United States Biennial Submission on Strategies and Approaches for Scaling up Climate Finance
November 2014

I. Introduction

The United States is pleased to submit this Biennial Submission on our strategies and approaches for scaling up climate finance in accordance with COP Decision 3/CP.19. This submission builds on and provides updates to our October 2013 Submission.[1]

Mobilizing climate finance is a major priority of the United States. After meeting our fast start finance commitment, we are now working towards the collective goal of mobilizing $100 billion in climate finance per year by 2020, from a wide variety of public and private, bilateral and multilateral sources, to address the needs of developing countries in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation. Continuing U.S. leadership in this area, President Obama recently announced that the United States intends to contribute $3 billion to the Green Climate Fund's initial capitalization, with a significant portion aimed at supporting the Private Sector Facility. In order to encourage maximum support by other donors, the overall U.S. contribution is not to exceed 30 percent of total confirmed pledges.[2]

Facilitating developing countries' transition to low-carbon, climate-resilient (LCCR) development will require both public and private finance. To this end, the United States takes a multifaceted approach to scaling up climate finance that involves assembling a mix of instruments and interventions to match each country's unique needs and circumstances. Broadly, this approach includes:

- Using a range of public instruments and bilateral and multilateral entities to channel our resources and strategically mobilize additional climate finance
- Financing activities that build lasting resilience and adaptive capacity
- Enhancing coordination between partner countries and institutions
- Reducing support for high-carbon investments

Ensuring a robust core of public finance will continue to be vital to this effort, especially in areas where private investment is more challenging to mobilize, such as in less developed markets. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2013, U.S. public climate finance amounted to nearly $2.7 billion, an increase from 2012 as well as the average over the 2010-2012 Fast Start Finance (FSF) period.[3] Table 1 provides a snapshot of U.S. public climate finance from FY2010-2013.

The United States is committed to playing a leadership role in using public finance effectively and efficiently. However, any public financial instrument and intervention's ability to mobilize and deploy additional finance depends largely on the broader policy framework in place in developing countries. This can involve climate-specific policies, such as energy sector regulations and carbon pricing, as well as broader, non-climate specific policies and legal frameworks. The United States remains committed to

[1] https://unfccc.int/files/documentation/submissions_from_parties/application/pdf/cop_suf_usa_07102013.pdf.
2 Further information can be found online at: http://wh.gov/iaWJE.
[3] Further information related to multilateral, bilateral, and regional contributions related to the implementation of the UNFCCC can be found in Annex I. Annex II provides information related to the programming policies and priorities for Congressionally appropriated grant-based assistance.

working with development partners to identify complementary solutions for addressing domestic investment barriers and achieving their LCCR development strategies.

Table 1. U.S. climate finance from 2010-2013 (in US$ millions)[4]

Channel	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Congressionally Appropriated Grant-based Assistance	1,587.9	1,884.1	1,261.7	1,217.4	5,951.1
Development Finance	155.1	1,114.8	721.6	1,210.8	3,202.3
Export Credit	253.2	194.7	301.2	228.1	977.2
Total	**1,996.2**	**3,193.6**	**2,284.5**	**2,656.3**	**10,130.6**

Note: these figures do not include U.S. contributions to the ordinary capital resources of Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), part of which are used to finance climate-specific activities in developing countries, or contributions to non-climate- or environment-specific multilateral funds that finance climate-related investments (e.g. Global Agriculture and Food Security Program).

II. Using a range of public instruments and bilateral and multilateral channels to strategically mobilize finance

The U.S. is using a range of public financial instruments and interventions to mobilize climate finance via a diverse set of bilateral and multilateral channels. These include 1) grant-based technical assistance; 2) risk mitigation tools; and 3) low-cost, long tenor debt financing. Table 2 provides an overview of these instruments as well as a rationale for how they help to address specific financing barriers and mobilize climate finance.

Table 2. Overview and rationale of U.S. climate finance strategies for mobilizing climate finance

Strategy	Rationale	Examples
A. Grant-based technical assistance	Investment into LCCR development requires the presence of both viable investment opportunities and appropriate domestic enabling environments. Technical assistance can help developing countries strengthen their investment policy frameworks, develop national or sectoral LCCR strategies, and increase their readiness to access available funds. It can also be used to help develop an investment-ready project pipeline by supporting feasibility studies and project preparation costs.	In the clean energy sector, this may include helping countries develop and implement regulatory measures such as feed-in tariffs or surveying energy resources and grid infrastructure needs. For sustainable landscapes this may include helping countries improve land use to promote climate smart agriculture. For adaptation, this may include integrating adaptation into national planning and development policies, including land use reform or floodplain management.

[4] Congressionally appropriated grant-based assistance is channeled through USAID, State, Treasury, MCC, and other USG agencies; Development finance is channeled through the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC); Export credit is channeled through the Export-Import Bank.

B. Risk mitigation tools	Even with the right regulatory policies and incentives in place, it can be difficult to attract both foreign and domestic investors looking to support new technologies in emerging markets. Risk mitigation products are often unavailable or otherwise too expensive to access domestically.	Political risk insurance, regulatory risk insurance, first loss equity, and partial risk guarantees.
C. Low-cost, long-tenor debt financing	Many climate projects are sensitive to financing costs, particularly the cost of debt, especially because of their high upfront capital requirements. Working with relatively new technologies in developing markets where interest rates are high, project developers often struggle to access the large amount of low-cost financing they require. Developed countries, benefitting from their low cost of borrowing, can help channel low-cost, longer term loans not otherwise available.	Debt financing with tenors, terms, and or rates not otherwise available from the market.

The following sections provide examples of how the United States is working to utilize these instruments and tools to mobilize climate finance. While a given initiative or institution may be used to illustrate one particular instrument (e.g. provision of low-cost, long-tenor debt financing), many institutions and initiatives provide cross-cutting support through a range of instruments and interventions.

A. Grant-based technical assistance

The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) leads on delivery of targeted technical assistance to cultivate stronger enabling environments in developing countries, facilitate the development of country-driven national and sectoral LCCR strategies, and develop investment-ready project pipelines. In 2013, support was provided via USAID, the U.S. Department of State, the U.S. Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), and other U.S. Government agencies. The below examples illustrate efforts currently underway.

