
CLIMATE FINANCE FOR COMMUNITY-LEVEL ADAPTATION PROJECTS

Prof. Runa Sarkar

Professor

Economics Group

Indian Institute of Management Calcutta

Kolkata, West Bengal, India

Abstract

Climate change is experienced most directly through local disruptions to water, agriculture, health, housing, ecosystems and livelihoods. Community-level adaptation projects can respond to these pressures through measures such as rainwater harvesting, climate-resilient agriculture, ecosystem restoration, heat-risk preparedness, flood protection, livelihood diversification and locally managed early-warning systems. Yet communities that face the highest exposure often have the least access to predictable, affordable and flexible finance. Climate finance is therefore not only a matter of mobilising larger funding volumes; it is also a question of who can define priorities, control resources, manage risk and account for results.

This study examines climate finance for community-level adaptation projects through a qualitative review of scholarly literature, international climate policy, public climate-fund guidance and practice-oriented evidence on locally led adaptation. The analysis focuses on finance access, local ownership, grant design, risk allocation, inclusion, safeguards, accountability and measurement of adaptation outcomes. It also considers the role of public grants, concessional finance, direct-access mechanisms, decentralised funds, blended finance and community-based financial institutions.

The findings indicate that effective community-level adaptation finance should be predictable, grant-oriented where public benefits are substantial, accessible through proportionate procedures and governed through transparent local decision-making. Projects are more likely to be durable when finance supports local institutions, includes women, Indigenous peoples, youth and marginalised groups in priority setting, and funds maintenance, learning and adaptive management rather than one-time assets alone. However, localisation does not mean transferring risk without support. Communities require technical assistance, fiduciary strengthening, social and environmental safeguards, grievance channels and accountable partnerships with public authorities and funders.

The paper proposes a practical framework for community-level adaptation finance that combines equitable access, locally determined priorities, appropriate financial instruments, protection against maladaptation, transparent monitoring and long-term institutional support. The framework is intended to assist governments, climate funds, development institutions, civil-society organisations and local governments in designing finance that strengthens resilience while respecting community agency and justice.

Keywords: Climate Finance, Community-Level Adaptation, Locally Led Adaptation, Resilience, Direct Access, Adaptation Grants, Climate Justice, Local Institutions, Inclusive Finance, Sustainable Development

1. INTRODUCTION

Climate change is not experienced as an abstract global trend. It is encountered in villages, neighbourhoods, coastal settlements, mountain communities and small towns through changing rainfall patterns, heat stress, water scarcity, flooding, crop losses, ecosystem degradation, disease risks and disruptions to livelihoods. The costs of these impacts are often borne first by households and local institutions whose financial

resources, public services and infrastructure are already constrained. Community-level adaptation therefore occupies a central place in climate-resilient development because it connects broad climate objectives with the everyday decisions that determine safety, livelihoods and well-being.

Adaptation actions at community level may include restoring wetlands, protecting local water sources, improving drainage, strengthening climate-resilient housing,

diversifying crops and income, supporting producer groups, improving access to climate information, developing evacuation plans, upgrading health preparedness and creating local systems for emergency assistance. These measures are context-specific. A coastal fishing community, a drought-prone farming settlement and an informal urban neighbourhood face different risks and possess different forms of knowledge, organisation and capacity. Finance that arrives with rigid priorities, short delivery windows or complex compliance conditions can therefore fail to address the actual sources of vulnerability.

Climate finance is commonly discussed in terms of international pledges, national allocations and large investment programmes. Those levels matter, but the pathway from international commitments to local action is often long and fragmented. Funds may move through ministries, multilateral agencies, accredited entities, commercial intermediaries and implementing organisations before a community receives support. At each stage, transaction costs, eligibility rules, documentation requirements and decision-making distance can reduce flexibility. Community organisations may have strong knowledge of local risks but lack formal registration, audited accounts, technical proposals or collateral required by conventional finance systems.

The challenge is not simply that adaptation projects are small. Many community actions generate public benefits that are difficult to monetise, including reduced disaster loss, ecosystem protection, health protection, social cohesion and improved access to information. They may require grants, concessional resources, public-service investment or risk-sharing rather than standard debt. They also need financing that can adapt to uncertainty. Climate risks evolve, local priorities change and project design may need revision after seasonal learning or unforeseen events. A finance system that rewards only rapid disbursement or easily measurable outputs may discourage the flexible, participatory processes on which adaptation depends.

