ECONSTOR
Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of

ZBW Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Putz, Lena-Marie; von Haaren, Paula; Berger, Axel; Baldrighi, Rafael de Moraes; Pereira, Guísela

Research Report

Mobilising and scaling up local climate action

IDOS Policy Brief, No. 5/2026

Provided in Cooperation with:
German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS), Bonn

Suggested Citation: Putz, Lena-Marie; von Haaren, Paula; Berger, Axel; Baldrighi, Rafael de Moraes; Pereira, Guísela (2026) : Mobilising and scaling up local climate action, IDOS Policy Brief, No. 5/2026, German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS), Bonn, https://doi.org/10.23661/ipb5.2026

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/340850

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

SOUTHERN VOICE ipea Institute for Applied Economic Research IDOS German Institute of Development and Sustainability

IDOS POLICY BRIEF 5/2026



Mobilising and Scaling Up Local Climate Action

Lena-Marie Putz, Paula von Haaren, Axel Berger, Rafael de Moraes Baldrighi & Guísela Pereira

Summary

As the world approaches global warming tipping points, local climate engagement aims at climate actions that are equitable, effective and aligned with local needs. Strengthening and scaling up these initiatives can amplify impact, though efforts are often fragmented and require strengthened coordination. This policy brief identifies barriers and enablers of local climate action, how it is best scaled up, and how international actors – donors, policymakers, city and research networks, businesses and others – can support this process.

Building on these insights, the following points outline key conditions for strengthening, scaling up and sustaining locally led climate action:

- **community-centred co-creation** – investing in participatory, culturally grounded processes that map local needs, integrate diverse knowledge, and establish a common language;
- **predictable, flexible funding** – providing long-term resources for locally led climate action, and planning additional finance to scale up solutions, including those involving knowledge sharing platforms and coordination capacity;
- **private-sector engagement** – creating incentives aligned with climate and community priorities, such as collaboration in the development of green products, in facilitating their market access and assisting with certification and value-chain regulations.
- **multilevel coordination and data sharing** – establishing clear institutional pathways, monitoring mechanisms and interoperable data platforms to connect local action with national and international policies, leveraging synergies, and increasing accountability; and
- **just international partnerships** – supporting local and Southern priorities through green development opportunities, ensuring fairness and co-benefits for the partners involved.

CC BY 4.0 license

Introduction

Global warming continues to increase, with severe impacts on natural and human systems already occurring at a warming of 1.5°C (IPCC, 2022). Notwithstanding this, climate policy measures of major emitting countries only expanded by 1% in 2024, pointing to a significant loss of momentum (OECD, 2025). In contrast, local climate action has become a central pillar of global mitigation and adaptation efforts (Biermann et al., 2022). Local communities face a wide range of climate challenges, among which are heat-waves, flooding and ecosystem degradation. Not only are formerly safe areas now becoming vulnerable to extreme heat and floods, but rapid urban expansion in the form of informal settle-ments or formal peri-urban development of higher-income enclaves is extending into environ-mentally sensitive and hazard-prone areas such as floodplains and steep or unstable terrain (Castaldo et al., 2025), while loss of green spaces increases heat and ecological risks. These developments are made possible by limited planning control, including lack of regulations and poor enforcement (Castaldo et al., 2025). Against this backdrop, the importance of strengthening effective, grounded climate action, especially at the local level, becomes even more evident.

Local actors play an essential role in climate action for several reasons. First, local actors, including traditional communities, hold invaluable contextualised knowledge on local conditions, and long-standing mitigation and resilience strat-egies, supporting a more holistic perspective on the issue and how it can be addressed. Second, communities are more likely to accept and engage in mitigation and adaptation when these activities are connected to tangible improvements in their lives – such as better waste management, safer mobility or more resilient livelihoods. Local groups, particularly those most vulnerable to climate change, are best placed to identify the relevant local needs and adaptation priorities. Finally, broad participation in climate action planning and implementation leads to greater ownership and more equitable outcomes (Ayompe et al., 2025). By taking into account local knowledge, priorities and incentives, context-specific, equitable solutions can be developed. The adaptation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to national and sub-national contexts is an example.

> Local climate action has also gained prominence at the 2025 COP30 in Brazil, with 80% of Nationally Determined Contributions submitted mentioning local actors such as cities – an increase of one fifth from the previous round (van den Berg, 2025).
>
> The COP30 slogan Mutirão Global brought local collective climate efforts to a global level. The concept of Mutirão, derived from Tupi-Guarani languages, refers to community-led mobilisation, shaped by solidarity, cooperation and a shared sense of purpose.

