a structured pre-approval appraisal process for new climate investment projects, including:

- **Climate relevance screening:** a standardized checklist to verify that a proposed project genuinely contributes to mitigation or adaptation objectives, and is not merely labeled as climate-relevant for access to finance. This addresses the greenwashing risk raised in multiple interviews and the concern about "everything being labeled as climate mitigation or adaptation"
- **Climate risk screening:** an assessment of whether the project's design adequately accounts for physical climate risks (e.g., whether a coastal infrastructure project accounts for a rise in sea levels)
- **Alignment check:** verification that the project supports an identified NDC action or national climate plan commitment
- **Cost-benefit analysis:** a cost-effectiveness indicator showing the estimated climate impact per dollar invested, to help prioritize across projects.

3. Implementation Monitoring

The platform shall enable ongoing tracking of project implementation across the portfolio, providing:

- **Milestone tracking:** recording of planned and actual milestone dates, with automated flagging of milestones that are at risk or overdue

- **Disbursement status:** real-time or near-real-time view of disbursements from the central treasury or IFI to the implementing entity, drawn from IFMIS and/or IFI system integration
- **Stalled projects identification:** automated flagging of projects that show signs of implementation failure, based on configurable thresholds — including no disbursement activity over a defined period, no milestone progress recorded within an expected window, or a significant gap between funds disbursed and procurement activity initiated
- **Procurement linkage:** connection between project financial data and procurement contract data (drawn from e-GP integration), so that government users can see whether disbursed funds have resulted in contracted activity on the ground

4. Outcome and impact recording

The platform shall support structured recording of project outcomes and impacts against a predefined indicator framework, including:

- **An indicator library** containing standardized output and outcome indicators aligned with the country's NDC framework and, where applicable, internationally recognized indicator sets
- **Data entry workflows** for project managers and implementing agencies to submit progress reports against agreed indicators
- **Linkage** between financial inputs (disbursements, expenditures) and physical outputs/outcomes, enabling basic cost-effectiveness analysis at the project level
- **Document and evidence attachment capability**, allowing implementing agencies to upload supporting evidence (survey reports, monitoring data, photo records) against reported outcomes

5.3 Reporting and donor coordination

Purpose: Reduce the administrative burden of climate finance reporting by generating structured, consistent reports for multiple audiences from a single underlying data source, and by providing a consolidated view of all donor relationships and obligations.

1. Predefined institutional reports

The platform shall include pre-configured report templates for the most common recurring international and domestic reporting obligations. At minimum, this shall include:

- UNFCCC Biennial Transparency Report (BTR)
- Green Climate Fund reporting
- Adaptation Fund reporting

Each report shall be generated from the platform's live data without requiring manual data entry, and shall be exportable in the required format (typically PDF, Excel, or XML depending on recipient).

2. Custom and donor-specific reports

The platform shall provide a configurable reporting layer that allows users to:

- **Generate ad-hoc reports** filtered by sector, region, funding source, time period, ministry, or NDC action
- **Create donor-specific reports** that extract project and financial data relevant to a specific donor's portfolio and formatted to the donor's preferred template
- **Schedule recurring reports** for automatic generation and optional automated delivery

3. Donor coordination dashboard

The platform shall provide government users with a consolidated view of all active donor relationships and financing arrangements, including:

- **Active donor commitments:** amounts committed, disbursed to date, and remaining, by donor and by project
- **Reporting calendar:** upcoming reporting deadlines across all active donors, with status indicators (on track / overdue / submitted)

5.4 Public transparency portal

Purpose: Make climate finance data accessible to civil society, communities, investors, researchers, and the general public through a separate public-facing interface, building public trust and demonstrating the governance quality that may reduce the cost of capital for the implementing country.

1. Public project registry

The platform shall provide a public-facing, searchable database of climate investment projects. Each public project should include at minimum:

- **Project identification:** title, implementing ministry/agency, sector, geographic scope, funding source(s), start and end dates, responsible government official and (if applicable) donor focal point
- **Budget and finance:** total project value, breakdown by funding source, approved budget, disbursements to date, expenditure to date
- **Status and milestones:** current implementation phase, key milestones, scheduled and actual completion dates
- **NDC alignment:** which NDC actions or national climate plan commitments the project contributes to

The registry should be searchable and filterable by sector, region, funding source, project status, date range, and should be accessible without login or registration.