<u>Cultivating stronger enabling environment in developing countries</u>

Low Emission Development Strategies

In 2010, the United States launched the Enhancing Capacity for Low Emission Development Strategies (EC-LEDS) program. EC-LEDS brings to bear technical expertise and resources from several U.S. government agencies to support developing countries' national efforts to pursue long-term,

What is a LEDS?
A LEDS is an economy-wide national strategic analysis and planning process for promoting economic growth while reducing long-term GHG emission trajectories. At a practical level, a LEDS is the strategic framework, based on sound analytical foundations, that articulates concrete actions, policies, programs, and implementation plans to help a country achieve its development goals in a way that lowers its GHG emissions from what they would be if the country carried on with business as usual. Because each country has unique national circumstances and priorities, each country develops and drives its own LEDS approach.

transformative development while slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions. The program is implementing official partnerships with more than 20 countries to help these countries identify and pursue the unique portfolio of low-carbon solutions that make most sense for them.[5]

The LEDS Global Partnership, an initiative the United States helped successfully launch in 2011 to enhance coordination, information exchange, and cooperation among programs and countries working to advance low emissions growth, brings together more than 140 government and international institutions. One aspect of this partnership is the LEDS Expert Assistance on Finance that provides targeted technical assistance on financing strategies, policies, or programs in support of LEDS.

Facilitating the development of country-driven resilience strategies

Coastal Community Adaptation Program

The United States also provides targeted technical assistance to developing countries as they work to enhance resilience and adaptive capacity. One effort that highlights our approaches in this area is USAID's Coastal Community Adaptation Program (C-CAP), a five-year, $23.6 million project being implemented across the Pacific Island nations that aims to build local capacity for disaster risk reduction and preparedness, and integrate climate resilient policies and practices into long-term land use plans and building standards. The policies developed through this initiative will serve as a positive signal to the public and private sectors that may be considering further LCCR infrastructure and project finance in the region.

Developing an investment-ready project pipeline

CTI Private Finance Advisory Network

In order to stimulate the development of viable LCCR investment opportunities, the United States provides a range of technical assistance to support project feasibility studies, preparation costs, and business plan development. For example, the CTI Private Financing Advisory Network (CTI PFAN) is a USAID-supported platform that helps promising clean energy entrepreneurs in developing countries to develop a business plan and investment pitch, connect with private investors, and ultimately secure financing.

Since 2006, over 240 clean energy projects have been inducted into the CTI PFAN Project Development Pipeline. To date, 45 of these projects have successfully achieved financial closure, attracting over $544 million of investment. These projects include biogas, biomass, waste to energy, clean transport, wind, solar, small hydro and energy efficiency initiatives that, collectively, have the potential to mitigate over 2 million tons of CO_2e per year and provide over 396 MW of clean generation capacity.

[5] EC-LEDS country partners include Albania, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Gabon, Georgia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Macedonia, Malawi, Mexico, Moldova, Peru, the Philippines, Serbia, South Africa, Thailand, Ukraine, Vietnam and Zambia.

U.S.-Africa Clean Energy Finance Initiative

The U.S.-Africa Clean Energy Finance Initiative (U.S.-ACEF) is a joint program between the U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Trade and Development Agency (USTDA). Recognizing that early-stage project development risks often jeopardize project bankability, U.S.-ACEF seeks to address sub-Saharan Africa's acute energy needs by providing early-stage project development support to ensure that renewable energy and energy efficiency projects reach financial close and mobilize significant private investment.

The demand for U.S.-ACEF funds has been strong to date. It was originally estimated that it would take five years to deploy the initial $20 million commitment, but, by the end of this year, we will have already committed this initial tranche to support more than 25 projects across 10 African countries. This project preparation support is expected to unlock hundreds of millions of public and private finance that would not otherwise flow. Building on the successes of the initial $20 million commitment, on August 5, 2014, Secretary of State Kerry announced the intention to commit an additional $10 million in U.S. Department of State funding to the initiative. U.S.-ACEF continues to demonstrate how a very limited amount of early-stage public resources – when surgically applied – can catalyze a much larger pool of finance that can bring climate projects to fruition at scale.

Providing long-term technical and policy support

Climate Fellows

Through the Climate Fellows program, the United States provides long-term technical support to key countries seeking develop and implement strategies for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+). Climate Fellows are experts who provide long-term technical support to REDD+ country ministries, helping develop policies, implement programs, and refine data and systems. By working day to day with host country governments, Climate Fellows assist in advancing the development and implementation of their REDD+ strategies while contributing to enhancing the technical skills and knowledge of national REDD+ teams. The program of work of each Fellow varies, and is based on the specific needs and priorities of the host country governments. Fellows also draw on a network of additional technical experts to provide targeted technical support, and will share experiences among the broader Climate Fellows network to ensure innovations and lessons learned benefit other REDD+ stakeholders.

Building capacity through multilateral climate funds

The United States is a major contributor to multilateral climate funds that provide grant-based technical assistance (e.g., Global Environment Facility (GEF), Least Developed Country Fund (LDCF), the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Fund, and the BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes (ISFL)). Earlier this year, the United States contributed $27.02 million to the LDCF and $10 million to the SCCF. This brings our total contributions (FY 2010-FY 2013) to $107.02 million for the LDCF and $50 million for the SCCF. We have contributed $23 million to the FCPF and $25 million to ISFL to date; these trust funds are currently capitalized at $860 million and $311 million to date. In April 2014, the United States pledged $546.4 million to the sixth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund (GEF-6). Collectively, GEF-6 secured $4.43 billion in pledges from more than 30 countries.

The GEF also supports a range of activities related to climate change beyond capacity building. In the current cycle of GEF funding, the climate change mitigation focal area will broadly focus on i) promoting innovation, technology transfer, and supportive policies and strategies; ii) demonstrating mitigation options with systemic impacts; and iii) fostering enabling conditions to mainstream mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies. However, the GEF will continue to support low-carbon and climate resilient development, through other work areas, such as the Sustainable Forest Management/REDD+ focal areas, and its ongoing support for adaptation via the LDCF and SCCF. During GEF-6, three integrated approach pilots (IAPs) are also being implemented that work to achieve the objectives of the FCCC in an integrated manner with other environmental objectives. The IAPs are: Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa; Sustainable Cities; and Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains

B. Risk mitigation tools

The United States provides risk mitigation instruments to support LCCR investment through multiple channels. These include grant-based assistance, development finance, export credit, and other incremental cost financing that helps to address the viability gap that may remain. For example, our development finance institution, OPIC, has been one of the most innovative public finance institutions in the world in developing risk mitigation products to enable climate action. As with technical assistance, application of specific risk mitigation tools is driven by country and region-specific circumstances.