Local climate actions can be scaled up hori-zontally – through replication in similar contexts, which typically occurs voluntarily through learning and the exchange of knowledge and experiences – or vertically, through integrating or transferring such actions into higher level policies. The process of scaling up local climate action provides an opportunity for policymakers to learn from successful practices and to achieve economies of scale and greater overall impact. Notwithstanding this, local initiatives often remain isolated and fragmented.

Against this backdrop, three questions arise.

1. What are the barriers and enablers that impact local communities' meaningful en-gagement in climate action?
2. How can successful local climate solutions be horizontally and vertically scaled up in a sus-tainable way?
3. How can local priorities be linked to national and international priorities, and what role can multilateral connections play in this process?

This policy brief addresses these questions based on the outcomes of a roundtable discussion held in São Paulo in the context of the Southern Voice Member Conference 2025 – a gathering of over 70 think tanks from the Global South. The roundtable was organised by the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS), Southern Voice (SV) and the Institute for Applied Economic Research (IPEA), Brazil, in cooperation with the Hamburg Sustainability Conference (HSC). The event brought together experts from think tanks, governments, civil society and the private sector across Latin America, Africa and Asia. This policy brief synthesises their perspectives on the questions above, embeds them in the literature on local climate action and scaling, and highlights next steps for strengthening locally rooted, globally relevant climate solutions.

Mobilising local climate action: barriers

Roundtable participants identified several barriers to local climate action: on the one hand, there are challenges in terms of access to participation and motivation to engage in climate action; on the other hand, the implementation of policies and regulations remains a hurdle.

Barriers to participation and motivation include, firstly, **lack of access to and low integration of community expertise** in policy development, and even less so in decision-making processes around climate policy. Participants from South Asia, Latin America and Africa reported that this is further hindered by diverging language on climate issues. The excessive use of technical or legal jargon by governments and technical experts can complicate conversations and create confusion. Second, while local populations observe climate impacts and may engage in mitigation and adaptation activities, they may not associate it with broader climate change or know about the full range of potential **pathways to climate mitigation and adaptation**. Third, existing **inequalities**, such as access to finance and digital technology, but also literacy, can limit the participation of stakeholders in policymaking and their access to relevant information and funds needed for action. Fourth, local climate action is hindered by perceived **trade-offs between climate and economic needs**. Poor and vulnerable communities, in particular, may be hesitant to prioritise collective climate action while their basic needs remain unmet. Trade-offs may also lead to “winners” and “losers” of certain climate policies, with the latter being naturally less inclined to support climate action.

Implementation barriers arise through complicated **governance structures**, **limited financial and technical capacities**, and **vested interests**. Intermediaries or bureaucratic bottlenecks render processes – such as applying for funding, reporting environmental infringements, or attaining approval for implementation of climate actions – non-transparent and inflexible. Furthermore, local governments and NGOs, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), often have a plethora of pressing and competing issues and lack capacity to apply and manage complex and strict funding instruments, including gaining access to green financing or green markets. However, capacity gaps are not the only challenge; in some cases, ecologically harmful activities such as deforestation or natural resource extraction may also persist due to the interests of powerful actors within the communities who benefit from these activities.

Mobilising local climate action: enablers

The above barriers to local climate action can be overcome through several best practices:

First, roundtable participants emphasised that effective mobilisation requires the establishment of a **common understanding** among all stakeholders. To foster effective alignment, the development of a shared language, or at least flexibility in using stakeholder-specific language, can overcome communication barriers, clarify roles, foster trust and equity, enhance acknowledgement of existing local action and complementarity of scientific and traditional knowledge, and thus

increase cooperation and engagement with climate action. Further, both tailoring communication to sector-, country-, or community-specific values and appealing to shared values can increase engagement in climate action. Accessible data and transparent planning tools provide a common ground for evidence-based decision-making.

Second, perceived trade-offs and difficulties in prioritising climate action versus basic needs can be softened by seeking **solutions that avoid trade-offs and provide multiple benefits**, but also by **emphasising** in communications with stakeholders the potential **benefits** of climate action for better community living conditions. For example, climate mitigation, and in particular adaptation, can provide protection from climate-induced extreme weather events (IPCC, 2022), improve health conditions (Romanello et al., 2025), create new job opportunities (Scholz and Fink, 2022) and support access to education in circumstances where extreme weather hinders children from attending school. Examples of solutions that can simultaneously improve climatic and socio-economic conditions are payments for eco-system services, ecotourism or buildings that both protect from extreme climatic conditions and serve as community centres. Moreover, community justice principles should be taken into account and, where trade-offs are unavoidable, those negatively impacted by climate policies should be compensated.