CoST — the Infrastructure Transparency Initiative has developed a public project registry prototype that demonstrates this type of searchable, public-facing interface at national scale. The Feasibility Study should include a review of the CoST prototype's design and technical approach as a potential foundation for this module, rather than building from scratch.

2. Geospatial visualization

The platform shall provide an interactive map interface displaying climate investment projects at their geographic location, enabling users to:

- **See the spatial distribution** of climate investments across the country, and identify areas of high investment concentration and areas receiving little or no investment
- **Filter the map** by sector, funding source, project status, and time period
- **Click on a project pin** to view the project summary

3. Progress and results summaries

The platform shall provide plain-language summaries of climate investment progress for non-specialist audiences, including:

- **A national-level summary** of total climate investment, broken down by mitigation and adaptation and by major sector
- **Progress toward NDC commitments** expressed in both financial and outcome terms (e.g., "X% of NDC financing target met; Y tonnes CO_2 equivalent avoided to date")
- **Highlight stories** or featured project spotlights, populated by government communications teams

4. Citizen feedback and engagement

The platform shall provide a structured, moderated channel through which citizens and community organizations can submit observations, concerns, or questions about climate projects in their area. This mechanism shall:

- **Allow users to submit structured feedback** against a specific project or geographic area
- **Route submissions** to the relevant implementing ministry or project manager for response, with a defined response timeframe
- **Make the status of submitted feedback visible** to the submitter (received / under review / responded)
- **Aggregate feedback** for review by oversight bodies and for inclusion in government accountability reporting

5.5 Data analytics

Purpose: Transform the raw financial and project data held in the platform into structured insights for government decision-makers, and provide an integrated view that links financial spending to climate commitments and measurable outcomes.

1. Executive dashboards

The platform shall provide pre-configured dashboards for different user roles, including at minimum:

- **Portfolio dashboard:** total climate investment by sector and funding source, budget vs. actual execution, portfolio health indicators (stalled projects, upcoming milestones, disbursement pipeline), and year-on-year trends
- **Sector dashboard (line ministry view):** filtered view for a specific ministry's projects, enabling sectoral program managers to monitor their climate portfolio

Dashboards shall be configurable by administrators to add or remove indicators, and shall include data quality indicators so users understand the freshness and completeness of the underlying data.

2. NDC and carbon alignment view

The platform shall provide a dedicated analytical view that links the financial and project data to the country's NDC commitments and, where available, its national carbon budget.

3. Investment analytics and gap identification

The platform shall support analysis to help government users and potential investors understand the financing landscape, including sectoral financing gaps, donor concentration analysis, absorption rates analysis, and cost-effectiveness comparisons.

4. Data quality monitoring

The platform shall include a data quality monitoring capability that provides administrators and data managers with visibility into the completeness, timeliness, and consistency of the platform's data.

5.6 Open data

Purpose: Make the platform's public dataset available in machine-readable formats to researchers, journalists, investors, and civil society organizations, for reuse in downstream analytical tools, to maximize the impact of the data the government publishes.

1. Open data publication

The platform shall publish a machine-readable, openly licensed dataset of the public project registry and financial flow data, updated on a defined schedule. The open dataset shall:

- Be published in a standardized format (e.g., IATI and/or OC4IDS)
    - For climate-relevant infrastructure projects in particular, the OC4IDS sustainability disclosure framework provides a structured approach to publishing environmental, economic, fiscal and social data alongside project and procurement records, and should be considered during the data model design phase
- Be downloadable in bulk without registration
- Include data field definitions and a methodology note
- Carry an open license to enable reuse

2. API access

The platform shall provide a documented, publicly accessible API that allows third parties to query the public dataset programmatically. The API shall:

- Support standard query parameters (filter by sector, region, funding source, time period, project status)
- Return data in JSON format (at minimum)
- Include rate limiting to prevent abuse
- Be accompanied by public documentation (endpoint descriptions, example queries, data dictionary)

5.7 Interoperability and Integrations

Purpose: Define how the platform connects to the national and international systems that are the primary sources of the data it aggregates and the primary destinations for the data it publishes.

