

RESILIENCE
HUB

COP30 RESILIENCE HUB SYNTHESIS REPORT



RESILIENCE HUB

The Resilience Hub is managed by the Global Resilience Partnership and the Atlantic Council's Climate Resilience Centre. The Hub is co-shaped by regional partners who guide decisions and programming to ensure they reflect the priorities and knowledge of communities most susceptible to climate change and address barriers to scaling up action on resilience across the globe.

The Race to Resilience

The Resilience Hub acts as the home to the Race to Resilience campaign, led by the Climate Change High Level Champions to mobilise greater ambition and action from non-party stakeholders to build the resilience of 4 billion people from climate-vulnerable communities by 2030.

Managing Partners

The Managing Partners coordinate with a wide network of external partners who provide strategic oversight of the Hub to ensure it is meeting its overall purpose and objectives in coordination with other processes around COP. The Steering Committee also helps ensure that the Resilience Hub complements and adds to the ambition of the COP Presidencies and the overall aim to elevate action and finance for adaptation and resilience on par with mitigation measures.



Resilience Hub Sponsors

A big thank you to all of our sponsors, without whom the Resilience Hub would not have been possible: Marsh McLennan, PwC, Walton Family Foundation, FCDO (UK Government), Zurich Insurance, and AON.

Resilience Hub Supporters

We like to thank the Government of Peru for their ongoing support on helping the Hub's partners share their action on climate adaptation and resilience.

About this report

Resilience Hub (2025). COP30 Resilience Hub Synthesis Report. Belem, Brazil.
Authors: Namrata Ginoya, Chndy Rogel, Anastasia Brainich

Table of Contents

4

Executive summary

6

Key expectations
for COP31

7

Key announcements
from COP30

8

The official home of the
Race to Resilience

9

The Resilience Hub at
COP30 and the 6 challenges

12

Challenge 1

14

Challenge 2

15

Challenge 3

18

Challenge 4

20

Challenge 5

23

Challenge 6

27

Peru Resilience Hub

29

Reflections and next steps
on the road to COP31

Executive summary

The Resilience Hub is an inclusive physical and virtual platform that convenes non-party stakeholders, local leaders, scientists, private sector actors, youth, Indigenous representatives, and frontline communities to inspire ambitious and practical resilience action. As the home of the Race to Resilience campaign at COP, the Hub represents over 600 members working to strengthen the resilience of 4 billion people by 2030.

This report synthesises the key adaptation and resilience developments at COP30 in Belém, Brazil and summarises the main messages emerging from the Resilience Hub's events. It aims to guide collective action toward COP31 in Türkiye and inform priorities beyond 2026.

To understand the impact of the Resilience Hub, it is critical to reflect back on the larger progress and ecosystem of COP30. Our team has prepared eight insights to help you focus on the key outcomes for adaptation and resilience in Belém, Brazil.

- A mixed outcome on finance: Momentum with major gaps
- Global Goal on Adaptation: Indicators adopted, work ahead
- National Adaptation Plans: Progress acknowledged, support insufficient
- Loss and Damage: Incremental advances without major breakthroughs
- Just Transition and people-centered action
- Nature and land: Momentum outside the negotiating text
- Trade and economic systems: A new opening for dialogue
- Gaps between commitments and action



A mixed outcome on finance: Momentum with major gaps

COP30 unfolded under intense expectations to move from commitments to implementation. Finance dominated the political landscape, with countries reaffirming the Baku-to-Belém Roadmap to scale climate finance to at least USD 1.3 trillion per year for developing countries by 2035. They also agreed to triple adaptation finance by 2035, signaling long-term political intent. However, developing countries expressed frustration that the target lacked a 2030 baseline and did not match the accelerating adaptation finance gap. Nonetheless, COP30 did establish a follow-up Climate Finance Delivery (“Global Mutirão”) work programme through 2027 to maintain momentum on the Baku-to-Belém Roadmap.

Global Goal on Adaptation: Indicators adopted, work ahead

Parties adopted 59 indicators for the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA), covering finance, capacity building, technology transfer, sectoral resilience, gender-responsive planning, and ecosystem stability. These indicators represent the first globally agreed framework for tracking adaptation progress, but do not yet constitute an operational global monitoring system. In addition, last-minute revisions created inconsistencies, prompting a new two-year process (Belém-Addis) to refine guidance before 2027. The indicators are voluntary and non-prescriptive - and while they represent the first global attempt to track adaptation progress in a structured way, countries will need significant technical and financial support to integrate them into their national monitoring systems.

National Adaptation Plans: Progress acknowledged, support insufficient

After two years of negotiation, COP30 adopted the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) assessment, recognising improvements in planning and implementation across developing countries. The assessment highlights persistent barriers: inadequate finance, limited climate information, and insufficient integration of Indigenous and Traditional Knowledge. It provides no new support mechanisms, leaving implementation challenges largely unresolved.

Loss and Damage: Incremental advances without major breakthroughs

Loss and Damage received less attention than at previous COPs, but negotiators agreed to strengthen guidance for the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FRLD) and initiated a State of Loss and Damage Report. Countries also endorsed efforts to integrate Loss and Damage considerations into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). However, COP30 did not deliver significant new funding pledges, reinforcing persistent concerns about the gap between institutional progress and the scale of resources required. Expectations for more ambitious support remained unmet, and political debates continued to stall comprehensive, system-level action.



Just Transition and people-centered action

COP30 established a new Just Transition Mechanism aimed at strengthening cooperation, technical assistance, and knowledge-sharing across sectors. The mechanism emphasises social protection, worker rights, and inclusion of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. This represents the most explicit recognition to date of the social dimensions of the climate transition.

Nature and land: Momentum outside the negotiating text

Although the final COP decision did not include a formal roadmap to end deforestation, COP30 was marked by a series of high-profile initiatives and announcements beyond the formal negotiating space. These included the launch of the Tropical Forests Forever Facility that raised USD 6.6 billion for forest conservation, alongside renewed commitments to secure 160 million hectares of land tenure for Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and expanded investments in forest restoration, regenerative agriculture, and sustainable bioeconomy systems. It is worth noting that some of these initiatives (including the TFFF) also attracted significant scrutiny and criticism from civil society and UNFCCC constituencies, highlighting ongoing concerns around governance, equity, and accountability. Together, these developments point to growing political and financial activity on nature and land, even as multilateral consensus and shared legitimacy remain fragile.

Trade and economic systems: A new opening for dialogue

For the first time, COP outcomes referenced climate-related trade measures. A structured dialogue process will explore how global trade policies can enable or constrain climate action, reflecting growing recognition that economic rules shape resilience outcomes.

Gaps between commitments and action

Despite visible progress, many areas remain misaligned with climate realities. Adaptation indicators remain technically incomplete and voluntary in nature; finance timelines focus on 2035 and lag behind urgent near-term needs; binding roadmaps on fossil fuels and deforestation are absent and leave a critical implementation gap. Many countries stressed that without strengthened finance and clearer long-term direction, resilience ambitions will continue to outpace delivery.



Key expectations for COP31

and strengthening Global Adaptation Action

COP30 showed that while multilateral progress is possible, it will increasingly rely on coordinated action among governments, non-state actors, and frontline communities. Delivering resilience at scale will require both political agreements and the collaborative engines that turn them into real-world outcomes.

Looking ahead to Türkiye, countries must:

- Accelerate delivery of adaptation finance, ensuring the path to tripling by 2035 is credible, front-loaded, and accessible.
- Operationalise the GGA, refining indicators, supporting national MEL systems, and ensuring alignment with NAPs and NDCs.
- Advance the fossil fuel and deforestation roadmaps initiated by the Brazilian Presidency and integrate them into broader implementation pathways.
- Strengthen the Loss and Damage architecture, including direct access for affected communities and alignment with NAPs.
- Improve coherence across finance, trade, and sectoral policies so that climate-resilient development becomes a whole-of-economy priority.
- Support just transition planning, embedding equity, gender responsiveness, and Indigenous rights in national strategies.
- Mobilise non-party stakeholders, leveraging the Climate Action Agenda as a practical engine for implementation across cities, companies, and communities.