Piloting innovative approaches to enhance the financial viability of LCCR projects

Pilot Auction Facility for Methane and Climate Change Mitigation

Launched in September 2014, the Pilot Auction Facility for Methane and Climate Change Mitigation (PAF) aims to increase investor confidence in methane abatement projects. The World Bank will oversee the facility and will auction zero-coupon tradable putable bonds. Specifically, developers of low-carbon projects will competitively bid for a price guarantee for emission reductions from projects that cut methane emissions from key sources including landfills, animal waste, and wastewater treatment facilities. The competitive nature of the auction reveals the minimum incremental price required by the private sector to make such investments. It will directly catalyze private investment, and in contrast to grants and loans, will only disburse financial support after emission reductions have been verified. The U.S. intends to contribute $15 million to the PAF, subject to Congressional appropriation. If successful, this novel approach to providing incremental cost financing to incentivize private sector investment may hold significant potential for replication with other pollutants or via other institutions.

Developing innovative risk mitigation products

R4 Rural Resilience Initiative

USAID is also actively engaged in the development of risk management tools, including by piloting new insurance approaches to help poor farmers manage weather risks. In Senegal, for example, USAID is investing $8 million through the World Food Programme in the R4 Rural Resilience Initiative, which overcomes cash constraints by enabling the poorest farmers to pay for insurance with their labor by working on community risk reduction projects, such as improved irrigation or soil management. In 2014, R4 in Senegal reached 6,000 participants and plans to double this in 2015. Building on this experience, the World Food Programme is exploring ways to fund R4 in future years without USG support and is

planning to expand the R4 approach in Malawi and Zambia. The insurance company Swiss Re is also providing funding for R4.

Althelia Climate Fund

Innovation in U.S. risk mitigation tools extends to sustainable landscapes as well. For example, in order to address a market barrier to investment in forest conservation, USAID's Development Credit Authority (DCA) worked with Althelia Climate Fund to structure a partial loan portfolio guarantee. This partnership is expected to unlock investments by providing the added risk support needed to encourage additional lending for project development to communities working to protect the world's tropical forests. These loans will eventually be repaid through revenue from productive activities and the sale of carbon credits. Specifically, $5.7 million in U.S. funding is expected to leverage over $133 million of private sector capital.

Green Guaranties

In September of 2014, the U.S. OPIC issued its first-ever Green Guaranty. Meeting the requirements of the Green Bond Principles of 2014, OPIC Green Guaranties finance renewable energy projects supported by OPIC. This OPIC Green Guaranty supports the construction of the Luz del Norte solar PV project in Chile – which will be, when completed, the largest photovoltaic project in Latin America. Green Guaranties are another tool by which OPIC mobilizes private capital to generate both social and financial returns. By the end of 1Q 2015, OPIC estimates it will have over $100m in Green Guaranties outstanding in support of climate friendly transactions, and OPIC will endeavor to scale up Green Guaranties in the future.

C. Low-cost, long-tenor debt financing

Access to debt financing at rates and/or tenors not otherwise available is provided through OPIC, the U.S. Export-Import (Ex-Im) Bank, and our contributions to multilateral development banks (MDBs). Financial support from these public institutions can make the critical difference in the viability of many LCCR investments in developing countries.

Providing access to debt financing through OPIC

Under the Obama Administration, OPIC has become one of the world's largest financiers of clean energy projects in developing countries, committing more than $3.2 billion over the last five years to renewable energy projects. In addition to its standard debt products, OPIC also provides senior secured loans to private equity funds (making it one of the largest supporters of private equity funds in developing countries), and political risk insurance to project lenders and equity investors operating in emerging markets.

Scaling up LCCR export-credits through Ex-Im

The U.S. Ex-Im Bank continues to scale up its competitively-priced, long-tenor climate-related financing. Although total financing in any given year is variable due to the impact of individual large projects, Ex-Im has increased renewable-energy authorizations in every year in comparison with FY 2008 ($30.4 million). In FY 2013 alone, Ex-Im provided over $200 million of support to climate-specific activities in developing countries, not including the private finance mobilized by this public support. In FY 2014, Ex-Im

authorized approximately $65 million in financing for wind turbines at two adjacent wind farms in Peru. The projects represent Ex-Im Bank's first renewable-energy transactions in Peru. Ex-Im financing for the projects was critical because of a lack of commercial bank long-term credit with fixed-rate pricing for renewable energy project financings in Peru.

Deploying concessional loans through multilateral channels

Multilateral Development Banks

The MDBs and multilateral climate funds are expanding low-cost, long-tenor lending to LCCR projects and thereby attracting significant private sector co-financing. In fact, MDBs have significantly scaled up their climate financing activities. The MDBs use grants, loans, guarantees, equity, and performance-based instruments to finance projects in, inter alia, energy efficiency, renewable energy, transport, agriculture, and forestry. In 2013 alone, MDBs provided nearly $ 22 billion of their own resources to address climate change.

Climate Investment Funds

In terms of multilateral funding, the Clean Technology Fund (CTF) provides middle income countries with highly concessional resources to explore options to scale up the demonstration, deployment, and transfer of low carbon technologies in renewable energy, energy efficiency, and sustainable transport. In 2013, the CTF approved $881 million to be provided to a portfolio of projects totaling over $14 billion. As of June 2014, the CTF has approved a total of over $3.5 billion to be provided as part of total project investments of $33 billion.

Another example that highlights our current approach is our support for the Scaling-Up Renewable Energy Program (SREP) under the CIFs. SREP aims to scale up the deployment of renewable energy solutions and expand renewable markets in the world's poorest countries. Channeled through the MDBs as grants and near-zero interest loans, the SREP is country-led and builds on national policies and energy initiatives. In 2013, the SREP approved $18 million to be provided to a portfolio of projects totaling over $54 million. As of June 2014, the SREP has approved a total of over $75 million to be provided as part of total project investments of $578 million.