1. IFMIS / treasury system

The platform shall integrate with the national Integrated Financial Management Information System to import:

- **Approved budget allocations** by program and project code
- **Budget revision** and supplementary allocation records
- **Expenditure execution data** (actual spending by program, project, and economic classification)
- **Disbursement records** from treasury to implementing agencies

2. Electronic government procurement (e-GP)

The platform shall integrate with the national e-GP system to import at minimum:

- **Contract award records** (contractor, value, scope, date) for projects tagged as climate-relevant
- **Contract milestone** and completion status

This integration connects financial disbursements to actual procurement activity, enabling the platform to show whether money that has been disbursed has resulted in contracted work on the ground — addressing one of the most commonly cited transparency gaps.

3. GHG inventory and / or national MRV

The platform shall integrate with the national GHG inventory or MRV system to import:

- **Published sector-level GHG emission data**, used as the reference baseline for the NDC alignment view

- **NDC action definitions and targets**, used as the framework against which project outcomes are mapped

4. **International and donor systems**

The platform shall support import of project data and disbursement records from IFI and multilateral fund systems where those systems support machine-readable export (via IATI standard or direct API).

Where machine-readable export is not available, the platform shall provide structured data entry templates and import workflows to allow government focal points to manually upload IFI data in a consistent format.

6. Non-functional requirements

Non-functional requirements define the qualities a system must have — how it must behave — rather than what it must do. For a platform of this kind, which is deployed into the operational environments of national governments, such non-functional requirements are at least as important as the functional ones. They determine whether the platform is usable by the actual people who need to use it, trustworthy enough for governments to stake their accountability obligations on it, and durable enough to remain in operation beyond the initial deployment period.

This section defines seven categories of non-functional requirements.

6.1 Security and access control

1. **Role-based access control**

The platform shall implement a Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) model in which every action — reading, creating, modifying, approving, deleting, or exporting a data record — is governed by the user's assigned role. Roles shall be defined in collaboration with the implementing government, covering at minimum the following tiers:

Table 3. RBAC model

Role	Scope	Examples
Public	Read-only access to published public portal data	Citizens, researchers, civil society organizations
Viewer	Read-only access to full internal government dataset	Development partner focal points, observers
Contributor	Data entry and editing within an assigned entity or project	Line ministry project managers, subnational focal points
Reviewer	Approval authority over data submitted by Contributors	Senior ministry officials, budget officers
Administrator	Platform configuration, user management, publication decisions	Designated system administrators
Auditor	Read-only access to audit logs and full data history	Internal audit bodies, external auditors

No role shall have the ability to modify or delete audit log records. Administrator access shall not extend to the audit trail. User roles shall be assigned and revoked by the Administrator role only, and all role assignments shall themselves be audit-logged.

2. Authentication

All authenticated (non-public) access to the platform shall require multi-factor authentication (MFA).

Where a national government identity or single sign-on (SSO) system exists and meets the platform's security requirements, the platform shall integrate with it as the primary authentication mechanism. Where no national SSO system exists, the platform shall implement its own MFA-capable authentication layer as a temporary measure, with a migration path to government SSO when available.

6.2 Scalability and performance

1. Modular and scalable architecture

The platform's underlying architecture shall be modular, allowing individual components to be scaled, updated, or replaced independently without requiring a full system rebuild. This is both a performance requirement (components under high load can be scaled without affecting others) and a maintainability requirement (individual modules can be upgraded as technology evolves).

The architecture shall support both vertical scaling (increasing the capacity of individual servers) and horizontal scaling (adding additional instances).

6.3 Availability and Resilience

1. Uptime

The platform shall target a minimum of 99.5% availability on a monthly basis, equivalent to no more than approximately 3.6 hours of unplanned downtime per month. Planned maintenance windows shall be scheduled outside government working hours and communicated to users at least 5 business days in advance.

2. Backup and data recovery

The platform shall maintain automated daily backups of all data, stored in a geographically or physically separate location from the primary system.

3. Disaster recovery

The platform deployment shall include a documented disaster recovery plan, reviewed and approved by the government's designated IT authority, before go-live. The plan shall identify the recovery procedures, responsible parties, communication protocols, and test schedule. It shall be tested at least annually.