This paper investigates climate finance for community-level adaptation projects and develops a framework for responsible design and governance. It examines why local

adaptation is financially underserved, how different financing instruments can be matched to community needs, and what institutional arrangements can improve local access without weakening accountability. The purpose is to show that the effectiveness of climate finance should be assessed not only by the volume committed, but also by whether resources reach vulnerable people in forms that strengthen locally defined resilience, equity and long-term capacity.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on adaptation has consistently emphasised that vulnerability is shaped by social, economic, institutional and environmental conditions. Exposure to a climate hazard does not automatically determine harm; outcomes are influenced by access to assets, services, information, rights, networks and decision-making power. Community-level adaptation consequently requires attention to local institutions and collective action. Local governments, self-help groups, water-user associations, farmer organisations, cooperatives, women's groups and civil-society organisations can translate climate information into practical responses when they have legitimacy, resources and room to act (Agrawal, 2008; Adger, 2003).

The literature on community-based and locally led adaptation also cautions against treating participation as a simple project activity. Consultation alone does not create ownership when priorities, budgets and technical choices remain externally determined. Meaningful local leadership involves participation in problem definition, project selection, resource allocation, implementation, monitoring and learning. It also requires attention to power within communities. Women, Indigenous peoples, landless households, informal workers, persons with disabilities, older persons and migrant groups may experience climate risks differently and may be excluded from local decision-making unless financing arrangements deliberately support inclusion and representation.

Climate-finance scholarship identifies several barriers to adaptation investment. Benefits can be diffuse and long term, while costs are immediate and concentrated. Project outcomes are uncertain, and adaptation may be difficult to distinguish from regular development

expenditure. These features make private investment alone insufficient, particularly in poor or remote areas. Public finance and grant-based support therefore remain essential for activities that protect common goods, reduce poverty, strengthen ecosystems or improve the capacity of institutions and households to respond to hazards. International assessments also underline the persistence of a substantial gap between adaptation needs and available finance, especially in countries and communities with limited fiscal capacity.

Direct-access and enhanced-direct-access approaches are important responses to this gap. They seek to bring decisions closer to national and subnational actors by allowing accredited domestic institutions to manage resources and, in some cases, establish local facilities for small grants, on-lending or blended finance. The Green Climate Fund's enhancing direct access model illustrates the principle of devolving sub-project selection and oversight through pre-agreed criteria while

preserving fiduciary and safeguard responsibilities. Such models can improve contextual fit and local ownership, but their effectiveness depends on transparent governance, technical support and procedures that do not exclude smaller community organisations.

A further strand of literature focuses on maladaptation and climate justice. Adaptation finance can produce harmful outcomes when it shifts risk to poorer groups, protects high-value assets while neglecting basic needs, causes displacement, creates debt burdens or reinforces existing inequalities. The quality of finance therefore matters as much as quantity. Community-level projects need safeguards that assess distributional effects, protect rights and ecosystems, and provide accessible mechanisms for complaint and correction. Long-term resilience requires finance that supports learning, maintenance and institutional continuity rather than narrowly defined, one-off infrastructure outputs.

Table 1: Summary of Key Literature on Climate Finance for Community-Level Adaptation Projects

S. No.	Author(s)	Year	Methodology	Key Focus	Major Findings
1	UNFCCC	2015	International agreement	Paris Agreement and climate finance	Establishes adaptation as a global objective and recognises the importance of financial support for developing countries.
2	Agrawal	2008	Conceptual analysis	Local institutions and adaptation	Local institutions can connect climate responses with livelihoods, resource governance and collective action.
3	Ayers & Forsyth	2009	Policy analysis	Community-based adaptation	Development priorities and local resilience should be integrated rather than treated as separate objectives.
4	Adger	2003	Theoretical analysis	Social capital and collective action	Networks, trust and institutions influence the capacity of communities to respond to climate risks.
5	Moser & Ekstrom	2010	Framework development	Adaptation barriers	Institutional, informational and political barriers can obstruct adaptation even when resources are available.
6	Barnett & O'Neill	2010	Conceptual review	Maladaptation	Adaptation interventions should be assessed for outcomes that increase vulnerability or shift harm to others.