III. Building lasting resilience and adaptive capacity

The United States is committed to helping vulnerable countries adapt to climate change and enhance resilience of their communities and economies. U.S. financial support for adaptation has increased eightfold since 2009. From fiscal year (FY) 2010 to FY2013, the United States has provided roughly $1.8 billion in adaptation assistance to developing countries. We aim to continue to increase our support for dedicated adaptation funding, since such funding is critical to managing the risks posed by climate change in vulnerable countries.

At the same time, the magnitude of the challenge requires not just dedicated adaptation finance flows but also a broader, integrated approach. It is essential to incorporate adaptation considerations into international investment and development. Consistent with this need, on September 23, President

Obama issued an executive order mandating federal agencies to take climate change impacts into account in all U.S. international development work.[6] Development investments in areas as diverse as eradicating malaria, building hydropower facilities, improving agricultural yields, and developing transportation systems will not be effective in the long term if they do not account for impacts such as shifting ranges of disease-carrying mosquitoes, changing water availability, or rising sea levels.

Supporting the development of country-driven adaptation strategies

In addition to our dedicated adaptation funding, as well as efforts to incorporate adaptation into our broader efforts, the United States has supported National Adaptation Plan (NAP) processes in several developing countries. USAID provides technical support to countries to make their own decisions on how to address the impacts of climate change. Our experience so far demonstrates that countries see the NAPs fundamentally as a planning process – with the goal of mainstreaming climate change into national and sector planning and development in a continuous, progressive, integrated, and iterative manner.

USAID has supported coordination, policy development, technical assistance, and other activities in a number of developing countries to help advance the NAP process. One example of these efforts is in Jamaica. Jamaica launched their NAP process with a workshop in Kingston in July 2012. Jamaica's NAP takes the form of a national climate policy that addresses adaptation and mitigation. One hundred and fifty people attended and helped build support for the NAP process across Jamaica's government and with stakeholders and development partners. Stakeholders developed inputs for a policy framework that will enable Jamaica to address climate risks while achieving the goals of its Vision 2030 Jamaica: National Development Plan, which is intended to enable Jamaica to become a developed country by 2030. Building on the momentum from the workshop, Jamaica has developed a national climate change policy that shares responsibilities for addressing climate risks across sector ministries; those responsibilities will be codified in updated sector plans.

Providing tools for data-driven adaptation approaches

Information on the weather and climate is important for adaptation decision making and planning. Yet, such information is often incomplete in developing countries. The U.S. is investing in weather data recovery and in building the capacity of meteorological services to enable developing countries to provide this crucial information. In the Caribbean, the U.S. is investing in the Caribbean Institute for Meteorology and Hydrology, a regional center of excellence that supports the countries of the region with data and training. The U.S. also helped Jamaica develop a drought forecast tool to help farmers plan ahead for dry conditions. In Africa, we are supporting the development of hybrid data sets that combine satellite data with station data to provide richer historical weather records. We also support a community of practice, the Climate Services Partnership, which enables climate information providers and users to share lessons among themselves. All of these efforts are aimed at increasing the quality and usefulness of climate information in the belief that, with better information, more robust decisions can be made leading to smarter investments.

[6] Executive Order – Climate Resilient International Development, http://wh.gov/ilyI6

Enhancing resilience through multilateral channels

The International Development Association (IDA) 17 replenishment summary of conclusions and recommendations also reflect the need to integrate climate considerations. Specifically, participants in the replenishment requested that:

- All IDA country partnership frameworks incorporate climate and disaster risk considerations into the analysis of the country's development challenges and priorities and, when agreed with the country, incorporate such considerations in the content of the programs and results framework;
- Management screen all new IDA operations for short- and long-term climate change and disaster risks and, where risks exist, integrate appropriate resilience measures; and
- IDA scale up support to IDA countries to develop and implement country-led, multi-sectoral plans and investments for managing climate and disaster risk in development in at least 25 additional IDA countries.

Separately, the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Board has agreed to aim for a 50:50 balance between adaptation and mitigation, on a grant-equivalent basis, over time. Recognizing and prioritizing the needs of those most vulnerable to climate change, a minimum of 50% of this adaptation funding will be reserved for particularly vulnerable countries, namely African states, Least Developed Countries, and Small Island Developing States.

IV. Enhancing coordination between partner countries and institutions

Mobilizing climate finance at scale is a global challenge that requires action by all players. A key element of the U.S. Strategy to mobilize climate finance is to pursue joint efforts and work collaboratively with other countries and institutions. The sections below provide illustrative examples of the numerous joint initiatives currently underway, many of which intend to mobilize additional climate finance.

Coordinating public mobilization efforts

Climate Finance Mobilization initiative

The Climate Finance Mobilization initiative brings together ministers and senior officials across governments to coordinate efforts to accelerate the scale up and mobilization of climate finance. The initiative underscores the high-level commitment made by developed countries towards the goal of mobilizing $100 billion per year by 2020 from all sources in the context of meaningful and transparent action by developing countries. To facilitate this effort, the initiative serves as a platform for identifying and developing the most effective ways to use public resources and policies to 'crowd-in' the additional capital required to support developing countries' transition to LCCR economies.

Launched in Washington, D.C. in April 2013, the Climate Finance Mobilization initiative has held subsequent meetings in Copenhagen in October 2013 and New York in September 2014. The initiative's work streams focus on how to best coordinate public mobilization efforts amongst and between three distinct but complementary types of public financial institutions: development finance institutions, multilateral development banks, and export credit agencies.

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development Export-Credit Group

At the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), ECAs along with relevant governmental authorities are continuing discussions on how export credits can be better used to mobilize finance to address climate changes. For instance, in June 2014 the Participants to the Arrangement on Officially Supported Export Credits agreed to allow longer loan tenors for adaptation projects. Since 2005, the Participants have offered extended terms for renewable energy projects, and a few years later the group agreed to allow extended repayment terms to projects that can mitigate climate change, such as plants that deploy carbon capture and storage, waste to energy projects, hybrid power plants using fossil fuel substitution, efficient combined heat and power projects, and district heating and cooling plants. Longer repayment terms for green energy and infrastructure projects can make these projects more competitive and attractive to other sources of climate finance.