6.4 Auditability and traceability

1. Audit log

The platform shall maintain a complete, immutable audit log of all data operations. Every creation, modification, deletion, approval, or publication action shall be recorded.

The audit log shall be technically immutable: no user role, including Administrator, shall have the ability to alter, delete, or suppress audit log entries. The log shall be stored in a separate data partition from operational data and shall be backed up independently.

2. Audit log access and export

Audit log data shall be accessible to users with the Auditor role through a dedicated interface that supports filtering by user, date range, record type, and action type. The log shall be exportable in CSV and PDF formats at minimum, for use in external audit processes. The Auditor role shall be assignable to external audit bodies by the Administrator without granting those bodies access to the operational dataset.

3. Retention

Audit log records shall be retained for a minimum of seven years from the date of the recorded action, consistent with standard government financial record-keeping requirements. After seven years, records may be archived rather than deleted, subject to the government's own records management policy.

4. Data lineage

Where data enters the platform through an automated system integration (IFMIS, e-GP, IFI portal), the platform shall record the source system, the date and time of the import, the version of the data, and any transformations applied during import. This data lineage record enables users to trace any figure in the platform back to its originating source system entry, a requirement for third-party data verification.

6.5 Usability and accessibility

1. Accessibility standard

The platform shall comply with W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 at Level AA. This is the internationally recognized standard for public sector digital services and covers visual, auditory, motor, and cognitive accessibility requirements. Level AA compliance shall apply to both the public portal and the authenticated government interface. Compliance shall be verified by an independent accessibility audit before the public portal goes live.

2. Mobile responsiveness and low-bandwidth operation

The public portal interface shall be fully functional on mobile devices. Page weights shall be minimized; pages shall load progressively, with critical content rendered before non-essential elements.

3. Language and localization

The platform shall be designed for localization from the outset. The core user interface shall support full translation into the implementing country's official language(s), and the translation infrastructure shall be built into the platform architecture rather than retrofitted.

Beyond language, the platform shall accommodate local conventions for date formats, number formats, and currency display. The platform shall support multi-currency data entry and display, with exchange rate management functionality to enable consistent reporting in a reference currency.

4. Usability design requirements

The platform shall be designed using a human-centered design process. User research and usability testing with representative government users shall be conducted before the design is finalized, and the results shall demonstrably influence the interface design. The platform shall not go live without usability testing confirming that representative users from each primary role group can complete their core tasks without external assistance.

Complexity shall be progressive: the default interface for each role shall show only the functions relevant to that role's day-to-day tasks. Advanced configuration and administrative functions shall be accessible but not presented as part of the primary interface.

5. Training and in-platform support

The platform shall include contextual in-platform guidance — tooltips, field-level help text, and embedded guidance for complex workflows — sufficient for a trained user to complete standard tasks without referring to external documentation. Formal training materials (written guides and video walkthroughs) shall be produced in the local language(s) as part of the deployment package.

6.6 Data governance and sovereignty

1. Data ownership

All data entered into or generated by the platform shall be owned by the implementing government. The implementing partner, the platform vendor, and any contracted technical support provider have no right to use, sell, share, or otherwise process government data for any purpose other than the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the platform under the terms of the implementation agreement.

This ownership principle shall be formalized contractually before deployment begins.

2. Open licensing of public data

Data published through the public portal shall be licensed under an open licence — at minimum Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) — to permit reuse by researchers, civil society organizations, journalists, and the general public. The licence terms and any restrictions shall be clearly displayed on the public portal.

3. Privacy and personal data

The platform is designed primarily to handle institutional and financial data rather than personal data. However, user account data (government officials' names, email addresses,

and activity logs) constitutes personal data and shall be handled in compliance with applicable national data protection legislation and, where national legislation does not provide adequate protection, with GDPR-equivalent principles. Personally identifiable information shall not be included in exported data sets or published on the public portal.

Prior to the launch of the public portal and before any new category of data is added to the public dataset, a privacy assessment shall be conducted to verify that the disclosed information does not inadvertently expose personally identifiable information — including through a combination of fields that are individually innocuous but identifiable in aggregate.