Key announcements made at COP30 on adaptation and resilience



Tripling of adaptation finance by 2035

COP30 adopted a political commitment to triple global adaptation finance by 2035, embedded in the “Global Mutirão” decision. Though lacking a baseline and more delayed than many developing countries requested, this is now the strongest global reference point for scaling resilience finance.

Adoption of 59 Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) indicators

After two years of negotiations, Parties adopted 59 indicators to track global progress on adaptation, covering water, health, agriculture, ecosystems, infrastructure, planning, and means of implementation. The indicators are voluntary and will undergo refinement through the Belém–Addis Vision process until 2027.

Launch of the Belém–Addis vision for adaptation metrics

A new two-year technical programme was established to refine and operationalise the GGA indicators. This process is expected to shape how countries integrate adaptation monitoring into their NDCs and Biennial Transparency Reports ahead of the second Global Stocktake.

Strengthening of National Adaptation Plan (NAP) processes

COP30 adopted the long-pending NAP assessment decision, which recognises progress, identifies persistent barriers (such as lack of climate information and finance), and calls for better integration of Indigenous knowledge, gender-responsive approaches, and ecosystem-based adaptation in NAPs.

Loss and Damage: Launch of the State of Loss and Damage Report

COP30 agreed to begin producing a State of Loss and Damage Report to strengthen accountability and evidence for countries facing irreversible climate impacts. The Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FRLD) opened its call for proposals under the Barbados Implementation Modalities, and new guidance was adopted to better align the Fund with the new climate finance goal.

Creation of the Belém Action Mechanism for a Global Just Transition

Parties agreed to establish a Global Just Transition Mechanism, the strongest multilateral step to date on ensuring people-centred transitions. It mandates international cooperation, technical assistance, capacity building, and human-rights safeguards, including explicit references to Indigenous Peoples and workers.

New work programme on Climate Finance Delivery (2026–2028)

A two-year work programme was created to follow up on delivering the New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG) from COP29, including tracking progress toward mobilising USD 1.3 trillion annually by 2035. The work programme will examine public finance responsibilities under Article 9.1 and scaling private-sector contributions.

Integration of Gender and Social Equity through the New Gender Action Plan

COP30 adopted an ambitious Gender Action Plan, strengthening requirements for gender-responsive climate policy, disaggregated data, and women’s leadership in resilience, adaptation planning, and just transition processes.

Launch of the Belém declaration on hunger, poverty, and human-centred climate action

Signed by more than 40 countries, the declaration focuses on linking adaptation to food security, social protection systems, and rural livelihoods, committing to expand climate-adaptive safety nets and support for smallholder farmers.

Ocean and water adaptation commitments

Six additional countries joined the Blue NDC Challenge, expanding global efforts to integrate oceans into climate adaptation plans. Brazil also joined the Ocean Panel, committing to sustainably manage its entire marine territory by 2030.

Launch of the Global Implementation Accelerator & Belém Mission to 1.5

While not adaptation-specific, both initiatives explicitly integrate NDC and NAP implementation and provide new platforms for tracking delivery of adaptation commitments across sectors.



The Resilience Hub: The official home of the Race to Resilience

The Resilience Hub has served as the official home of the Race to Resilience (RtR) campaign for the past five years, anchoring adaptation and resilience at the heart of the global climate agenda. Through this role, it has demonstrated that resilience-building is never a one size fits all effort but one that demands a whole-of-society approach rooted in local priorities, cultural knowledge, and community leadership. The Hub continues to show that effective adaptation depends on inclusive governance systems that empower diverse actors to drive and sustain locally led solutions.

At COP30, RtR presented its first cumulative implementation results in the *“Race to Resilience: Putting People First in the Global Climate Action Agenda.”* Nearly half a billion people were made more resilient, 18.4 million hectares of nature were protected, and USD 4.2 billion in adaptation finance deployed, demonstrating the delivery of inclusive, people centered climate action and measurable impact at scale.

Launched on the road to COP26 to place the most vulnerable people at the heart of climate action, RtR has helped shift resilience from the margins to the mainstream. At COP30, resilience stood as a key pillar of the COP Presidency, underscoring that climate action begins and ends with people.

Under the COP30 Action Agenda, RtR delivered tangible outcomes as part of Activation Group 17, focused on reducing climate impacts on hunger and poverty. Through innovation, finance, and collaboration across sectors, from nature based and insurance solutions to resilient housing, farmers' access to finance, and the blue economy, RtR partners are scaling solutions that deliver co benefits for people, nature, and the economy.

The campaign showed how partners are accelerating implementation across all axes and objectives of the Action Agenda, marking five years and completing a full reporting cycle, delivering concrete impact results.



The Resilience Hub at COP30

Six major climate challenges that resilience can help solve

COP 30 marks the fifth year of the Resilience Hub operations, building on four successful Hubs since its launch at COP26 in Glasgow. This marks a great moment to reflect on five years of knowledge gained and re-orient the Resilience Hub's programme to one that seeks to address key challenges through the lens of Resilience Science Must-Knows: to increase levels of awareness, investment and action on climate resilience.

This year also served as an opportune moment to advance the Sharm El-Sheikh Adaptation Agenda (SAA) launched at COP27 and provide support to Global Goal on Adaptation and the National Adaptation Plans; and the non-state actor leadership as part of the Race to Resilience Campaign.

The Resilience Hub took on these ambitions and translated them into concrete action with **four milestone events** throughout the year.



The science-backed approach to COP30

The six Resilience Challenges that informed the Hub's programming were grounded in the Resilience Science Must-Knows. There are nine Must-Knows, which were outlined in a new report that distills decades of scientific evidence on how systems respond to shocks, stressors, and long-term change. The report emphasises how resilience is shaped by dynamic interactions across social, ecological, and economic systems, and that effective action requires tackling root causes, power imbalances, structural incentives, uncertainty, and multi-scale complexity. These six programmatic challenges translate those nine scientific insights into an actionable agenda for governments, businesses, communities, and financial institutions to drive coherent, equitable, and future-ready resilience efforts.

The six resilience challenges

- 1 Resilience pays off.** Act early, build opportunity.
- 2 Facing the trade-offs** towards thoughtfully designed transformations.
- 3 Mind the misalignment gap.** Realigning actions across timescales, mandates, and funding cycles.
- 4 Risk is not what it seems.** Redefining and repricing risk to unlock better responses.
- 5 More than inclusion.** Designing systems for agency and equity.
- 6 Solutions in action.** Bridging climate, nature, and equity goals.



The COP30 Resilience Hub *AT A GLANCE*



6,700

virtual visitors



64

hours of discussion



10,000+

total visitors



370

speakers



10

days of programming



77

organisations involved



61

sessions *available online*

Challenge 1: Resilience pays off.

Act early. Build opportunity.

Resilience remains chronically underfunded. Political cycles reward short-term outputs over long-term preparedness. Economic systems undervalue avoided losses. Financial institutions lack clear metrics to price resilience. As a result, many countries and businesses remain locked into reactive spending, high-risk exposure, and rising costs. Global insured losses from natural catastrophes reached **USD 137 billion** in 2024, showing the enormous economic burden of reactive rather than anticipatory action. This challenge explores how to shift the global financial and governance architecture so that resilience is recognised as a foundation for security, competitiveness, and prosperity. It draws from emerging innovations in fiscal planning, public-private finance, nature-positive investment, inclusive governance, and early action that demonstrate how acting early is both cost-effective and transformational.

Transforming economic systems to reward early action begins with shifting how ministries of finance, planning agencies, and infrastructure authorities evaluate risk and value. Countries including Bangladesh and Peru are demonstrating that embedding climate variables into national development plans, budget frameworks, and sectoral strategies improves long-term decisions. Bangladesh's whole-of-government Climate Development Platform ensures that all climate-related projects pass through a coordinated review to avoid fragmented investment and to prioritise risk reduction and locally relevant solutions.