S. No.	Author(s)	Year	Methodology	Key Focus	Major Findings
7	Global Commission on Adaptation	2019	Economic assessment	Benefits of adaptation	Early adaptation investment can protect lives, livelihoods and infrastructure while supporting development benefits.
8	WRI	2021	Practice framework	Locally led adaptation	Local leadership requires devolved decision-making, flexible funding and equitable participation.
9	IPCC	2022	Scientific assessment	Vulnerability and adaptation	Adaptation effectiveness depends on enabling conditions, equity, governance and attention to limits.
10	GCF	2021	Operational guidance	Enhancing direct access	Country-level selection and oversight can support small-scale community projects through pre-approved criteria.
11	UNEP	2024	Global assessment	Adaptation finance gap	Finance flows remain inadequate relative to adaptation needs and implementation requirements.
12	UNEP	2025	Global assessment	Finance needs and flows	Urgent scaling of public and private finance is needed while avoiding unsustainable debt burdens.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The object of this study is climate finance for community-level adaptation projects. The study examines how financial resources are designed, allocated, delivered, governed and evaluated when adaptation actions are implemented by or with communities facing climate risks. It focuses on the quality of financial access and decision-making rather than on finance volumes alone. The central question is whether a financing arrangement enables communities to identify relevant climate priorities, obtain suitable resources, implement actions safely and sustain benefits over time.

The research considers multiple sources and instruments of finance, including international climate funds, national and subnational public budgets, adaptation grants, direct-access facilities, concessional loans, microfinance, community revolving funds, insurance-linked support, philanthropic funding and blended-finance structures. These instruments differ in purpose and risk profile. A small grant for restoring a community water system should not be assessed through the same criteria as a credit facility for resilient enterprises or a public capital programme for flood protection.

Instrument choice should reflect the nature of the benefit, the capacity of users and the risk of placing repayment burdens on vulnerable households.

The study also examines the interaction between finance architecture and local governance. Community-level adaptation is more likely to be durable when financing supports local institutions, aligns with public planning, respects customary and legal rights, includes people who are often excluded, and creates channels for transparency and redress. The aim is to develop a framework that balances local discretion with prudent fiduciary management, social and environmental safeguards, and evidence-based learning.

KEY POINTS OF OBJECT OF STUDY

- To examine how climate-finance resources reach community organisations, local governments and vulnerable households.
- To assess whether eligibility criteria, application procedures and reporting requirements are proportionate to the scale of community projects.
- To analyse the suitability of grants, concessional finance, guarantees and

- revolving funds for different adaptation activities.
- To evaluate local participation in project selection, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and learning.
 - To examine the inclusion of women, Indigenous peoples, youth, older persons, persons with disabilities and marginalised livelihood groups.
 - To assess whether finance supports maintenance, capacity building and adaptive management in addition to initial capital expenditure.
 - To study risk allocation, debt exposure and the use of financial instruments in contexts where benefits are public or non-monetary.
 - To evaluate environmental and social safeguards, grievance mechanisms and protection against maladaptation.
 - To examine transparency, auditability and accountability across intermediaries, funders and local implementing partners.
 - To develop a practical framework for equitable, locally led and climate-resilient finance delivery.

Table 2: Object of Study Framework

S. No.	Study Component	Description	Purpose
1	Finance access	Eligibility, application pathways, transaction costs and disbursement timing for local actors.	Enable communities to obtain finance without disproportionate administrative barriers.
2	Local priority setting	Participation in defining risks, selecting projects and allocating resources.	Align finance with locally experienced climate risks and development needs.
3	Instrument suitability	Fit between grants, loans, guarantees or revolving funds and project benefit profiles.	Avoid unsuitable debt or rigid funding conditions for public-benefit adaptation.
4	Inclusion and equity	Representation of groups facing differentiated climate risks and exclusion.	Ensure finance does not reinforce existing inequalities or elite capture.
5	Institutional capacity	Support for local governments, community organisations and implementing partners.	Strengthen long-term ability to plan, manage and maintain adaptation actions.
6	Safeguards and rights	Environmental, social, gender and rights-based protections.	Prevent displacement, ecological harm, discrimination and maladaptation.
7	Accountability	Disclosure, audit trails, grievance mechanisms and community oversight.	Build trust and enable correction when problems occur.
8	Learning and durability	Monitoring, maintenance, flexibility and post-project support.	Support adaptation as an ongoing process rather than a one-time output.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a qualitative, document-based research design. It combines normative analysis of climate-finance principles with a comparative review of peer-reviewed scholarship, international climate-policy documents, climate-fund guidance, institutional reports and practice-based