4. **Open-source licensing**

The platform codebase could be published under an approved open-source licence (such as MIT, Apache 2.0, or a similar permissive licence) or placed in source code escrow accessible to the government.

6.7 Vendor and technology independence

The platform shall not create dependency on proprietary tools, data formats, or services that are controlled by a single commercial vendor. All integrations shall use documented, standard APIs and open data formats.

Where commercial components are used (for example, cloud infrastructure or mapping services), they shall be replaceable with equivalent alternatives without requiring changes to the core platform. The deployment shall document all third-party dependencies with clear information about their licensing, support terms, and replacement options.

1. **Technical documentation**

Complete technical documentation, including system architecture, data model, API specifications, integration configuration, and deployment procedures, shall be a contractual deliverable, handed over to the government at go-live and updated whenever material changes are made.

This documentation shall be written at a level that allows a competent local technical team to operate, maintain, and extend the platform without the original development team's involvement.

2. Government technical capacity

A designated government technical team shall be identified and fully trained before the platform goes live. "Fully trained" means the team can independently perform the following without external assistance: routine system administration, user account management, standard troubleshooting, data backup and restoration, and basic integration monitoring.

The implementing partner's support obligation shall shift progressively from primary support to advisory support over a defined period (typically 12–24 months from go-live), with the government team taking primary operational responsibility.

3. Institutional mandate

The data flows that feed the platform shall be codified in institutional mandate — whether through administrative instruction, inter-agency memoranda of understanding, or, where feasible, legislation — before or shortly after deployment.

A platform whose data inputs depend on the informal goodwill of officials in other ministries will not survive personnel changes or shifts in political priority. The Feasibility Study shall identify which data flows require formal institutional backing and map the path to securing it.

4. Modularity and incremental improvement

The platform shall be modular enough to allow individual components to be updated, extended, or replaced independently. This is both a technical architecture requirement (see Scalability and Performance) and a sustainability requirement: a platform that must be entirely rebuilt to incorporate improvements will not be maintained.

The deployment roadmap shall define an explicit schedule for the first post-go-live review and upgrade cycle, and the government shall have a defined process for requesting and approving platform changes.

7. Next steps: feasibility study and readiness assessment

The requirements set out in this document are deliberately stated at the business level rather than as a technical specification. This is intentional. A high-functioning deployment in a country with a mature IFMIS and an established green budget tagging program looks materially different from a first deployment in a country where those foundations are still being built. The platform's modular architecture means every country will take a different path through the same requirement set.

This means that the immediate next step is not implementation, but a structured Feasibility Study and Readiness Assessment — a process that translates the business requirements in this document into a country-specific technical specification, deployment roadmap, and institutional plan.

7.1 Country selection criteria

Where there is demand for taking this concept for a digital platform forward, the obvious next step would be to support a feasibility study in one or more pilot countries. We suggest a set of selection criteria for this below. No country will meet all of them perfectly. The purpose is to identify countries where the conditions for a successful initial deployment are strong enough to generate a replicable model, not to wait for a perfect environment that may never exist.

- **Institutional setup and political buy-in.** Evidence of an active mandate for climate finance transparency from, at minimum, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Environment, with named senior officials willing to engage as champions. Joint ownership across both ministries is particularly important: a platform championed by Environment alone will struggle to access budget data; a platform championed by Finance alone will lack the climate policy framework it needs to function. A cross-ministerial climate finance coordination body or unit — where one exists — is a strong positive signal, and membership of global initiatives such as the Belém country platforms for climate investment are a good indicator of political commitment.
- **Technological readiness.** A functional IFMIS that records budget allocations and expenditure execution at a level of granularity compatible with project-level tracking. An e-GP system with accessible contract award data. Where national public

investment management or infrastructure planning systems exist, their data accessibility should also be assessed, as they may hold project pipeline data relevant to the platform's registry function. The ability to provide data access via API, or at minimum via structured batch export, is a practical prerequisite for the automatic data feeds the platform depends on.