Collaborating to pioneer innovative approaches for mobilizing private investment

The Global Innovation Lab for Climate Finance

The Global Innovation Lab for Climate Finance (the "Lab") is a public-private initiative to identify and pilot cutting edge climate finance instruments to unlock new private investment for climate change mitigation and adaption in developing countries. The Lab was launched in June 2014 by Germany, the U.K. and the United States, along with private sector partners, and the Lab is a direct outgrowth of the mobilization dialogue discussed above. The Lab received more than 90 proposals for consideration from around the world and through an expert evaluation process, has selected four of the most promising proposals to move toward the pilot phase. The intent is for the Lab to demonstrate the viability of new and innovative climate finance instruments for countries, MDBs, DFIs and other institutions to potentially deploy.

The BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes

The BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes (ISFL), launched in 2013, is a multilateral fund, supported by donor governments and managed by the World Bank. It seeks to promote reduced greenhouse gas emissions from the land sector, from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD+), and from sustainable agriculture, as well as smarter land-use planning, policies and practices. ISFL will provide a unique combination of incentives: up-front finance and technical assistance will support necessary actions and reforms, while results-based finance will reward emissions reductions. Private sector incentives, for example through increased commodity sourcing or other business, will complement the grants and results based payments. The ISFL is currently capitalized at over $300 million; U.S. contributions to date total $25 million. The first ISFL jurisdiction is the Regional State Of Oromia In Ethiopia, while a second program is being developed in Zambia. Additional Programs in three countries are currently under consideration.

V. Reducing support for high-carbon investments

In addition to efforts to mobilize climate finance, it is critical to reduce finance flows for high-carbon investments and projects. Using scarce public resources to support high-carbon infrastructure and assets undercuts our global efforts to address climate change by locking in future GHGs emissions as

well as increasing the viability gap between high-carbon and low-carbon alternatives. This support can take the form of financing high-carbon infrastructure by public finance institutions such as MDBs, BFIs and Export-Credit Agencies as well as policies in developing countries that create an un-level playing field for low-carbon alternatives.

The United States has taken steps to operationalize, in both its bilateral and multilateral aid programs, the provisions in the President's Climate Action Plan (CAP) on limiting U.S. government support for public financing of new coal plants overseas. The CAP calls for an end to U.S. government support for public financing of new coal plants overseas, except for (a) the most efficient coal technology available in the world's poorest countries in cases where no other economically feasible alternative exists, or (b) facilities deploying carbon capture and sequestration technologies.

The U.S. also remains committed to phasing out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that lead to wasteful consumption, higher emissions and other economic distortions. President Obama's FY 2015 budget proposal eliminates domestic fossil fuel tax subsidies, estimated at nearly $5 billion per year, and the President has raised the issue in his most recent State of the Union address to Congress. The U.S. has been a leading advocate for fossil fuel subsidy reform in the G20 and APEC, and leaders in both fora have agreed to rationalize and phase out inefficient subsidies. Recently, the U.S. and China agreed to become the first countries to undergo a voluntary fossil fuel subsidy peer review under the auspices of the G20. The U.S. is committed to maintaining momentum around this issue and encouraging additional countries to assess, quantify, and reform their own subsidies.

VI. Going forward

The United States remains committed to working with partner countries to scale-up and mobilize financial resources that help facilitate the transition to LCCR economies in developing countries. The concrete examples highlighted in this submission illustrate the multifaceted approach the United States has taken, and will continue to take, to achieve this going forward. This approach includes deploying interventions and instruments through a range of bilateral and multilateral public finance channels; collaborating with partners; building resilience and adaptive capacity in developing countries; and reducing support for high carbon investments.

Annex I. U.S. Multilateral, Bilateral, and Regional Contributions Related to the Implementation of the UNFCCC (FY2010-2013)

The tables below include grant-based assistance, development finance, and export credit, and combines direct climate funding and activities that provide climate co-benefits.[7] In the case of grant-based assistance, two important caveats: First, some countries that benefit from U.S. climate finance are not listed here. This happens in cases where a country does not benefit from bilateral programs but instead from activities and funds that are categorized as "Multiple Countries" or "Multilateral" and not disaggregated by country. Second, for many countries, these data under-represent the total U.S. assistance benefiting that country. This happens in the following cases: (a) a country benefits from additional funding through regional or global programs, which are not disaggregated by country; and/or(b) that country benefits from multilateral programs (e.g., Climate Investment Funds, Global Environment Facility, etc.), to which the U.S. contributes a portion. Please note that neither of these tables captures U.S. contributions to the ordinary capital resources of multilateral development banks, a portion of which are used to finance climate-specific activities.

Fiscal Year 2010

Recipient Country/Region	Energy	Forestry and Agriculture	Adaptation	Total
Overview				
Grant-Based Assistance	915.3	242.4	430.3	**1587.9**
Development Finance	155.1	0.0	0.0	**155.1**
Export Credit	253.2	0.0	0.0	**253.2**
Total	1323.5	242.4	430.3	**1996.2**
Geographic Breakdown				
Grant-Based Assistance				
Multiple Regions, Multiple Countries	467.9	120.1	301.1	889.4
Africa	**159.2**	**36.2**	**29.9**	**225.2**
Africa - Multiple Countries	9.6	15.9	12.0	37.5
Angola	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4
Democratic Republic of the Congo	2.3	7.9	0.3	10.4
Ethiopia	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Ghana	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Kenya	1.5	1.0	4.2	6.7
Liberia	1.0	0.4	0.0	1.4
Malawi	138.8	2.0	0.0	140.8

[7] 1 Included in these totals are (1) activities that were conceived and funded specifically to achieve climate-related objectives, and (2) activities that provide climate co-benefits (e.g., biodiversity and food security activities). In cases where a portion of a program's budget supports climate benefits, only that portion has been counted. Congressionally appropriated grant-based assistance is channeled through USAID, State, Treasury, MCC, and other USG agencies; development finance is channeled through the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC); export credit is channeled through the Export-Import Bank.