frameworks on locally led adaptation. This approach is appropriate because the research question concerns the design features, governance arrangements and ethical considerations that make community-level adaptation finance more accessible, equitable and durable. Rather than presenting a statistical estimate from a single project

portfolio, the paper synthesises evidence and policy principles that can guide the design and assessment of finance mechanisms across different local contexts.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

- Study Type: Qualitative and document-based analysis
- Approach: Normative evaluation supported by comparative policy and institutional analysis
- Unit of Analysis: Community-level adaptation-finance mechanisms, projects and governance controls
- Source Categories: Scholarly literature, climate agreements, fund policies, official guidance and development reports
- Core Analytical Dimensions: Access, ownership, equity, instrument suitability, safeguards, accountability and durability
- Analytical Goal: Develop a practical framework for designing and governing finance for community-level adaptation

4.2 METHODOLOGICAL STEPS

- Step 1: Define community-level adaptation and identify common climate-finance pathways and instruments.
- Step 2: Review literature on local institutions, vulnerability, collective action, climate justice and adaptation barriers.
- Step 3: Examine international policy commitments, adaptation-finance assessments and climate-fund access modalities.
- Step 4: Develop an analysis matrix covering access, local decision-making, finance suitability, inclusion, safeguards and accountability.
- Step 5: Compare grant-based, concessional, direct-access, decentralised and blended-finance approaches.
- Step 6: Identify high-risk practices such as excessive centralisation, unsuitable debt, elite capture, weak safeguards and short-term projectisation.
- Step 7: Formulate design principles, review questions and monitoring responsibilities for funders and implementing institutions.
- Step 8: Interpret findings in relation to climate justice, community agency, resilience and sustainable development.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis is based on thematic comparison of the challenges and enabling conditions identified in the reviewed literature and policy sources. It evaluates how finance architecture affects the ability of communities to access resources, define priorities, manage projects and sustain adaptation benefits. The themes are interrelated: a technically sound project may fail if funds arrive too late; a well-funded intervention may deepen inequality if decision-making is captured by local elites; and a low-interest loan may still be inappropriate where benefits are public and households cannot reliably repay. The analysis therefore treats finance as a governance relationship rather than a neutral transfer of money.

5.1 ACCESS, SCALE AND TIMELINESS OF FINANCE

Access is a foundational challenge for community-level adaptation. Many climate-finance systems are designed around large projects, accredited entities and complex fiduciary requirements. These features can be necessary for accountability, but they can also make small, locally rooted projects invisible or ineligible. Community organisations may lack the staff time, legal status, financial records or technical expertise needed to prepare detailed proposals. The result is that resources tend to flow to institutions with existing administrative capacity, even when those institutions are distant from the people facing the risk.

An accessible finance pathway should use proportionate requirements. Small grants can rely on simplified concept notes, local-language support, predictable application windows and milestone-based reporting appropriate to the size of the grant. Intermediaries can provide technical assistance, procurement support and financial-management coaching without taking control of community priorities. Where climate risks are seasonal or acute, disbursement timing must match local planning cycles. Funding for drought-resilient agriculture, for example, is of limited value if it arrives after planting decisions have already been made.