- **Methodological alignment.** Availability of an existing national climate budget tagging methodology, or a demonstrated government commitment to develop one in parallel with platform deployment. The platform implements a tagging methodology — it does not define one. A country with no prior tagging practice can still be a viable deployment candidate, but the methodology development work must be scoped as a parallel workstream, not deferred to after go-live.
- **Local implementation capacity.** The presence of one or more capable local partners — technical firms, civil society organizations, or academic institutions — who can lead or co-lead system development, rollout, administration, ongoing maintenance, technical support, and capacity building.
- **Civil society demand.** Evidence of active civil society organizations, parliamentary committees, or oversight institutions that would use and validate the public transparency layer. The "watching effect" that makes the platform valuable internally depends in part on there being credible external actors who might look. A country with an active open data or fiscal transparency ecosystem is a stronger candidate than one where no such constituency currently exists.
- **Active international finance portfolio.** A country receiving significant international climate finance — from the GCF, MDBs, bilateral donors, or dedicated climate funds — has a stronger immediate use case for the platform's donor coordination and reporting modules.
- **Prior digital reform track record.** A government that has previously implemented significant digital PFM reforms — IFMIS upgrades, e-GP deployment, open budget portals — has demonstrated the institutional capacity that platform deployment requires. A first-ever digital government initiative is a higher-risk environment.

7.2 Objectives of the feasibility study and readiness assessment

A Feasibility Study and Readiness Assessment would be a structured diagnostic and design process, not a desk review. It requires direct engagement with the government teams, technology systems, and institutional arrangements that will define how the platform functions in practice. The Feasibility Study and Readiness Assessment shall achieve the following objectives:

- **Technical landscape audit.** Map the actual data workflows between the national systems the platform will integrate with — Budget/Treasury, IFMIS, Planning, Procurement (e-GP), GHG/MRV, and infrastructure and public works planning systems where relevant — and the proposed platform. Verify technical compatibility, identify integration gaps, and document the mechanism (API, batch file, manual export) and feasibility for each integration.

- **Stakeholder validation and implementer identification.** Conduct deep-dive workshops with primary stakeholders to validate the proposed use cases and functional requirements within the local context. Confirm which use cases represent the highest-priority entry point for this country and adjust the deployment scope accordingly. Identify specific government units and local co-implementers who will be responsible for the system development, rollout, administration, maintenance, technical support and capacity building.

- **Tagging methodology and process design.** Confirm or define the national climate budget tagging methodology the platform will implement. If an existing methodology is in use, assess its compatibility with international standards (Rio Markers, IMF C-PIMA) and its current level of institutional adoption. If no methodology exists, define the process for developing one as a parallel workstream, including the responsible parties, timeline, and validation process.

- **Data maturity and quality assessment.** Evaluate the quality of the current climate finance datasets that will feed the platform — completeness, consistency, update frequency, and the level of manual effort currently required to produce climate finance reports. Identify the data gaps that need to be addressed before the platform can be effectively deployed, and define a data improvement plan.

- **Regulatory and governance mapping.** Identify legal and administrative barriers to the data sharing the platform requires — data privacy laws, inter-agency confidentiality obligations, MoU requirements, and procurement data disclosure

constraints. Define the institutional mandate arrangements (administrative instructions, inter-agency MoUs, or legislative backing) required to formalize the platform's data flows. Map the path to securing those arrangements.

- **Risk and barrier assessment.** Identify and rate potential project risks, including: political turnover and the associated risk of losing ministry champions; technical debt in legacy systems that may complicate integration; resource constraints within implementing agencies; civil society capacity to engage the public transparency layer; and data sovereignty or security concerns. For each identified risk, define the mitigation approach.
- **Deployment sequencing and phasing.** Based on the findings across the other objectives, define a recommended deployment sequence: which modules to build first, what constitutes the minimum viable deployment that begins delivering value, and what the medium-term roadmap looks like.

8. Conclusion

The challenge of mobilizing and deploying an incredible sum of finance quickly to adapt communities, infrastructure, lifestyles and our economy to the changing nature of our climate is a large and complex undertaking involving many variables and stakeholders. We know OCP's research, experience and proposed concept for a new digital platform exist within this broader ecosystem and must complement the expertise and efforts of many others.

We believe more can be done to apply existing approaches and technologies to better understand the full scope of climate investment needs, and better deploy resources efficiently to meet those needs.