Mali	0.0	0.2	2.0	2.2
Mozambique	2.0	1.0	1.5	4.5
Nigeria	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5
Rwanda	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.3
Senegal	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5
Tanzania	0.0	3.3	2.2	5.5
Uganda	1.5	1.5	0.0	3.0
Zambia	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Asia	**198.2**	**34.8**	**36.7**	**269.8**
Asia - Multiple Countries	12.0	9.3	22.4	43.7
Afghanistan	48.6	0.0	0.0	48.6
Bangladesh	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Cambodia	0.0	3.0	1.0	4.0
China	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
India	11.3	5.0	4.0	20.3
Indonesia	5.0	17.5	0.0	22.5
Kazakhstan	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
Kyrgyzstan	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5
Maldives	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Marshall Islands	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Mongolia	48.7	0.0	0.0	48.7
Nepal	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Pakistan	63.8	0.0	0.0	63.8
Philippines	4.0	0.0	0.3	4.3
Tajikistan	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.9
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Europe & Eurasia	**12.7**	**0.0**	**3.5**	**16.2**
Albania	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5
Armenia	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
Georgia	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4
Macedonia	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Moldova	2.0	0.0	2.0	4.0
Ukraine	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Latin America & Caribbean	**64.2**	**51.3**	**19.1**	**134.6**
Latin America & Caribbean - Multiple Countries	16.0	28.0	10.3	54.3
Brazil	1.0	6.0	0.0	7.0
Colombia	2.0	1.3	0.0	3.3
Dominican Republic	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0

Ecuador	0.0	1.0	1.4	2.4
El Salvador	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Guatemala	0.0	3.0	1.4	4.4
Guyana	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Haiti	43.0	0.0	3.0	46.0
Jamaica	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
Mexico	2.2	3.0	0.0	5.2
Panama	0.0	2.5	0.0	2.5
Peru	0.0	4.5	0.0	4.5
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Middle East	**12.8**	**0.0**	**40.0**	**52.8**
Jordan	12.8	0.0	0.0	12.8
Other Operating Units	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Development Finance	**155.1**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**155.1**
Afghanistan	7.6	0.0	0.0	7.6
India	35.4	0.0	0.0	35.4
Mexico	20.3	0.0	0.0	20.3
Nigeria	69.8	0.0	0.0	69.8
Ukraine	22.0	0.0	0.0	22.0
Export Credit	**253.2**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**253.2**
Bangladesh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Chile	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Honduras	158.6	0.0	0.0	158.6
India	6.0	0.0	0.0	6.0
Jamaica	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Kenya	6.8	0.0	0.0	6.8
Mexico	81.2	0.0	0.0	81.2
Namibia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Africa	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
Uganda	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Fiscal Year 2011

Recipient country/region	Energy	Forestry and Agriculture	Adaptation	Total
Overview				
Grant-Based Assistance	962.4	361.5	560.2	**1884.1**
Development Finance	1113.9	0.9	0.0	**1114.8**
Export Credit	194.7	0.0	0.0	**194.7**
Total	2271.0	362.4	560.2	**3193.6**
Geographic Breakdown				
Grant-Based Assistance				
Multiple Regions				
Multiple Regions, Multiple Countries	332.6	132.8	351.7	817.1
Africa				
Africa -Multiple Countries	12.6	26.2	13.9	52.6
Ethiopia	0.0	7.0	16.1	23.1
Ghana	0.6	4.0	0.0	4.6
Kenya	4.6	0.1	5.4	10.0
Malawi	141.1	5.9	3.0	150.0
Mali	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Mozambique	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0
Nigeria	2.8	0.0	3.5	6.3
Rwanda	0.0	1.0	4.8	5.8
Senegal	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
South Africa	4.9	0.0	0.0	4.9
Tanzania	0.0	0.7	3.2	3.9
Uganda	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Zambia	0.0	5.0	0.8	5.8
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Asia- Grant-Based Assistance				
Asia - Multiple Countries	15.2	13.4	20.6	49.1
Afghanistan	73.5	0.0	0.0	73.5
Bangladesh	0.0	0.0	20.1	20.1
Cambodia	0.0	5.0	2.0	7.0
China	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.8
India	7.5	4.0	3.4	14.9
Indonesia	266.8	83.9	10.2	360.9
Kyrgyz Republic	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3
Maldives	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Nepal	0.0	3.0	4.4	7.4
Pakistan	42.0	0.0	0.0	42.0
Philippines	5.6	3.0	4.0	12.6
Tajikistan	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6

Thailand	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Timor-Leste	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Vietnam	4.0	4.0	3.0	11.0
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Europe & Eurasia				
Europe & Eurasia - Multiple Countries	9.1	1.0	1.0	11.1
Albania	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
Armenia	0.4	0.0	1.1	1.5
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8
Georgia	2.0	0.5	1.0	3.5
Macedonia	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
Moldova	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3
Ukraine	6.0	0.0	0.0	6.0
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Latin America & Caribbean				
Latin America & Caribbean - Multiple Countries	5.0	17.4	9.3	31.7
Barbados	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.3
Bolivia	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.9
Brazil	4.2	3.8	0.0	8.0
Chile	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2
Colombia	4.5	2.0	2.0	8.5
Dominican Republic	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Ecuador	0.0	5.9	0.0	5.9
El Salvador	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.4
Guatemala	0.0	7.1	3.5	10.6
Haiti	1.8	0.0	1.5	3.3
Honduras	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Jamaica	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Mexico	6.2	8.0	0.0	14.2
Peru	0.0	14.0	2.0	16.0
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Middle East				
Egypt	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
Morocco	1.8	0.0	2.5	4.3
Other Operating Units	0.0	0.0	39.0	39.0
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Development Finance				
Multiple Countries	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Cambodia	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.9
Georgia	58.0	0.0	0.0	58.0
India	213.8	0.0	0.0	213.8
Jordan	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0

Kenya	310.0	0.0	0.0	310.0
Liberia	90.0	0.0	0.0	90.0
Peru	123.0	0.0	0.0	123.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	16.1	0.0	0.0	16.1
Thailand	250.0	0.0	0.0	250.0
Export Credit				
Multiple Regions, Multiple Countries	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Brazil	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Chile	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2
Guatemala	4.6	0.0	0.0	4.6
India	180.0	0.0	0.0	180.0
Jamaica	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
Mexico	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3
Namibia	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1