Complementary approaches such as unconditional cash transfers for conservation, led by Cool Earth and Equal Rights, demonstrate that empowering communities with flexible finance strengthens forest protection, reduces extractive pressures, and recognises the unpaid labour of Indigenous stewards who already safeguard the planet's most biodiverse ecosystems.

Private and public finance must also move in tandem to shift investment norms. Financial regulators and development finance institutions (DFIs) are beginning to treat climate risk as a core financial issue. Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) notes that pricing climate risk into credit lines creates incentives for developers and investors to adopt resilience measures because riskier projects become more expensive and resilient projects more attractive.

New facilities are bundling small-scale adaptation projects to connect ministries of finance with investable pipelines and to mobilise bonds and blended capital for resilience. The International Finance Cooperation (IFC) demonstrates how adaptation of key performance indicator (KPI)-linked loans, resilience bonds, and aggregated small and medium enterprise (SME) finance can expand investment at scale when paired with strong standards and community-owned data systems.

Community-driven and Indigenous-led models further reinforce how early action strengthens social and ecological resilience. Indigenous leaders emphasise that meaningful participation, secure land and resource rights, and respect for traditional knowledge are central to protecting ecosystems and reducing long-term risks. They point out that less than five percent of climate finance reaches Indigenous peoples, despite their role in conserving a significant share of the world's biodiversity. Barriers such as complex application processes, epistemic biases, and inadequate governance recognition limit access to funding. Indigenous experts argue that resilience requires shifting power, respecting community-defined priorities, and financing territories as living systems rather than profit zones.



“

Investment in building climate resilience can deliver benefits equivalent to 150 million jobs by 2050... We will not create those jobs without having policies that support private capital moving into adaptation and the physical movement and adaptation of communities and workers.

Veronica Nyhan Jones
Global Head, IFC



The private sector plays a key role in climate adaptation and resilience, but progress is slowed by fragmented data, limited digital and physical infrastructure, uneven adoption of standards, and gaps in workforce capacity.

To leverage private sector-led resilience at scale, stakeholders need to improve climate-risk data integration, invest in essential digital and community infrastructure, enable open and interoperable data systems, expand catalytic and blended finance, and boost adoption of resilience standards along with broader workforce skills.

Corporate actors also have a critical role in demonstrating that resilience pays off. Companies across food, infrastructure, insurance, technology, and finance sectors are investing in resilience as a strategic asset. At the climate resilience investor and business forums, firms showcased gains from digital risk mapping, resilient housing loans, climate-smart agriculture sourcing, and AI-enabled early warning systems. For example, digital twin technologies used by Bentley Systems help governments and utilities map vulnerabilities across interconnected infrastructure systems. The Building Resilience Index and AI-enabled flood forecasting tools provide clearer signals for investors and planners to incorporate resilience into supply chain management, construction, and land use decisions. Agribusinesses such as Danone invest in smallholder training, diversified cropping, and early warning systems to reduce supply chain disruption while enhancing local livelihoods. Insurance providers such as Blue Marble and Pula demonstrate how parametric products, microinsurance, and farmer-level data platforms can reduce risks for underserved communities but require investment in national digital public infrastructure to scale effectively.

Across all examples, the message is consistent. ***Early action on resilience saves money, reduces losses, improves development outcomes, and creates long-term economic and ecological opportunity.*** The real challenge is realigning systems of governance, finance, and investment so resilience is built upfront rather than after disasters strike.

Learn more

[Bangladesh's Climate Development Platform](#) has become a model for coordinated resilience planning by ensuring all climate-related projects involve multi-ministry review. It reduces delays, fragmentation, and inefficiency while expanding local capacity for early action.

Launches and announcements

[The Mobilising Business for Resilience platform](#) by the Global Resilience Partnership (GRP) aims to catalyse three billion dollars in resilience investment by 2030 by convening leaders in finance, insurance, technology, and supply chains to deploy solutions at scale. It advances private sector engagement with communities and local systems at its core.

Challenge 2: Facing the trade-offs.

Towards thoughtfully designed transformations.

Transforming systems is essential for building resilient, equitable, and climate secure futures, yet transitions inevitably create trade-offs that shape who benefits and who bears the costs. Whether shifting food systems toward regenerative production, redesigning energy governance that is vital for powering health, water, food, and transport systems, but underrepresented in adaptation metrics and political frameworks, reforming land and water management, or transitioning away from fossil fuel dependence, change can generate short-term economic losses, social disruption, or ecological pressures. These tensions are often ignored in policy debates, but they determine whether transitions are politically legitimate, socially just, and resilient over time.

Public institutions increasingly face pressure to identify, disclose, and manage trade-offs in major decisions. The [Ethical Global Stocktake dialogues](#) emphasise that climate policies can reproduce inequalities when frontline workers, Indigenous peoples, and rural communities are excluded from decision-making. Territorial dialogues in Argentina showed that solutions imposed without community input often worsen structural injustices, including for recyclers, fire brigades, or Indigenous communities whose knowledge and labour remain undervalued. Similarly, youth leaders highlight that political cycles and elite-driven policy processes fail to account for generational equity.

They argue that transitions must be rooted in shared governance, long-term thinking, and meaningful participation to avoid reinforcing harmful systems. ***Managing trade-offs requires intentional sequencing. Governments in agriculture, water, and land use sectors are demonstrating that reforms must be phased in ways that minimise harm while protecting the most vulnerable.*** In Peru, water-intensive rice systems are being redesigned through alternate wetting and drying techniques that reduce methane emissions and mitigate water scarcity. These changes were developed through participatory consultation with farmers to avoid unintended impacts on food security and livelihoods. The approach is embedded in larger policy reforms within the Plataforma de Acción Climática (PLACA) regional agricultural platform which prioritises water resilience, adaptation finance, and farmer-led innovation. This demonstrates how adaptation reforms can be sequenced with governance shifts and financial support to safeguard producers during transitions that alter long-standing agricultural practices.

Similar tensions appear in forest and biodiversity transitions. In the Amazon, deep poverty and informality drive deforestation, creating a perverse resilience where harmful land use persists because it is the only viable livelihood pathway. The Mayangon Life Park initiative identifies that deforestation is a symptom of socioeconomic systems that trap communities in low-opportunity environments. The initiative seeks to shift this trajectory by creating diversified, climate-smart livelihoods, formalising local economies, and investing in agroforestry and forest restoration. These interventions reduce long-term climate and ecological risk, yet they require managing short-term disruptions to traditional practices, coordinating multiple stakeholders, and ensuring that communities shape transition pathways from the beginning. The initiative frames this as transforming an undesirable resilient system into one built around prosperity and ecological stability.

Trade-offs also emerge in climate finance and private investment. Adaptation finance often reinforces inequalities when risk pricing, disclosure standards, and investment criteria overlook social and ecological realities. Insurance and reinsurance actors illustrate how traditional risk models can inadvertently penalise vulnerable communities by deeming them uninsurable, thereby entrenching systemic vulnerability. AON and humanitarian partners are piloting solutions that integrate social value into risk modelling, such as insurance backstops for humanitarian funds that allow faster pre-disaster action and prioritise equity in payouts. These pilots show that insurers can address trade-offs by redesigning underwriting frameworks to recognise long-term resilience benefits rather than short-term financial exposure.

Businesses face similar tensions. Sustainability strategies can unintentionally shift risks onto small producers, informal workers, or Indigenous communities if companies fail to examine how supply chain reforms redistribute power and costs. Danone, Pula, and Build Change demonstrate alternative models that emphasise shared decision-making, respect for local agency, and investment in community systems. For example, Build Change works with residents in informal settlements to design housing upgrades that address heat, flood, and structural risks without displacing families or undermining local economic systems. This approach recognises that transitions in urban housing are not simply technical challenges but deeply social processes that require community governance and equitable benefit sharing.