Scale also requires careful interpretation. A project need not be large to be significant. Multiple small investments in water security,

ecosystem restoration, shelter improvement, health preparedness and local information systems can produce cumulative resilience when linked to local planning and public services. Portfolio approaches, programme windows and devolved sub-grant mechanisms can aggregate these actions while preserving local relevance. The objective is not to fragment finance indefinitely, but to create pathways where local initiatives can be supported, monitored and expanded when evidence and community demand justify it.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Finance access improves when application, reporting and procurement procedures are proportionate to project scale and local capacity.
- Local intermediaries can reduce transaction costs when they provide support without replacing community decision-making.
- Timely and predictable disbursement is essential because climate-sensitive livelihoods follow seasonal and hazard-specific cycles.

5.2 LOCAL OWNERSHIP, INCLUSION AND PROCEDURAL EQUITY

Local ownership is often described as a principle, but it must be visible in actual decisions. Communities should have meaningful influence over which risks are prioritised, what forms of adaptation are acceptable, who benefits, how resources are managed and what counts as success. This does not mean that every decision must be made through informal consensus or that technical expertise is unnecessary. It means that project design should combine local knowledge, rights and preferences with relevant scientific, engineering and financial support.

Inclusion is central because climate risks and financial barriers are unevenly distributed. Women may face constraints in land rights, mobility, income and access to agricultural extension. Indigenous communities may have distinct governance systems and knowledge relationships with land and water. Informal workers and landless households may be excluded from asset-based interventions. Finance mechanisms should therefore specify participation standards, representation thresholds, accessible meeting arrangements

and transparent beneficiary criteria. They should also ensure that local committees have procedures for recording decisions and resolving conflicts.

Procedural equity also requires that community participation is not used to transfer unpaid labour or administrative burden to people already coping with risk. Where local organisations are expected to manage grants, they should receive appropriate overhead support, training and compensation for coordination work. Transparent disclosure of budgets, selection criteria and project progress can reduce the risk of elite capture and build confidence. Complaint channels should be independent enough to allow people to raise concerns without fear of retaliation.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Locally led finance requires decision-making authority, not only community consultation after priorities have been fixed.
- Inclusion measures should address power differences, rights, language, accessibility and the cost of participation.
- Local organisations need operational support and safeguarding capacity, not merely responsibility for implementation.

5.3 FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS, RISK ALLOCATION AND BLENDED APPROACHES

The choice of financial instrument shapes both access and fairness. Grants are generally appropriate where adaptation provides public goods, protects ecosystems, reduces disaster losses or benefits households unable to assume repayment risk. Examples include community drainage, mangrove restoration, local early-warning systems, public water infrastructure and climate-resilient public facilities. Concessional loans may be appropriate for revenue-generating activities, such as resilient small enterprises, irrigation services, cold storage, energy access or value-chain improvements, provided repayment assumptions are realistic and do not exclude poorer groups.

Blended finance can play a role when public and concessional resources reduce risks that would otherwise prevent private investment. However, blended structures should not be treated as a universal solution. They need clear additionality, transparent risk sharing and

safeguards against subsidising activities that would have occurred without public support. In community settings, the use of guarantees, revolving funds or matching grants should be designed to avoid debt traps and to protect people whose livelihoods are highly sensitive to climate variability.

Risk allocation should be explicit. Climate shocks can reduce incomes precisely when repayment is due, and insurance products may be difficult to understand or inaccessible after loss events. Financial mechanisms should include grace periods, contingency provisions, flexible repayment where appropriate, and links to social-protection systems. Funders should avoid measuring success only through leverage or repayment volume. A responsible

assessment should ask whether finance reduced vulnerability, strengthened adaptive capacity and preserved dignity without exposing households or local institutions to unmanageable obligations.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Grant finance remains essential for community adaptation activities that create public benefits or protect highly vulnerable groups.
- Concessional and blended instruments should be used only where benefits, revenues and repayment risks are realistic and equitable.
- Risk-sharing arrangements should prevent climate shocks from becoming debt crises for households or local institutions.