Fiscal Year 2012

Recipient country/region	Energy	Forestry and Agriculture	Adaptation	Total
Overview				
Grant-Based Assistance	586.5	277.5	398.2	**1262.2**
Development Finance	721.6	0.0	0.0	**721.6**
Export Credit	301.2	0.0	0.0	**301.2**
Total	1609.3	277.5	398.2	**2285.1**
Geographic Breakdown				
Grant-Based Assistance				
Multiple Regions				
Multiple Regions, Multiple Countries	382.7	141.0	180.4	704.1
Africa				
Africa -Multiple Countries	11.7	17.2	16.9	45.7
Burkina Faso	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.8
Cape Verde	0.0	0.0	41.0	41.0
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.0	2.2	0.0	2.2
Ethiopia	0.0	0.0	22.9	22.9
Gabon	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2
Kenya	4.0	1.0	3.5	8.5
Liberia	5.5	4.4	1.8	11.7
Malawi	0.0	3.0	5.0	8.0
Mozambique	0.0	0.0	4.7	4.7
Nigeria	3.4	0.0	1.7	5.1
Rwanda	0.0	0.0	3.5	3.5
Senegal	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
South Africa	3.1	0.0	0.0	3.1
Tanzania	0.0	0.2	5.9	6.1
Uganda	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Zambia	0.0	5.0	0.8	5.8
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Asia				
Asia - Multiple Countries	5.4	8.5	17.6	31.5
Afghanistan	79.6	0.0	0.0	79.6
Bangladesh	4.5	2.0	9.0	15.5
Cambodia	0.0	3.6	4.0	7.5
China	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2
India	4.6	4.0	2.0	10.6
Indonesia	3.0	8.4	4.1	15.6
Kazakhstan	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Kyrgyz Republic	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7
Maldives	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0

Nepal	0.0	4.5	4.8	9.3
Pakistan	31.8	0.0	0.0	31.8
Papua New Guinea	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
Philippines	3.0	5.8	2.8	11.6
Timor-Leste	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
Vietnam	2.0	1.9	3.0	6.9
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Europe & Eurasia				
Europe & Eurasia - Multiple Countries	3.4	0.0	0.0	3.4
Albania	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
Armenia	1.6	0.0	0.0	1.6
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.6
Georgia	4.0	0.8	0.1	4.8
Macedonia	0.8	0.0	0.2	1.0
Ukraine	7.1	0.0	0.0	7.1
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Latin America & Caribbean				
Latin America & Caribbean - Multiple Countries	6.4	18.0	7.0	31.4
Barbados	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5
Brazil	0.0	8.7	0.0	8.7
Colombia	4.0	4.5	3.0	11.5
Dominican Republic	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
Ecuador	0.0	2.8	2.0	4.8
El Salvador	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.8
Guatemala	0.0	4.5	3.1	7.6
Haiti	0.0	0.0	3.5	3.5
Honduras	0.1	1.3	4.0	5.3
Jamaica	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0
Mexico	5.4	10.4	0.0	15.8
Peru	0.0	10.7	2.6	13.4
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Middle East				
Jordan	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
Morocco	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7
Other Operating Units	0.0	0.0	22.0	22.0
no regional total provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region				
Development Finance				
India	261.9	0.0	0.0	261.9
Pakistan	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7
Peru	193.0	0.0	0.0	193.0
South Africa	250.0	0.0	0.0	250.0
Export Credit				
Multiple Regions, Multiple Countries	11.5	0.0	0.0	11.5

Barbados	6.4	0.0	0.0	6.4
Brazil	80.7	0.0	0.0	80.7
India	201.6	0.0	0.0	201.6
Mexico	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0

Fiscal Year 2013

Recipient Country/Region	Energy	Forestry and Agriculture	Adaptation	Total
Overview				
Congressionally Appropriated Assistance	590.9	230.9	395.6	**1,217.4**
Development Finance	1,210.8	0.0	0.0	**1,210.8**
Export Credit	228.1	0.0	0.0	**228.1**
Total	2,029.8	230.9	395.6	**2,656.3**
Geographic Breakdown				
Congressionally Appropriated Assistance				
Multilateral	**240.6**	**66.9**	**121.5**	**429.0**
Clean Technology Fund	196.2	0.0	0.0	196.2
Forest Investment Program	0.0	11.9	0.0	11.9
Global Environment Facility (climate-attributable)	32.5	30.0	0.0	62.5
Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
Least Developed Countries Fund	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
Pilot Program for Climate Resilience	0.0	0.0	86.5	86.5
Scaling-Up Renewable Energy Program in Low-Income Countries	11.9	0.0	0.0	11.9
Special Climate Change Fund	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0
Global and Multi-Regional (excluding multilateral)				
Multiple Regions - Multiple Countries	99.1	41.3	105.5	245.9
Africa				
Africa - Multiple Countries	12.9	25.9	21.7	60.5
Congo - Republic of	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Ethiopia	0.0	0.0	20.2	20.2
Ghana	1.6	0.0	0.3	1.9
Kenya	3.9	0.6	1.0	5.4
Liberia	6.0	2.6	0.8	9.5
Malawi	0.0	2.9	3.3	6.2
Mali	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Mauritius	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Mozambique	0.0	0.0	5.2	5.2
Nigeria	0.7	0.0	11.2	12.0

Rwanda	0.0	0.7	1.9	2.6
Senegal	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.9
South Africa	4.4	0.0	0.0	4.4
Tanzania	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9
Uganda	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9
Zambia	0.0	4.8	2.5	7.3
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Asia				
Asia - Multiple Countries	4.3	10.5	5.9	20.7
Afghanistan	54.5	0.0	0.0	54.5
Bangladesh	4.8	2.9	9.8	17.4
Cambodia	0.0	3.3	3.8	7.2
China	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2
India	4.2	2.9	1.9	9.0
Indonesia	4.1	7.9	3.2	15.2
Kazakhstan	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
Maldives	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.9
Mongolia	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
Nepal	0.0	1.9	2.4	4.3
Pakistan	98.4	0.0	0.0	98.4
Philippines	2.9	2.9	2.6	8.3
Thailand	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5
Timor-Leste	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.9
Vietnam	3.5	2.4	3.5	9.5
Pacific Islands	0.0	0.0	9.1	9.1
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Europe and Eurasia				
Europe and Eurasia – Multiple Countries	6.1	0.0	0.0	6.1
Armenia	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3
Georgia	3.0	0.2	0.0	3.1
Macedonia	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.5
Moldova	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2
Ukraine	4.8	0.0	0.0	4.8
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Latin America and Caribbean				
Latin America and Caribbean - Multiple Countries	4.3	10.5	10.2	25.0
Belize	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.3
Brazil	0.3	9.6	0.0	9.8
Chile	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.4
Colombia	4.6	6.1	2.9	13.6
Dominican Republic	0.0	0.0	3.5	3.5