“

Despite rich research, resilience science remains hard to translate into action. Decision-makers urgently need clear, science-based insights that they can grasp and integrate into their processes.



Jesper Hornberg,
CEO, Global Resilience
Partnership

Finally, confronting trade-offs requires inclusive systems of governance that recognise the rights of nature and the rights of communities. Indigenous leaders from the Rights of Nature movement argue that legal frameworks built on extraction and commodification generate perverse resilience by sustaining harmful economic logics even as ecosystems collapse. Recognising rivers, forests, and ecosystems as rights-bearing entities reframes ecological transitions not as optional co-benefits but as essential conditions for justice, dignity, and survival.

These leaders call for transitions that protect both ecological integrity and cultural continuity, noting that ignoring trade-offs produces new vulnerabilities for communities already disproportionately impacted by climate change. Across all cases, the sessions make clear that well-designed transitions demand transparency, accountability, and participatory governance. They require institutions to confront political and economic trade-offs head-on, acknowledge historical inequalities, and co-create safeguards with affected groups. ***Decision-makers should invest in resilience across multiple timescales, supporting immediate coping, long-term adaptation, and transformation, while valuing social and natural systems alongside technical solutions and aligning policy cycles with the longer time horizons required to build resilience.*** Only through such deliberate processes can transformations become both ambitious and legitimate, shifting systems away from harmful resilience patterns and towards futures that are equitable, nature-positive, and built to endure.

Learn more

Territorial dialogues under Argentina 1.5 reveal how frontline workers, Indigenous communities, recyclers, and scientists understand trade-offs in climate governance. These dialogues helped translate ethical tensions into actionable proposals for COP30 and demonstrated how participatory processes can address inequities in policy design.

Launches and announcements

The ***Resilience Science Must Knows*** report outlines nine foundational insights for navigating turbulence and managing systemic risk. It underscores that trade-offs, power dynamics, and transformation capacities must be integrated into policy design and investment decisions to avoid reinforcing harmful systems. It also stresses the importance of distributed agency across scales and actors. It provides a science-based guide for designing transitions that are fair and future ready.

Challenge 3: Mind the misalignment gap.

Realigning actions across timescales, mandates, and funding cycles.

One of the most significant barriers to effective resilience is misalignment. Political cycles operate on short time horizons while climate risks unfold over decades. Infrastructure is expected to last generations yet financial systems reward rapid returns. Institutional mandates are siloed across sectors while real world risks cut across water, food, health, finance, and ecosystems. Funding cycles are tied to annual budgets while communities confront long-term degradation of soils, forests, and coasts.

These temporal, spatial, institutional, and financial mismatches create a misalignment gap that weakens national adaptation plans, disrupts city-level climate strategies, and undermines the long-term stewardship that resilience demands.

While global policy coherence is improving, implementation in countries remains fragmented. The “landing spots” of global frameworks in countries are routed through varied national institutions that often operate in siloes, leading to inefficiencies and duplicated use of resources. Building resilience through a comprehensive risk management approach can help break down these siloes by creating a shared understanding of risk across timescales, and has proven essential in addressing the climate crisis. Early warning systems and early action offer a strong foundation for more coherent implementation. Central to this effort is valuing local, indigenous, and traditional knowledge, which is critical for more inclusive resilience, effective disaster risk reduction, and adaptation to a changing climate.

Misalignment is also financial. Public investment frameworks often fail to match the long-term nature of resilient infrastructure, regenerative landscapes, and social systems that evolve across generations. Climate finance continues to be dominated by short-term horizons and fragmented processes, which undermines the stability required for resilience. Effective adaptation must be treated as an integrated economic function rather than a stand-alone silo, supported by tools such as climate budget tagging, programmatic financing, and multi-year budget cycles. These approaches ensure that investments in water systems, health, food security, and social protection reflect the full life cycles of the systems they aim to strengthen.



Credit: Kathleen Euler

Misalignment also arises from mandates that do not reflect how climate risks operate across interconnected systems. **Institutions responsible for environment, finance, agriculture, and urban development frequently work in isolation even though their decisions affect shared ecological and social processes.** Current governance structures remain shaped by extractive and short-term economic logics that do not correspond to ecological timeframes. Ecosystems regenerate over long cycles, yet policy frameworks still treat nature as a commodity rather than as a living system in need of long-term stewardship. Aligning mandates with ecological processes requires new legal and governance approaches that reflect this fundamental reality.

Cities face a particularly acute version of this gap. Municipal governments are on the frontlines of climate impacts, yet they rely on national finance pipelines and sectoral ministries whose planning horizons often do not match local needs. Housing resilience, for example, requires multi-year upgrading strategies and homeowner-led improvements, but city authorities frequently operate with short-term disaster response budgets that cannot support proactive action. Aligning municipal mandates with national financing systems, microfinance institutions, and community planning processes is essential to ensure that long-lived housing systems evolve with climate risk instead of recurring crises.

Communities, Indigenous peoples, and grassroots organisations also experience deep misalignment when their lived timelines and governance systems are not reflected in formal adaptation plans. Indigenous forest management is rooted in generational stewardship, cultural continuity, and long-term care for ecosystems. However, most climate finance mechanisms rely on short-term grant cycles that do not support these enduring processes. Shifting toward flexible, multi-year financing that backs community-defined priorities such as forest sanctuaries, biodiversity monitoring, and livelihood transitions strengthens both ecological and social resilience by aligning finance with community timelines.



The private sector is also confronting temporal and mandate misalignments. Companies want long-term supply chain stability but often depend on procurement practices that reward short term price signals. Industry leaders highlight the need for forward compatible corporate strategies, resilience linked financing, and investments in predictive technologies. These innovations help align business planning with multi-decade climate risks related to flooding, heat stress, and food system volatility. Private sector leaders argue that resilience-aligned mandates improve competitiveness, reduce risk exposure, and support long-term collaboration with communities and governments. However, it is to note that private sector participation also depends on regulatory clarity, stability, and interoperability. Investors prefer predictable rules and alignment with voluntary and compliance markets (e.g., EU Emissions Trading System (ETS), Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM)) to reduce investment risks and enhance market confidence.

“

If our financing systems continue to think in annual cycles, while communities face decade long climate pressures, we will always be too late. Resilience requires multi-cycle planning.



Debbie Palmer,
UK Foreign,
Commonwealth and
Development Office

Across these diverse experiences, a consistent message emerges: resilience cannot succeed if decision cycles, mandates, and financial systems continue to operate in misalignment with the long-term nature of climate risk. Closing this gap requires adaptive planning models, multi-cycle investment frameworks, joint mandates across ministries, and participatory systems that incorporate the lived timelines of communities. The discussions highlighted that resilience is not only technical, but also relational and systemic, as it involves uncertainty, multiple time horizons, and the need for both immediate coping strategies and long-term transformative capacity.

Building systemic resilience requires deeper cross-sector collaboration: insurers emphasise smarter risk layering rather than simple premium subsidies, while scientists highlight the need to make resilience knowledge accessible and usable. Stronger partnerships among insurers, philanthropy, science, and policy are essential to translate evidence into practical, affordable resilience solutions.

By redesigning institutions to act across decades rather than electoral seasons, aligning finance with long lived systems, creating coordinated governance across levels, and investing in anticipatory models, **governments and partners can enable transitions that are flexible, long-term, and future-ready**. This alignment is essential for building systems that can withstand slow onset risks, navigate uncertainty, and support resilient development for generations.

Challenge 4: Risk is not what it seems.

Redefining and repricing risk to unlock better responses.