Table 3: Community-Level Adaptation Finance Evaluation Matrix

Finance Dimension	Primary Risk	Responsible Practice	Evidence / Control
Access	Complex procedures, high transaction costs and delayed disbursement	Use simplified local-language applications, technical assistance and proportionate reporting.	Access pathway map; service standards; disbursement tracking.
Local ownership	Top-down project selection and weak community authority	Devolve priority setting and selection through transparent local decision processes.	Documented criteria; meeting records; community oversight body.
Instrument suitability	Inappropriate debt or financial products for public-benefit adaptation	Match grants, concessional finance and risk-sharing tools to project economics and social purpose.	Instrument rationale; affordability test; contingency arrangements.
Equity	Elite capture or exclusion of vulnerable groups	Apply inclusion targets, accessible participation and transparent beneficiary rules.	Disaggregated participation data; grievance log; independent review.
Safeguards	Environmental harm, displacement or maladaptation	Conduct proportionate social, environmental and gender safeguards before implementation.	Safeguard screening; mitigation plan; community consent records.
Accountability	Opaque use of funds and no remedy for harm	Disclose budgets and progress, assign responsibilities and provide complaint channels.	Public dashboard; audit trail; corrective-action register.
Durability	Short-term assets without maintenance or learning support	Fund operations, maintenance, capacity building and adaptive management.	Maintenance plan; post-project review; follow-up financing pathway.

5.4 SAFEGUARDS, ACCOUNTABILITY AND PROTECTION AGAINST MALADAPTATION

Adaptation finance should be assessed for who benefits, who bears risk and whether an intervention may create new forms of vulnerability. Infrastructure designed to protect one area can redirect flooding elsewhere. Conservation projects can restrict access to land or resources if rights are not respected. Credit schemes can increase stress where climate shocks interrupt income. These risks underline the need for safeguards that are practical at local scale but sufficiently robust to identify foreseeable harms. Screening should include environmental, social, gender, disability-inclusion and rights considerations, with intensified review for projects involving land, relocation, sensitive ecosystems or high-risk livelihoods.

Accountability is strongest when it is continuous. Funders, intermediaries and local implementers should agree on responsibilities for procurement, financial management, technical quality, safeguard compliance, participation and grievance handling. Communities should be able to see how funds are allocated and spent in formats that are understandable locally. Monitoring should include qualitative feedback, not only financial reports and physical outputs. An accessible grievance mechanism can identify problems early, including exclusion, contractor failure, misuse of funds or unintended environmental impacts.

Protection against maladaptation also requires a long-term perspective. Projects should assess how climate conditions may change over their intended life and whether the intervention could lock communities into inflexible or high-maintenance solutions. Nature-based approaches, diversified livelihoods, climate services and flexible local planning can sometimes offer more adaptive options than single-purpose infrastructure. The appropriate solution will depend on context, but finance should create space for revision when evidence shows that an approach is not delivering the expected resilience benefits.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Safeguards should be proportionate but should not be omitted for small projects

where rights, ecosystems or livelihoods may be affected.

- Transparent budgets, local oversight and accessible grievance mechanisms are essential elements of accountable finance.
- Adaptive management helps prevent maladaptation by allowing project design to change in response to evidence and community feedback.

5.5 MONITORING ADAPTATION RESULTS AND LEARNING

Measuring adaptation outcomes is challenging because resilience is dynamic, context-specific and influenced by many factors beyond a single project. Yet the difficulty of measurement should not lead to a narrow focus on easy-to-count outputs. The number of water tanks, training sessions or hectares restored can be useful, but these indicators do not alone show whether households have safer water access during drought, whether evacuation systems reach people with disabilities, or whether women have greater voice in local resource decisions.

A balanced monitoring framework should combine outputs, intermediate outcomes and process indicators. Quantitative measures can track households reached, assets installed, ecosystem area restored, time saved, losses avoided, service reliability or access to climate information. Qualitative and participatory methods can capture local perceptions of risk, decision-making quality, maintenance challenges, cultural acceptability and unintended effects. Disaggregated data should be used where relevant to assess whether benefits reach groups facing differentiated risks.

Learning must be financed as part of implementation. Local partners need resources to document experience, convene reflection meetings, adapt work plans and share lessons across communities. Funders should treat honest reporting of challenges as a sign of responsible management rather than a failure. A finance system that permits learning can improve future project design, strengthen local capacity and avoid repeating ineffective approaches. This is particularly important as climate impacts intensify and historical experience becomes a less reliable guide to future conditions.

KEY OBSERVATION:

- Adaptation measurement should combine physical outputs with evidence on reduced risk, equity, local capacity and decision-making quality.
- Participatory monitoring can reveal benefits and harms that standard reporting systems may overlook.
- Finance for learning, maintenance and adaptive management strengthens the durability of community-level adaptation.