Third, **governance inadequacies** need to be tackled. Apart from the removal of bureaucratic bottlenecks, participants mentioned decentralisation, which allows for local decision-making and better adaptation to or dynamic development of local conditions (Roll et al., 2024). Moreover, it is essential that local governments map local needs, existing initiatives and community leaders, and involve the relevant communities at each step in the process. Consultation and co-production not only produce more actionable and relevant climate information, but, equally important, foster trust, promote inclusive and just decision-making and address power imbalances (Hanson et al., 2025). Several participants shared examples of successful approaches, including projects of *Decodifica*, an institute that collects data related to climate justice in peripheries and favelas of Brazil, in order to understand local obstacles and priorities through first-hand information. Another example, implemented in both high- and low-income countries, are urban labs that co-create and test locally adapted climate solutions (Roll et al., 2024).

Fourth, adequate and predictable **funding** was identified as a prerequisite for enabling local climate action. Participants stressed the importance of supporting communities throughout the full project cycle, from early-stage design to long-term maintenance. Private-sector engagements were mentioned as a potential avenue for unlocking additional resources, provided they are aligned with community needs and environmental safeguards. Private-sector behaviour can be aligned with these criteria via two pathways: external regulation, changing corporate values, or following their corporate logic by making their involvement profitable.

Finally, **technical capacity development is required for all stakeholders**, not only community members. Local governments, civil society intermediaries and technical experts also need support to work effectively across sectors, understand local priorities and translate concepts into inclusive decision-making processes.

Scaling up local climate action

Barriers to scaling up mirror those at the local level – inadequate contextualisation of approaches and anticipation of trade-offs, and weak communication, governance, financial and technical capacities. However, barriers are compounded by the challenges of reconciling and mobilising a multitude of governance levels and actors, hierarchies between levels, and imperfect information flows. Local experiences and knowledge, in particular, often remain in the local community, making it difficult for external actors to learn from, adopt or scale up the same approach

(Cisneros, 2019). Accordingly, scaling up requires systemic thinking. Critical actors are city and community administrations acting as facilitators, street-level bureaucrats and business networks, but also researchers and journalists who publicise knowledge about best practices and implementation, and ensure accountability of policymakers. Given this complexity, barriers should be addressed and enablers supported early on, to prevent challenges from building up and persisting into later stages, when they are harder to resolve.

When scaling a climate action approach horizontally to a different location, or engaging new actors for vertical scale-up, **participatory and culturally sensitive governance mechanisms** are key. Local solutions can only inform higher-level policies, for example through applied research and other forms of knowledge transfer, if institutional structures enable their recognition and integration. Moreover, actor engagement strategies and policy design should appeal to the different value systems and logics of involved stakeholders so that they feel motivated to contribute. This might involve, for example, recognising private-sector business practices that, when compatible with climate objectives, prioritise cost-efficient solutions, or exploiting political logics by seeking synergies with political agendas and career interests to gain political support for scale-up of climate actions. Finally, broader policies need to be flexibly adaptable to the local context.

Coordinating mechanisms are needed to strengthen communication among communities, municipalities, and national and multilateral institutions, while reducing duplication of efforts and negative spillover effects. Designating a coordinating body with a clear capacity-building mandate at the national or sub-national level, with predictable long-term funding sources, strengthens local climate networks on a large scale. A successful coordinating initiative is the Brazilian programme AdaptaCidades, which supports municipalities by providing national frameworks for climate plans of regional and local governments, providing technical assistance and mobilising climate finance to design and implement adaptation plans. In contrast, fragmented institutional mandates should be avoided, as they obscure responsibilities and thus weaken implementation. Experiences from Indonesia's energy sector underline the importance of assigning responsibilities based on managerial capacity rather than political considerations, to avoid rent-seeking.

Coordination should aim to **create synergies across governance levels**, such as pooling information, capacities and funds, linking municipal action plans with national climate strategies or leveraging regional networks. For example, an inter-federative chamber of commerce could help align national business strategies with local policies. Synergies for integration of local solutions in larger frameworks can also be created by agreeing on shared narratives and priorities. Partnerships between communities, and with bigger entities, such as larger municipalities, give legitimacy to enforce planned policies at the local level. Researchers and leaders from central initiatives that aim to support local climate action should actively advertise promising ideas and projects directly with stakeholders, as the latter might not have time to search for or familiarise themselves with evidence for policy, calls and procedures for support and funding. Overload can also be avoided through iterative planning that cultivates a series of small wins and steers policymakers and local stakeholders towards the desired outcome (van der Heijden, 2023). Furthermore, synergies are generated by pooling funds and avoiding competition between foundations. Synergies over time are leveraged through long-term projects and funding.