Risk is not an objective or neutral category. It reflects the narratives, valuation systems, and institutional choices that determine which communities are protected and which remain exposed. Across sovereign credit ratings, insurance pricing, disaster planning, and public investment decisions, dominant risk models capture only a narrow slice of reality. They often focus on short-term economic exposure and insured losses while overlooking slow onset climate impacts, social vulnerability, ecosystem degradation, and the erosion of community governance systems. These omissions distort the cost of capital for climate vulnerable countries, discourage adaptation finance, and reinforce inequalities in who can access protection.

Speakers highlighted that many **global south countries are penalised in sovereign ratings because climate risk is interpreted as a macroeconomic weakness rather than an argument for increased support or long-term investment.**

Adaptation spending is rarely treated as credit positive, which leaves ministries of finance navigating a paradox where they invest in resilience but still face higher borrowing costs.

Development finance institutions and insurers also acknowledge that perceived risk in vulnerable countries often exceeds real risk, inflating premiums and restricted lending. These distortions cascade across supply chains, public budgets, and local economies, widening the gap between where climate vulnerability is highest and where financial resources flow.

Risk models in insurance and disaster risk financing face similar blind spots. They rarely incorporate compounding or socially embedded risks, such as the rising burden on women collecting water under drought conditions, the fragmentation of informal safety nets, or the loss of Indigenous land governance systems that maintain ecosystem stability. When these risks remain invisible, adaptation measures fail to address the root causes of vulnerability. The absence of social and ecological data in national risk registers also limits governments' ability to design early warning systems, resilience metrics, or investment tools that reflect lived realities in informal settlements, rural communities, and Indigenous territories.

Ecosystem-based risks are also systematically undervalued. Forests, mangroves, coral reefs, and wetlands provide essential buffers against climate extremes, yet their protective value rarely appears in sovereign assessments or fiscal planning. When ecosystems degrade, countries face higher long-term risk, but this does not automatically translate into investments in restoration or community stewardship.

Learn more

The Platform of Latin America and the Caribbean for Climate Action on Agriculture (PLACA) regional platform demonstrates how multi-country, long-term collaboration across ministries can harmonise climate adaptation planning and create aligned timelines for water resilience, agricultural innovation, and climate finance across Latin America and the Caribbean.

Launches and announcements

Long-Term Insurance and Risk Management Roadmap: A national roadmap for integrating insurance and risk-transfer systems into NAP processes was presented, helping countries move from reactive disaster spending to pre-arranged, long-term financial protection. This roadmap bridges mismatches between short-term budget cycles and the long-term horizon of climate risks.

Global synthesis report on Comprehensive Risk Management: Charting a path towards resilient futures (UNDRR and REAP): A global snapshot of how countries, regions, and institutions are advancing integrated approaches to disaster risk reduction and climate action for sustainable development. Drawing on analysis of national adaptation plans and national DRR strategies, supported by AI-informed analysis, the report identifies persistent gaps as well as promising trends and practical pathways for coherence across governance, financing, and implementation.



Credit: Lemes Produções

Instead, the risk is misinterpreted as an economic weakness rather than an opportunity to channel finance toward nature-based stabilisation. Speakers highlighted how this risk travels to the private sector which might bring in more awareness for e.g. a Dutch tea company reported projected losses of 300 million dollars per year due to climate impacts on plantations and supply chains, showing how climate mispricing distorts business risk assessments.

Frontline communities highlight that risk is inseparable from agency, equity, and justice. Youth advocates argue that risk is often framed within political cycles that ignore intergenerational impacts. Indigenous and local leaders stress that risks to land, identity, and cultural continuity are central to long-term climate resilience but remain absent from official risk maps. Their experiences reveal a fundamental mispricing of climate risk that privileges economic exposure over lived vulnerability. When seen in numbers, nearly 250 million children missed school in 2024 due to climate-related disruptions, revealing social risks that are not captured in traditional risk or economic loss metrics.



Reforming risk requires widening the lens. Sovereign risk assessments can integrate resilience adjusted indicators, recognising adaptation investment as a stabilising force. Insurers and DFIs can develop models that capture resilience dividends, community risk reduction, and ecosystem services. Public risk registers can include social cohesion, Indigenous early warning knowledge, informal labour realities, and gender differentiated burdens. Philanthropies and development banks can pilot alternative risk narratives based on agency, justice, and long-term co-benefits rather than narrow loss-based metrics. Investors can adopt social risk indicators and procedural justice criteria to assess whether sustainability strategies shift power or reinforce exposure.

Local governments deal with insurance market failures, insufficient pre-arranged finance, and gaps in early warning systems. Nature-based solutions repeatedly appear as cost-effective, equitable tools that deliver climate mitigation, resilience, and social co-benefits, yet remain under-recognised within insurance and investment frameworks due to persistent data, attribution, and communication challenges. To shift this, science-based methodologies (e.g., resilience credits), blended natural-built infrastructure approaches, and collaborative risk modeling efforts are gaining traction.

Redefining and repricing risk is essential for lowering vulnerability, correcting systemic bias, and unlocking more affordable climate finance. When risk is understood as multidimensional and deeply social, countries investing in resilience are rewarded rather than penalised. Communities gain access to the tools and finance they need. Ecosystems are valued for the protection they provide. Repricing risk becomes a pathway to fairness, stability, and long-term resilience. This includes consideration of how risk is assessed and priced in the context of increasing loss and damage associated with climate change. Such assessments must account for the multi-dimensional nature of non-economic loss and damage (NELD), including its intersecting impacts across gender, economic empowerment, loss of social agency, risks of conflict and displacement, and the erosion of cultural heritage.

“

When nature is treated as property, the risks to people and ecosystems are hidden. Recognising nature as a living relative changes how we understand harm, responsibility, and the true cost of ignoring ecological collapse.



Casey Camp Horinek, Ponca Nation, Global Alliance for the Rights of Nature

Importantly, funding for non-economic loss and damage may not align with conventional climate impact financing models. Addressing NELD therefore requires dedicated resources that support multiple, flexible, and responsive activities. Participatory funding approaches are essential to ensure that community-led efforts are relevant, effective, and grounded in lived realities. Participants emphasized that funders must remain reflexive and responsive to community contexts, to avoid placing the burden on communities to categorise or justify their losses in order to access funding.

There is a call for a **paradigm shift in how the world conceptualises adaptation finance**. Beyond incremental fixes, speakers argue for reimagining economic systems, risk-sharing mechanisms, and the values that underpin decision-making.

Rather than treating adaptation as a discrete “finance gap,” some advocate recognising existing flows (e.g., remittances, social protection, SME finance) as hidden but powerful adaptation systems. Others challenge dominant economic narratives and call for solidarity-based models, futures literacy, and systemic reforms that confront entrenched power structures.

Learn more

The [Rights of Nature dialogues](#) illustrate how reframing ecosystems as rights-bearing entities helps governments and institutions understand ecological collapse as a systemic and long term risk that must be reflected in planning and legal frameworks.

Launches and announcements

Insurance and humanitarian partners are piloting new models of anticipatory action that link financing to community resilience indicators, helping correct distortions in risk pricing and expanding affordable protection for vulnerable populations. The [Rooted in Resilience](#) report by Howden, BCG and Climate High-Level Champions show how insurance unlocks private capital for regenerative agriculture, re/afforestation and other nature-based solutions.

Challenge 5: More than inclusion. *Designing systems for agency and equity.*

Resilience cannot succeed through participation alone. Many systems invite communities to consult or provide input, yet the structures that govern resources, decision-making, and legitimacy remain centralised. Agency requires a shift in how power is distributed, how value is defined, and whose knowledge is recognised. Across governance, finance, food systems, and climate planning, communities, Indigenous peoples, youth, and frontline groups emphasise that resilience is built through lived knowledge, cultural identity, ecological stewardship, and social cohesion. These forms of capital are foundational, yet they remain undervalued in dominant models of planning and investment.