6. DISCUSSION

The analysis indicates that community-level adaptation finance cannot be understood as a final delivery step after global or national climate commitments are made. It is a system of choices about eligibility, authority, risk, instruments, timing, safeguards and evidence. A programme may have a large budget but still fail to support vulnerable communities if decisions are centralised, procedures are inaccessible or resources are restricted to capital assets without support for maintenance and local capacity. Conversely, a modest community grant can have significant value when it is timely, locally prioritised, inclusive and connected to wider public planning.

Access and accountability should not be presented as opposing objectives. The choice is not between highly centralised control and unstructured local spending. Effective systems can combine simplified procedures for small projects with clear selection criteria, trained local intermediaries, public disclosure, proportionate audits and grievance mechanisms. Enhanced direct access, decentralised climate facilities and local-government grant windows provide practical models for bringing decisions closer to communities while retaining fiduciary responsibility. The critical design issue is whether accountability mechanisms strengthen local agency or simply reproduce the barriers that prevent communities from accessing finance.

Equity is also a practical condition for effectiveness. Projects designed without attention to land rights, gender, disability, ethnicity, income, migration status or informal tenure may benefit relatively secure groups while leaving highly exposed people behind. Inclusive governance and disaggregated monitoring are not administrative add-ons;

they help ensure that finance addresses the actual distribution of vulnerability. Funders should therefore set expectations for participatory processes and representation while allowing communities to select culturally appropriate methods for meeting those expectations.

The discussion further highlights the limits of debt-led adaptation. Loans, guarantees and blended finance can be useful in specific contexts, especially for resilient enterprises and services with reliable revenue. However, they should not replace grants for public goods, basic services, ecosystem protection or actions serving households with limited repayment capacity. Adaptation finance that increases debt vulnerability can undermine the resilience it seeks to create. The principle of instrument suitability requires that repayment and risk are borne by actors with the capacity to manage them, not shifted downward to communities already exposed to climate shocks.

Finally, community-level finance should be connected to broader climate-resilient development. Local projects cannot substitute for national investments in social protection, health systems, infrastructure, land-use planning, climate services and disaster preparedness. Their strength lies in translating these wider systems into locally meaningful action and feedback. Governments, climate funds and development partners should therefore use community-level programmes not as isolated pilot projects, but as durable components of adaptation planning with predictable funding, institutional support and mechanisms for replication where communities choose to scale successful approaches.

7. CONCLUSION

Climate finance for community-level adaptation projects is essential for translating climate commitments into practical protection for people, livelihoods, ecosystems and local services. This study finds that the most important principles are equitable access, locally determined priorities, appropriate financial instruments, inclusive participation, proportionate safeguards, transparent accountability and sustained support for maintenance and learning. These principles apply across rural, urban, coastal, mountain

and Indigenous contexts, although the specific forms of finance and governance must reflect local realities.

The research confirms that finance volume is necessary but not sufficient. Resources can be committed at national or international level while remaining inaccessible to communities because of complex procedures, weak local capacity, delayed disbursement, unsuitable loan terms or centralised decision-making. Effective climate finance should therefore be evaluated through its delivery pathway: whether people facing climate risk can understand it, influence it, use it safely and

sustain its benefits without taking on unfair burdens.

A responsible community-level adaptation finance framework combines simplified access with strong governance, grants for public-benefit adaptation, careful use of concessional and blended instruments, inclusion of groups facing differentiated risks, safeguards against harm, and monitoring that supports learning. By embedding these elements in programmes and institutions, climate-finance providers can strengthen community agency while improving transparency, resilience and long-term development outcomes.