This research reflects our acute interest in moving the field forward. We welcome feedback and further ideas on how to collectively build an ever clearer picture of how climate finance is currently being mobilized, coordinated, invested, and evaluated. The scale of finance required and the level of innovation and complexity needed to transition our economic model for sustainability is unprecedented: testing, learning, iteration and adapting across diverse country contexts will be essential.

Thank you and good luck to all the builders out there working to take this vital work forward. Let OCP know how we can help!

Annex A: Bibliography

A.1 Reports

The following reports were reviewed during the research phase and influenced the proposed design of the platform.

Climate Finance Transparency Guide, *ICAT (Initiative for Climate Action Transparency), 2024*
A practical guide to improving the transparency of climate finance tracking at the national level. Covers methodological frameworks for classifying and measuring climate finance flows, data collection approaches, and institutional arrangements for sustainable tracking systems.

A Road Map for Establishing Information Systems for Climate Action and Support, *ICAT (Initiative for Climate Action Transparency), 2019*
An earlier ICAT publication that provides a structured approach to designing national information systems for climate action tracking. Covers system architecture, institutional arrangements, data governance, and integration with national PFM and MRV systems.

DFI Transparency Index 2025, *Publish What You Fund, 2025*
An annual ranking of the world's leading development finance institutions (DFIs) by the quality and accessibility of their project and financial data. Provides context for the landscape of international climate finance data disclosure and highlights which DFIs publish IATI-compliant data.

Transparency, Participation, and Accountability in Financing Climate Action, *World Resources Institute (WRI), 2026*
A WRI report examining the state of transparency, civic participation, and accountability mechanisms across climate finance flows. Covers the gap between international commitments and local accountability infrastructure, and the role of civil society organizations in climate finance oversight.

Readiness for Climate Finance: A Framework for Understanding What It Means to Be Ready to Use Climate Finance, *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2015*
A UNDP framework paper defining the institutional, technical, and policy conditions that constitute "climate finance readiness" at the national level.

A.2 Methodologies and standards

The following methodologies and technical standards are referenced in the body of this document and underpin the platform's design requirements.

Rio Markers (OECD DAC)
The OECD Development Assistance Committee's methodology for marking official development assistance according to its contribution to climate change mitigation and adaptation objectives. Rio Markers apply a two-level relevance classification — principal objective (the activity would not be undertaken without the climate objective) and significant objective (climate is a co-benefit) — across mitigation and adaptation dimensions.

IMF Climate Public Investment Management Assessment (C-PIMA)
The International Monetary Fund's framework for assessing whether a government's public investment management institutions and processes adequately account for climate change. Covers climate-responsive budget tagging, climate risk screening of public investments, and the integration of climate considerations into national planning and PFM systems.

IATI Standard (International Aid Transparency Initiative)
An open data standard for publishing detailed information about development and humanitarian activities, including financial flows, project descriptions, results, and organizational relationships. The IATI Registry aggregates IATI-compliant data from donors and implementing organizations globally.

Open Contracting for Infrastructure Data Standard
A standard developed by the Open Contracting Partnership and CoST — the Infrastructure Transparency Initiative for publishing information about infrastructure projects across the full project cycle, from preparation through to procurement, implementation and completion. The OC4IDS sustainability disclosure framework provides a structured approach to publishing environmental and social sustainability data alongside project and procurement records.

Open Contracting Data Standard
The Open Contracting Partnership's standard for publishing procurement data, covering the full contracting cycle from planning and tender through award and implementation.

UNFCCC Enhanced Transparency Framework and Biennial Transparency Report
The UNFCCC Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF), established under the Paris Agreement, defines the reporting obligations for all Parties on climate action and support. The Biennial Transparency Report is the primary reporting instrument under the ETF, replacing the former Biennial Update Reports and Biennial Reports.

Green Climate Fund Results Management Framework
The Green Climate Fund's results framework, which defines the output, outcome, and impact indicators against which GCF-funded projects are measured.

Annex B: Existing digital platforms

The following platforms and initiatives were reviewed during the research phase as part of the landscape analysis of existing digital tools for climate finance tracking, public investment transparency, and development finance disclosure.