Sessions across sectors reveal that agency arises when communities shape priorities, design metrics of success, and control resources. Agency is not a consultation exercise. It is the capacity to set direction, interpret risk, build local institutions, and hold external actors accountable. Frontline leaders consistently describe how exclusion from formal systems limits their ability to prepare for climate impacts, govern land, maintain food systems, or protect ecosystems. The challenge is therefore not inclusion, but redesigning systems so that communities have real authority over decisions that affect their lives. **Less than 1 percent** of climate finance currently reaches Indigenous peoples and local communities, despite their stewardship of much of the world's biodiversity.

In the **Development and Climate Days** sessions, local and Indigenous leaders stressed that resilience requires shifting attention toward the people who experience risks directly. They highlighted that global frameworks often overlook the forms of value communities produce, such as social protection networks, informal governance, and cultural continuity. Without these assets, resilience cannot be sustained or scaled. Youth groups added that systems must recognise the expertise of younger generations, who will live with the long-term consequences of today's decisions, yet remain structurally absent from climate governance platforms that shape national and global priorities.

These insights reflect a larger shift underway: resilience requires redistributing influence and embedding legitimacy in the knowledge and leadership of those most affected. Community-defined metrics of success are emerging as a powerful tool for shifting how institutions evaluate resilience. In community-led data models, frontline groups develop their own indicators to track housing security, ecosystem health, cultural continuity, social cohesion, and livelihood stability. **These indicators are rooted in lived realities rather than external assumptions.** The community-led data session demonstrates that when communities own data and define success criteria, it changes how governments, donors, and businesses understand risk, value, and progress. These models also correct power imbalances by ensuring that communities can negotiate on equal footing with institutions that typically control information.

“

“Agency comes from relationships. When people reconnect with their river, their land, and their knowledge, they regain authority over what resilience means for them.”

Ned Tapa

**Whanganui River Guardian,
Aotearoa New Zealand**



Locally led adaptation efforts show that decision-making must move closer to communities to be effective. Yet most funding systems remain centralised, slow, and administratively burdensome. Indigenous organisations in the Amazon and Pacific regions shared how restrictive grant structures conflict with the timeframes and governance systems of Indigenous peoples. They argued for multi-year flexible grantmaking, pooled funds governed by local boards, and simplified application processes that match community capacity. These reforms shift power by allowing communities to direct resources toward priorities such as forest stewardship, agroecology, cultural education, and collective healing, all of which build resilience but are rarely recognised in traditional funding models.

Several sessions highlight governance models where Indigenous and customary institutions are already shaping formal adaptation strategies. Rights of Nature frameworks in Aotearoa New Zealand and the Americas show how legal recognition of Indigenous guardianship transforms power structures and embeds ecological knowledge into national law. Community-led water governance in parts of Latin America demonstrates how customary water management practices strengthen long-term water security and drought resilience. These examples show that integrating Indigenous governance is not symbolic participation but a functional realignment that improves ecological and social outcomes.

Development finance institutions and insurers also acknowledge that perceived risk in vulnerable countries often exceeds real risk, inflating premiums and restricted lending. These distortions cascade across supply chains, public budgets, and local economies, widening the gap between where climate vulnerability is highest and where financial resources flow.

Risk models in insurance and disaster risk financing face similar blind spots. They rarely incorporate compounding or socially embedded risks, such as the rising burden on women collecting water under drought conditions, the fragmentation of informal safety nets, or the loss of Indigenous land governance systems that maintain ecosystem stability. When these risks remain invisible, adaptation measures fail to address the root causes of vulnerability. The absence of social and ecological data in national risk registers also limits governments' ability to design early warning systems, resilience metrics, or investment tools that reflect lived realities in informal settlements, rural communities, and Indigenous territories.

Ecosystem-based risks are also systematically undervalued. Forests, mangroves, coral reefs, and wetlands provide essential buffers against climate extremes, yet their protective value rarely appears in sovereign assessments or fiscal planning. When ecosystems degrade, countries face higher long-term risk, but this does not automatically translate into investments in restoration or community stewardship.

Learn more

Community-led data initiatives show how shifting information ownership toward frontline groups builds agency, strengthens negotiation power, and reshapes institutional understanding of resilience by embedding lived knowledge into local and national decision-making systems.

Launches and announcements

The NDC Youth Equity Tracker is a global tool that monitors whether national climate commitments recognise young people as stakeholders and give them meaningful influence in decision-making processes. It strengthens intergenerational equity by formalising youth agency in the implementation of climate policy.

Launch of the policy brief "Converging Crises and Potential Opportunities: Gender, Climate, Sanitation and Water" by Sanitation and Water for All and partner institutions, provides evidence on the importance of integrating gender considerations into climate negotiations and agreements with particular focus on water and sanitation to strengthen incremental and transformative adaptation.

Non-financial forms of capital also require institutional recognition. Ecosystem stewardship, social cohesion, cultural identity, and community governance systems have enormous stabilising power, yet they do not appear in most investment or planning models. The agrobiodiversity and food systems discussions highlight that valuing Indigenous seeds, women’s agricultural labour, and ancestral food knowledge strengthens both nutrition and climate resilience. The mental wellbeing session shows that emotional and cultural resilience are necessary to support community agency. These elements are rarely measured but they are essential for long term stability.

Civil society coalitions and grassroots networks are also stepping into formal roles to influence national and global adaptation processes. The Ethical Global Stocktake demonstrates how frontline conveners can shape national positions, COP agendas, and global frameworks when given resources and recognised mandates. Similar coalitions of youth, Indigenous organisations, and local governments are advocating for formal seats in Green Climate Fund (GCF) board processes, NAP reviews, and national coordination bodies. These mechanisms shift resilience governance from consultation toward shared authority.

Effective adaptation depends on shifting power, resources, and decision-making authority to the communities most affected by climate impacts. Whether through Indigenous-led governance, women’s and youth leadership, informal settlement data systems, or locally led adaptation mechanisms like LIFE-AR, the sessions emphasised agency, rights, and lived experience as the foundation of resilient systems.



All examples make clear that designing for agency **requires institutional reforms that shift how power is held, how value is defined, and how decisions are made.** Sessions repeatedly highlighted the need to replace top-down, externally driven approaches with governance models that honor cultural knowledge, embed justice, enable co-governance, and legitimise community-defined resilience metrics. It demands systems that validate diverse knowledge, invest in locally led institutions, and embed accountability in relationships rather than compliance alone. Only then can resilience efforts become equitable, lasting, and rooted in the strengths of the people who sustain them.

Solving the interconnected crises of climate change, biodiversity loss, and social inequality requires more than isolated innovations. It demands approaches that integrate ecological health, community wellbeing, economic opportunity, and cultural resilience. Speakers and practitioners emphasise that the solutions with the greatest transformative potential are often those that blend diverse knowledge systems, recombine old and new practices, and strengthen relationships between people and nature. These approaches succeed not because they introduce entirely new ideas, but because they ground innovation in local realities, collective memory, and inclusive governance.

Challenge 6: Solutions in action.

Bridging climate, nature, and equity goals.

Solving the interconnected crises of climate change, biodiversity loss, and social inequality requires more than isolated innovations. It demands approaches that integrate ecological health, community wellbeing, economic opportunity, and cultural resilience. Speakers and practitioners emphasise that the solutions with the greatest transformative potential are often those that blend diverse knowledge systems, recombine old and new practices, and strengthen relationships between people and nature. These approaches succeed not because they introduce entirely new ideas, but because they ground innovation in local realities, collective memory, and inclusive governance.

The COP30 Presidency's call for a Granary of Solutions is reflected throughout the material. Many communities already possess tested strategies for managing water, regenerating land, protecting forests, adapting food systems, and maintaining social cohesion. These practices carry the memory of how societies have navigated climate shocks and ecological change for generations. Paired with modern technologies such as digital twins, AI-driven flood forecasting, satellite monitoring, and early warning systems, these ancestral insights become powerful foundations for contemporary resilience solutions.