8. REFERENCES

1. Adger, W. N. (2003). *Social capital, collective action, and adaptation to climate change*. *Economic Geography*, 79(4), 387–404.
2. Agrawal, A. (2008). *The role of local institutions in adaptation to climate change*. World Bank Social Development Notes, No. 118. <https://documents.worldbank.org/>
3. Adaptation Fund. (2023). *Annual Performance Report 2023*. <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/>
4. Ayers, J., & Forsyth, T. (2009). *Community-based adaptation to climate change: Strengthening resilience through development*. *Environment*, 51(4), 22–31.
5. Barnett, J., & O'Neill, S. (2010). *Maladaptation*. *Global Environmental Change*, 20(2), 211–213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2009.11.004>
6. Berkes, F., & Ross, H. (2013). *Community resilience: Toward an integrated approach*. *Society & Natural Resources*, 26(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2012.736605>
7. Climate Policy Initiative. (2023). *Global Landscape of Climate Finance 2023*. <https://www.climatepolicyinitiative.org/>
8. Coger, T., Corry, E., Gregerson, J., & Reinsborough, M. (2021). *Locally Led Adaptation: From Principles to Practice*. World Resources Institute. <https://www.wri.org/>
9. Eriksen, S., Aldunce, P., Bahinipati, C. S., Martins, R. D., Molefe, J. I., Nhemachena, C., O'Brien, K., Olorunfemi, F., Park, J., Sygna, L., & Ulsrud, K. (2011). *When not every response to climate change is a good one: Identifying principles for sustainable adaptation*. *Climate and Development*, 3(1), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.3763/cdev.2010.0060>
10. Fankhauser, S., & McDermott, T. K. J. (2014). *Understanding the adaptation deficit: Why are poor countries more vulnerable to climate events than rich countries?* *Global Environmental Change*, 27, 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.014>
11. Global Commission on Adaptation. (2019). *Adapt Now: A Global Call for Leadership on Climate Resilience*. <https://gca.org/>
12. Green Climate Fund. (2021). *Enhancing Direct Access Guidelines*. <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/eda-guidelines>
13. Green Climate Fund. (2025). *Enhancing Direct Access*. <https://www.greenclimate.fund/access-funding/other-funding-options/rfp/enhancing-direct-access>
14. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg2/>
15. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report*. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/>
16. International Institute for Environment and Development. (2017). *Delivering Real Change: Getting International Climate Finance to the Local Level*. <https://www.iied.org/>
17. Kates, R. W., Travis, W. R., & Wilbanks, T. J. (2012). *Transformational adaptation when incremental adaptations to climate change are insufficient*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(19), 7156–7161. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1115521109>

18. Mechler, R. (2005). *Cost-benefit analysis of natural disaster risk management in developing countries*. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit. <https://www.preventionweb.net/>
19. Moser, S. C., & Ekstrom, J. A. (2010). A framework to diagnose barriers to climate change adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(51), 22026–22031. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1007887107>
20. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). *Climate Finance Provided and Mobilised by Developed Countries in 2016–2020*. OECD Publishing. <https://www.oecd.org/>
21. Pelling, M. (2011). *Adaptation to Climate Change: From Resilience to Transformation*. Routledge.
22. Satterthwaite, D., Archer, D., Colenbrander, S., Dodman, D., Hardoy, J., Mitlin, D., & Patel, S. (2020). Building resilience to climate change in informal settlements. *One Earth*, 2(2), 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.02.002>
23. Soanes, M., Rai, N., Steele, P., Shakya, C., & Macgregor, J. (2017). *Delivering Real Change: Getting International Climate Finance to the Local Level*. IIED. <https://www.iied.org/>
24. Tanner, T., & Allouche, J. (2011). Towards a new political economy of climate change and development. *IDS Bulletin*, 42(3), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2011.00217.x>
25. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2015). *Paris Agreement*. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf
26. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2023). *Global Stocktake: First Global Stocktake Decision*. <https://unfccc.int/>
27. United Nations Environment Programme. (2024). *Adaptation Gap Report 2024: Come Hell and High Water*. <https://www.unep.org/resources/adaptation-gap-report-2024>
28. United Nations Environment Programme. (2025). *Adaptation Gap Report 2025: Running on Empty*. <https://www.unep.org/resources/adaptation-gap-report-2025>
29. World Bank. (2021). *Climate Change Action Plan 2021–2025: Supporting Green, Resilient and Inclusive Development*. <https://www.worldbank.org/>
30. World Resources Institute. (2021). *Principles for Locally Led Adaptation*. <https://www.wri.org/initiatives/locally-led-adaptation>