B.1 International transparency portals

IATI Datastore
The IATI Datastore is the central repository for all data published in compliance with the International Aid Transparency Initiative Standard. It aggregates project-level data from donor and implementing organizations, covering activity descriptions, financial flows (commitments, disbursements, expenditures), results, and related documents. The Datastore makes this data publicly accessible and downloadable, and is the primary global open data infrastructure for development and humanitarian finance.

B.2 Donor and fund-specific portals

Green Climate Fund | Approved Projects
The GCF's public project portal provides a searchable database of all GCF-approved funding proposals, including project descriptions, approved amounts, accredited entity, country, and sector. It publishes high-level disbursement figures and annual performance report summaries for active projects.

Adaptation Fund | Projects & Programmes
The Adaptation Fund's project portal covers the Fund's portfolio of adaptation projects in developing countries, providing project descriptions, implementing entities, approved

amounts, and status indicators. Like the GCF portal, it is organised around the Fund's own reporting requirements rather than recipient countries' portfolio management needs.

B.3 National MRV systems

Colombia National MRV

National Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) systems are designed to fulfill the Enhanced Transparency Framework reporting obligations under the Paris Agreement. Colombia's national MRV system is one of the more developed examples in the Latin American context and has been cited by multiple interviewees as a reference point for structured national climate data management.

B.4 Sector-specific country platforms

Just Energy Transition Partnership Indonesia

The Just Energy Transition Partnership (JETP) Indonesia platform is an emerging country-led coordination and transparency mechanism established to support Indonesia’s transition away from coal and toward a low-carbon energy system. Developed in the context of the international JETP agreement announced at the G20 Bali Summit 2022, the platform brings together financing commitments from bilateral and multilateral partners alongside domestic policy planning. It aims to provide structured visibility over pledged, committed, and disbursed finance, as well as associated investment plans under Indonesia’s Comprehensive Investment and Policy Plan (CIPP).

B.5 Spatial investment tools

MapaInversiones

MapaInversiones is a public investment transparency platform developed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and now deployed across 14 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. Originally developed in Colombia to track public investment financed by hydrocarbon royalties, it has evolved into a multi-source integration platform that automatically extracts data from national budget, treasury, and procurement systems and displays it in a geographically searchable public interface.

C. List of interviewees

Ainbinder, Olivia. Lawyer & Program Coordinator, Transparência Internacional - Brasil

Böhmer, Brice. Climate & Environment Lead Transparency International Secretariat

Bulyanyi, Oleg. Senior Programme Officer, Initiative for Climate Action Transparency

Caldwell, Molly. Associate II Climate Finance, World Resources Institute

Faria Lima, Amanda. Public Integrity & Governance Coordinator, Transparência Internacional - Brasil

Jarvis, Michael. Executive Director, Trust, Accountability & Inclusion Collaborative

Krafchik, Warren. Independent Public Finance Consultant.

Manzanares, F. Javier. CEO and Founder of ALLEN MANZA Inc. & former Executive Director of Green Climate Fund

Mazzola, Roxana. Director, Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) Argentina, Program of Studies on Inequalities and Policies, and International Consultant

McNair, David. Executive Director of Global Policy, ONE Campaign

Nino, José. InterAmerican Development Bank, MapaInversiones Technical Team

de Oliveira, Thulio. Public Integrity & Governance Analyst, Transparência Internacional - Brasil

Pérez Jaramillo, Diego Hernán. PEC Consultant, InterAmerican Development Bank, MapaInversiones Technical Team

Petrie, Murray. Independent Public Financial Management Consultant.

Rahim, Aly Zulficar. Program Manager, CIVIC: The Civil Society and Social Innovation Alliance & Global Partnership for Social Accountability / Global Lead for Civic & Citizen Engagement, World Bank

Raubenheimer, Stefan. Senior Associate, Children's Investment Fund Foundation

Saret, Dulce Marie. Sustainability & Climate Diplomacy Officer, Philippines Climate Change Commission

Torres, Philip. Director of the Sovereign Decarbonization and Biodiversity Program and of the Innovative Sustainable Finance Campaign, Emerging Markets Investor Alliance (EMIA)

Westenberg, Erica. Governance Programs Director, Natural Resources Governance Institute

Worker, Jesse. Director Climate Governance & Rights, World Resources Institute


OPEN
CONTRACTING
PARTNERSHIP
www.open-contracting.org