Across regions, communities are demonstrating that climate, nature, equity, and livelihoods can advance together. Integrated land use models in rainforest landscapes link agroforestry, forest restoration, and diversified incomes to reduce ecological and financial risk. Women-led coastal cooperatives use mangrove restoration as both a climate buffer and a livelihood strategy. Indigenous seed keepers safeguard agrobiodiversity that strengthens food and climate resilience while preserving cultural identity. These are not niche cases. They illustrate that resilience solutions rooted in community knowledge and ecological regeneration can scale when supported by institutions, financing, and partnerships.

In agriculture, agrobiodiversity leaders highlight that Indigenous seeds, soil traditions, and women's farming knowledge are essential for climate resilient food systems.

Scaling climate resilient agriculture in Latin America and the Caribbean demonstrates how farmer field schools, participatory breeding, and water smart cropping systems integrate ancestral knowledge with modern tools. These approaches strengthen nutrition, reduce emissions, improve yields, and support cultural continuity. They also align with biodiversity goals by protecting ecosystem services and genetic diversity across landscapes.

In coastal resilience, practitioners emphasise that communities are already combining traditional ecological knowledge with modern risk analytics. Women's networks in coastal economies connect mangrove restoration with income diversification, microinsurance, and digital tools for early warning.

These integrated solutions reduce climate risk, restore ecosystems, and create dignified livelihoods, especially for women and youth. The discussions highlight that these outcomes only scale when governments and donors recognise community governance structures, reform funding cycles, and invest in long-term implementation.

Rainforest resilience initiatives illustrate how combining science, Indigenous governance, and blended finance can shift entire socioeconomic systems. Regeneration of forests related activities reconnect ecological restoration with local economic opportunity by using agroforestry, cultural education, and community-led territorial planning. These solutions reduce deforestation, store carbon, support livelihoods, and strengthen social cohesion. Unlike short term conservation funding, its success depends on multi-year financing, local governance power, and strong community institutions.

Digital innovation is also emerging as a powerful enabler when paired with local practice. Data centres are integrated with greenhouse complexes to create energy-positive systems, transmitting data instead of energy as a smarter approach to minimising grid transmission challenges. Spatial planning and AI-enabled ecosystem approaches can optimise data center locations for energy, water, and telecoms infrastructure integration. These tools succeed when communities co-design them, define use cases, and maintain control over data systems. Community-led digital adaptation platforms and ethical data protocols are essential for ensuring that technology serves agency rather than undermining it.



“

Innovation in resilience is not just about new technology. It is about meeting entrepreneurs where they are and supporting solutions that communities are already using to manage risk every day.

Jocelyn Smith, Mercy Corps Ventures

Multi-year flexible grants, pooled funds for proven nature-based solutions, and outcome-linked finance help ensure that community-led projects move from pilot to systemwide adoption. Governments can support integrated land use strategies, participatory budgeting, and co management agreements with Indigenous and local institutions. Businesses can adopt nature-positive sourcing models, invest in regenerative value chains, and develop community owned data systems.

Resilience innovations showcased in the Investor Forum reinforce that early warning systems, climate services, community funds, and inclusive urban design models can work, but struggle to scale without blended finance, clear governance structures, and public-private cooperation. Projects across Brazil, Nepal, Sudan, and equatorial regions emphasised that technology is only effective when paired with local relevance, trust, and last-mile delivery systems.

Also central to resilience innovations is attention to people, place, and local knowledge in designing durable resilience solutions. Built-environment discussions echoed this, noting that resilient buildings, nature-based solutions, and retrofits must be **people-centred and aligned with comfort, cultural context, and everyday needs**. Countries such as Bangladesh, Singapore, Bahrain, and Peru showcased how governance systems that clarify roles, integrate local expertise, and invest in citizen engagement can improve preparedness and adaptation outcomes.

Several sessions also highlight that resilience solutions must address psychological wellbeing. **Climate anxiety, eco-grief, and loss of cultural identity are increasingly shaping risk perception and resilience capacities**. The wellbeing and climate session shows that community rooted healing, storytelling, connection to nature, and cultural ceremony are necessary components of resilience. These approaches strengthen emotional stability, deepen social cohesion, and connect communities to ancestral memory, all of which support long-term adaptive capacity.

Scaling such solutions requires institutional and financial reform. Donors and development banks must balance early stage innovation funding with long-term implementation.



From circular economy leaders to early-stage climate innovators and built-environment practitioners, speakers stressed that current systems are too fragmented, underfinanced, and misaligned with the speed and scale of climate impacts. Harmonised regulations, better worker skills, and upfront incentives are essential to unlock circular value chains. Circular business models in energy, manufacturing, and recycling are profitable and ready to scale with supportive policy and finance. Innovations such as AI-enabled weather intelligence, amphibious net-zero homes, nature-based coastal projects, and hyper-local disaster forecasting demonstrate that the resilience “dividend” spans economic competitiveness, health, and quality of life. Yet, capturing this value requires bridging gaps through better data, interoperable standards, blended capital, and policies that embed resilience alongside decarbonisation.

The solutions that deliver climate resilience, ecosystem health, social justice, and stable livelihoods are those that connect people with their environments and with each other. They recombine the knowledge of the past with the technologies of the present. They scale through institutions that respect agency and through finance that supports long-term change. *They succeed because they reflect how real communities live, learn, and adapt.*

Learn more

The [Race to Resilience](#) report session shows how ancestral knowledge, Indigenous agricultural practices, and regional cooperation can strengthen transboundary food system resilience, creating pathways that merge cultural memory with modern governance and climate science.

Launches and announcements

[Climate Resilience Awards for Business](#) by GRP and World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) spotlight companies implementing cross-cutting solutions such as AI flood forecasting, circular economy approaches, regenerative agriculture, and community-led value chains. These recognitions elevate real-world models that fuse climate, nature, and equity outcomes through practical innovation.





Credit: Lemes Produções

Peru Resilience Hub

The Resilience Hub partnered with the Government of Peru to bring Amazonia to the heart of COP30 conversations. As the host region for COP30, the Amazon is central to global climate stability, and Peru, home to 68 million hectares of Amazonian forests and 51 Indigenous peoples, positioned resilience, forests, and inclusive governance as its defining contribution to the COP. Peru entered COP30 with a mature, whole-of-government climate architecture and a set of new methodologies, tools, and policy innovations that together represent one of the strongest resilience governance models in Latin America.

A governance architecture built around indigenous and territorial resilience

Peru's resilience strategy is anchored in an Indigenous climate governance model that is unique in the region. The Platform of Indigenous Peoples for Climate Change (PPICC), created in 2020, now serves as a formal channel for Indigenous co-decision-making on national climate policy, including NDCs, NAP implementation, and international negotiation positions. The platform brings together seven national Indigenous organisations, government ministries, and regional platforms in Ayacucho, Junín, and Ucayali, enabling decentralised and culturally grounded climate action.

This model aligns with Peru's updated NDC 3.0, which includes a target to incorporate 80 percent of civil society and Indigenous proposals into climate decision making by 2035. This represents an unprecedented commitment to inclusive resilience governance. Indigenous organisations shared a range of adaptation and resilience practices, including forest governance, community monitoring, ancestral farming techniques, and youth knowledge revitalisation. These approaches highlight resilience as a daily lived practice shaped by territory, culture, and community priorities.

NDC 3.0: A stronger adaptation mandate and new loss and damage commitments

Peru's NDC 3.0, submitted in November 2024, expands national adaptation commitments and integrates loss and damage as a core pillar of resilience. The NDC introduces new thematic areas such as climate induced displacement and green jobs, along with sectoral strategies for water, health, forests, fisheries, agriculture, tourism, transport, and sanitation. Peru announced a national roadmap for loss and damage management to be operational by 2035. The roadmap will enable the country to access the Loss and Damage Fund and strengthen its systems for managing irreversible climate impacts. Peru estimates national climate-related losses at approximately USD 4.3 billion, and this evidence informs both governance and financing priorities. Peru announced a national roadmap for loss and damage management to be operational by 2035. The roadmap will enable the country to access the Loss and Damage Fund and strengthen its systems for managing irreversible climate impacts. Peru estimates national climate-related losses at approximately USD 4.3 billion, and this evidence informs both governance and financing priorities.