Ecuador	0.0	1.3	1.4	2.8
El Salvador	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.4
Guatemala	0.0	4.4	4.4	8.9
Haiti	7.7	0.0	2.1	9.8
Honduras	0.3	0.5	3.2	4.0
Jamaica	0.0	1.9	3.4	5.4
Mexico	5.9	7.2	0.0	13.1
Paraguay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Peru	0.0	9.0	8.6	17.5
Trinidad and Tobago	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Middle East				
Middle East - Multiple Countries	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
No regional total is provided because "multiple region" funds also go to this region.				
Development Finance	**1,210.8**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**1,210.8**
Development Finance - Multiple Countries	7.0	0.0	0.0	7.0
Tanzania	23.1	0.0	0.0	23.1
Pakistan	196.5	0.0	0.0	196.5
Chile	615.4	0.0	0.0	615.4
El Salvador	30.0	0.0	0.0	30.0
Mexico	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Peru	192.8	0.0	0.0	192.8
Uruguay	96.0	0.0	0.0	96.0
Export Credit	**228.1**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**228.1**
Export Credit - Multiple Countries	12.7	0.0	0.0	12.7
South Africa	23.0	0.0	0.0	23.0
India	32.0	0.0	0.0	32.0
Costa Rica	59.0	0.0	0.0	59.0
Honduras	28.0	0.0	0.0	28.0
Mexico	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8
Uruguay	72.7	0.0	0.0	72.7

Annex II. Congressionally Appropriated Grant-Based Assistance Programming Policies and Priorities

U.S. Congressionally appropriated grant-based assistance is categorized under the three thematic pillars of the President's Global Climate Change Initiative:

1. Adaptation (increasing resilience to the impacts of climate change);
2. Clean Energy (reducing greenhouse gas emissions from energy, industry, and transportation by greater utilization of renewable energy, increased energy efficiency, and other means); and
3. Sustainable Landscapes (reducing greenhouse gas emissions from forests and land use).

Further details on each pillar are provided below. These details are specific to the data in the 2014 Biennial Report (i.e., data for Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012) and are subject to change in future reporting.

Adaptation

Adaptation programming seeks to reduce the vulnerability of people, places, and livelihoods to negative impacts of climate change by integrating effective adaptive strategies into key development sectors, including agriculture and food security, infrastructure, health, water, disaster preparedness, and conflict prevention. Adaptation programming prioritizes countries, regions, and populations that are highly vulnerable to climate change impacts.

Types of activities include, but are not limited to:

- Developing tools for information dissemination or building new capacity among hydro-meteorological information providers to deliver climate information and services
- Providing support for modeling, mapping, and research to better understand climate impacts in specific regions or sectors
- Strengthening government and local community response and communications capacity for climate change-related disasters, such as floods
- Building capacity among decision-makers to use hydro-meteorological data to inform climate-resilient planning
- Increasing water storage and water use efficiency to deal with increased variability in water supply
- Distributing drought-resistant seeds or promoting management practices that increase the ability of farmers ability to cope with reduced rainfall
- Introducing and enforcing flood management plans and zoning and building codes, or coastal zone management activities to reduce vulnerability to rising sea levels and storm surges
- Reducing risk through activities such as flood and famine early warning systems, negotiation of trans-boundary water issues, or meeting critical infrastructure needs

Clean Energy

Clean energy programming seeks to enable countries to accelerate their transition to climate resilience, lower greenhouse gas emissions, and sustainable economic development through assistance for clean, low-emissions energy systems in energy, industry, transportation, and buildings. Clean energy programming prioritizes countries and sectors offering significant emission reduction potential over the

long-term, as well as countries that offer the potential to demonstrate leadership in sustained, large-scale deployment of clean energy.

Types of activities include, but are not limited to:

- Promoting and deploying clean energy, including renewable energy technologies, energy efficient end-use technologies, and carbon accounting
- Supporting clean energy technologies such as development of agricultural bio-digesters, improved cookstoves, solar water heaters, and/or electricity generation from landfill methane
- Strengthening greenhouse gas inventory and accounting systems
- Supporting an improved enabling environment (law, regulations, policies) for integrating renewable energy into national grids; enhancing cost recovery in the energy sector, improving financial and regulatory capacity of energy utilities
- Supporting efforts to reduce gas flaring through the creation of domestic markets and productive uses for the previously-flared gas
- Supporting the substitution of natural gas for gasoline and diesel fuels for vehicular transportation, or for efficient transportation or comprehensive transportation planning, analysis, and strategy
- Promoting supply-side energy efficiency by retro-fitting existing, high greenhouse gas-emitting fossil fuel power plants with more efficient turbines or installing more energy efficient transformers in a power distribution grid with a large fossil generation component
- Working to reduce technical losses in an energy distribution system, thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions; or upgrading transmission and operating systems that carry clean energy, in whole or in part (if part, only that share should be attributed)

Sustainable Landscapes

Sustainable Landscapes programming seeks to slow, halt, and reverse greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and degradation of forests, as outlined in the U.S. Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation of Forests (REDD+) strategy.

Types of activities include, but are not limited to:

- A program to build a country's capacity to estimate, report and monitor greenhouse gases from forest and land use at the national or subnational level
- Support for creating or strengthening national forest and forest carbon inventory and monitoring systems
- Assistance with implementing land use strategies that affect forests, for example, by addressing the most influential drivers of deforestation and forest degradation or restoring degraded lands through enhanced tree cover
- A forest conservation project leading to reduced-impact logging and reduced deforestation
- A forest conservation project improving governance in indigenous reserves and protected areas which are under threat of deforestation
- A program to improve land tenure systems that create incentives for communities to manage and restore forested areas, resulting in increased carbon sequestration in tree biomass.