Implementation of Peru's National Adaptation Plan: From strategy to investment

Peru's National Adaptation Plan (NAP), approved in 2021, has now entered an active implementation phase. Out of 84 adaptation measures, roughly half are already under implementation. This progress is supported by strong legal foundations and multisector coordination with the Ministry of Economy and Finance, which is integrating adaptation priorities into investment planning and public budgeting. The NAP features a participatory approach across multiple sectors. Peru also highlighted the use of its Climate Science Portal, which helps connect scientific data on glaciers, forest dynamics, water systems, and peatlands to policy decisions. This contributes to evidence-based resilience planning at national and regional scales.

REDD+ and Article 6: High integrity methodologies and new readiness milestones

Peru announced major progress on REDD+ and carbon market readiness. A key milestone is the country's readiness to authorise its first REDD+ results under Article 6.2. This is supported by the national mitigation registry RENAMI, which tracks mitigation outcomes and prevents double counting. Peru's REDD+ framework includes a safeguards system developed through extensive Indigenous consultation, a national measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) system aligned with Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) guidelines, and a national approach for nesting early projects within the national system. Peru also highlighted the world's first jurisdictional Indigenous REDD+ programme covering approximately 7 million hectares. This places Indigenous governance at the centre of carbon market integrity and benefit-sharing systems.

Peru's Country Package for forests and nature: A major announcement at COP30

One of Peru's most significant announcements was the launch of the Country Package for forests and nature. This effort is aligned with the Leaders Alliance for Climate and Forests and aims to mobilise resources and build integrated action for the Amazon. The Country Package includes five pillars:

1. Indigenous land tenure security
2. Conservation and restoration of protected areas
3. Sustainable bioeconomy and value chain development
4. Monitoring, enforcement, and forest control
5. Strengthened governance and transparency

The initiative was developed through extensive consultation with Indigenous organisations and regional governments. Canada committed 6 million Canadian dollars to support early implementation. Peru estimates that approximately USD 140 to 150 million is required to fully implement the Country Package. It positions Peru as a leader in linking climate action with territorial rights, biodiversity protection, and nature-based economic opportunities.

Amazon resilience and inclusive investment: A whole of society strategy

Peru emphasised integrated public, private, and Indigenous action for Amazon resilience. Key findings include:

- 43 percent of Peru's emissions come from deforestation in non-titled Amazon lands.
- More than 370 communities participate in forest conservation programs covering 4.8 million hectares.
- Peru manages 78 national protected areas and nearly 30 million hectares, with hundreds of community-led enterprises supported through seed capital programs.

Private sector leaders such as Natura and Peru Sostenible highlighted regenerative supply chains, Indigenous partnerships, and biodiversity-based business models as central to a resilient economy. Regional governments called for a national Amazon development plan that responds to poverty, illegal economies, and long standing gaps in education and health. This reflects a shift toward a holistic view of resilience that includes social and economic dimensions alongside climate and ecological priorities.

Through its partnership with the Resilience Hub at COP30, Peru presented a comprehensive model of resilience rooted in Indigenous leadership, strong climate governance, scientific tools, and multisector collaboration. From its ambitious NDC 3.0 and REDD+ methodologies to the Country Package for forests and nature, Peru demonstrated how climate, nature, and equity can be woven into a coherent national strategy.

Peru's message at COP30 was clear: protecting Amazonia is essential for planetary stability and for the cultural, economic, and social wellbeing of its people. Its resilience framework, grounded in ancestral knowledge and supported by robust national systems, offers a blueprint for Amazonian and global climate action in the years ahead.

Reflections and next steps on the road to COP31

COP30 unfolded in Belém at a moment when climate impacts, geopolitical fractures, and economic pressures are intensifying worldwide.



Credit: Kathleen Euler

Although the meeting was framed as an “**implementation COP**,” progress was uneven. Delegates arrived expecting breakthroughs on fossil fuel transition, strengthened adaptation systems, and clarity on long-term finance. What emerged instead was a mix of incremental advances, political compromises, and new collaborative pathways outside the formal negotiation process.

Deep political divides shaped the negotiations, particularly around climate finance, Article 9.1 obligations, and the global transition away from fossil fuels. Many countries pushed hard for a negotiated roadmap to phase out fossil fuels and halt deforestation, but opposition from several major producers prevented formal agreement. Still, the Brazilian Presidency announced it will pursue fossil fuel and deforestation transition roadmaps independently in the year ahead, signaling that voluntary, coalitions-based leadership will continue to shape global climate action.

Adaptation remained a central area of focus. Parties adopted a set of 59 global indicators for the GGA, covering sectors such as water, agriculture, health, and ecosystems. However, late alterations weakened their coherence and raised concerns about implementation. A new two-year process was launched to strengthen the technical guidance, and negotiators acknowledged the need for better alignment between indicators, national MEL systems, and the second Global Stocktake. Meanwhile, countries agreed that adaptation finance must increase significantly, with a new collective expectation to triple support by 2035. Although welcome, the timeline and lack of a clear baseline fell short of the urgency expressed by vulnerable countries.

Climate finance debates were central. COP30 reaffirmed the Baku-to-Belém roadmap, which seeks to mobilise at least USD 1.3 trillion annually for developing countries by 2035, and launched a political work programme to sustain momentum. Discussions on shifting all financial flows toward climate goals will continue under a newly established dialogue, underscoring the need for more coherent global financial governance.

Nature and land issues saw major announcements, even if not all were embedded in the negotiated text. Brazil launched the Tropical Forests Forever Facility, securing USD 6.6 billion in its initial fundraising round to reward countries that conserve tropical forests. Additional commitments expanded land-tenure security for Indigenous Peoples and local communities, while other initiatives focused on wildfire prevention, bioeconomy development, and restoration of degraded farmland. However, food systems were notably absent from the final decision text despite their centrality to climate and nature goals.

COP30 also marked a significant political moment for Indigenous Peoples, with the largest-ever participation at a climate COP and expanded recognition of their rights in several outcome documents. Yet, concerns remained about their limited access to negotiation spaces and the absence of direct financing mechanisms.

A new *Just Transition mechanism* was launched to strengthen cooperation, technical assistance, and knowledge sharing for equitable economic transitions. At the same time, trade gained unprecedented visibility, with countries agreeing to hold structured discussions on how trade measures intersect with climate action—an emerging arena of geopolitical tension.

Outside the formal negotiations, the *Climate Action Agenda demonstrated strong momentum*. Hundreds of voluntary coalitions, companies, subnational governments, and civil society groups advanced real-economy solutions across energy, industry, cities, food, forests, and resilience. Cities, in particular, showed influence: over 14,000 local and regional governments committed to accelerated climate action through new alliances and collaborative frameworks.

Looking ahead, COP31 will take place in Türkiye under a hybrid leadership arrangement between Türkiye and Australia, a novel governance model intended to foster trust between developed and developing countries. Brazil has already begun convening partners to shape next year's fossil fuel and deforestation roadmaps, and the new Global Implementation Accelerator will continue to support countries in delivering their NDCs and NAPs.

COP30 did not deliver all that was expected, but it signaled an important shift: the global climate agenda is increasingly shaped not only by negotiated outcomes but by coalitions of governments, communities, financial actors, and Indigenous leaders working in parallel. This blended model of multilateral and multi-stakeholder action will define the pathway to implementation over the coming decade.

We invite the Resilience Hub community to continue actively shaping the agenda for a bold, just and equitable resilient present with us today.



COP30 RESILIENCE HUB REPORT

RESILIENCE HUB

THANK YOU TO OUR SPONSORS



CONTACT US:



@copreshub.bsky.social



cop-resilience-hub.org



@copresiliencehub



@copreshub

info@cop-resilience-hub.org