Accessible and interoperable platforms and data systems allow local groups and policymakers to document and exchange experiences, connect with broader actors, and access information for coordinated local action and for ensuring accountability. A positive example of data-assisted deforestation control in Brazil combined

data from cadastral registers (SIGEF/CAR) with real-time data on wildfires (DETER). This immediately clarified who owned the land and who to contact, which facilitated faster fire containment and enabled responsible parties to be held accountable. Other examples are federal websites, the Painel Clima Brazil, and AdaptaCLIMA, containing the most important information on local climate action and adaptation measures. Data must not only be publicly available but also easily accessible, ideally in a form that does not require specific technical knowledge or education to make use of it. Finally, regional or national data platforms with harmonised indicators allow for local data systems to be integrated into broader planning processes. However, for data on effectiveness and reproducibility of climate adaptation initiatives and on implementation progress to be generated in the first place, **systematic monitoring and evaluation systems** need to be set up.

International contributions

How can multilateral actors, such as governments, external funders, scientific or city networks, and international businesses, support locally led climate initiatives, particularly in the Global South? **Bottom-up and horizontal partnerships that emphasise co-creation** are key for just and equitable processes. While North–South partnerships have for a long time been based on the narrative of "some countries have problems, others have solutions", equitable partnerships recognise that "everybody has problems and everybody has solutions", meaning that we can learn across levels and countries, from South to North and the other way around. Every society can support others in scaling successful approaches: high-income countries can assist low- and middle-income countries in capacity building concerning financing and reducing investment risk in projects; Global South countries already experiencing extreme climatic conditions can assist the Global North with knowledge transfers on heat and disaster management and cost-effective resilient infrastructure; and countries with advanced green technology, including emerging powers such as China, can foster technology transfer towards countries that have limited access to these technologies. **International knowledge sharing** should follow the principles of knowledge diplomacy – a collaborative, value-based approach that promotes reciprocity and mutual benefit to strengthen relations among countries, often through international research or educational collaboration. Initiatives such as the United Nations Office for South–South Cooperation (UNOSSC), the socialprotection.org platform, and the Global Alliance against Hunger and Poverty demonstrate how successful local policy solutions can be scaled up through knowledge diplomacy. Similarly, international networks, such as C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, the Urban 20 (U20) engagement group of the G20, Regions4 – a global network of subnational governments driving action in climate change, biodiversity and sustainable development – and Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI), facilitate coordination among local communities across countries, exchange of data and best practices (e.g. through open policy baskets), and public sector capacity building, including on financing mechanisms and risk reduction.

Horizontal cooperation also means that **external funders** of local climate action are accountable to their partners and the public. A prerequisite for this is transparency about distribution and usage of funds. In particular, external actors must ensure that the climate solutions they support truly **address the challenges faced by and the needs of local communities.** Foreign donors should therefore not only focus on reducing emissions but simultaneously promote inclusive development, improve livelihoods, create jobs, enhance wellbeing and strengthen resilience, for example by ensuring safe, accessible and climate-friendly mobility for all instead of solely reducing road emissions. An example of an international needs-driven initiative are the Transformative Urban Coalitions supported by international research organisations, Latin American cities and the German environmental ministry.

This also takes into account a broader sentiment across the Global South related to climate justice: many countries perceive disparities in their opportunities for industrialisation and see related benefits such as economic development, job creation and improved livelihoods hindered by climate policies. External actors often frame cooperation primarily around environmental protection – reframing it towards **green development opportunities and just transition** can increase acceptance, relevance, and impact. In addition, circular economy, nature-based solutions, and several indigenous and traditional ecological theories are increasingly promoted as alternatives or complements to growth-heavy green industrialisation. External actors can support circular economy transitions through long-term guidance, funding integrated approaches, and fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, while ensuring inclusive design and social safeguards, particularly for informal workers (Hadfield et al., 2025). Similarly, funders of nature-based solutions should ensure transparency and inclusivity. An example is the *Decodifica* research project in Brazilian favelas that works together with international initiatives for nature-based solutions, also from the private sector.

Global South countries also criticise inconsistencies in Northern climate action history and practice. While Global North countries expect others to phase out fossil fuels, only investing in fully green technologies in the South, not supporting the creation of transitioning systems first, they continue to invest in fossil-related infrastructure at home. To foster more equitable partnerships, it is important to **incorporate climate justice considerations into international cooperation and financing** modalities, acknowledging differences in historical trajectories and fiscal capacity. Studies such as that of de Moraes (2025) can help inform resource allocation and prioritisation for vulnerable populations, thereby guiding financing instruments that balance efficiency with international fairness. Further, local climate pressures and harmful actions in LMICs, such as unjust land acquisition and new deforestation, are often driven or reinforced by **consumption in high-income countries**. For instance, over 20% of the recent global deforestation footprints of Switzerland, Portugal, Spain and South Korea originated in the Amazon region (Singh et al., 2025), linking external demand to land-use pressures from the production of commodities such as soy and palm oil. To avoid such negative spillover effects from harmful extractivist activities in LMICs, global value chain regulations are needed that regulate and monitor international corporations' activities abroad. For instance, the recent EU-Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) prohibits the import of specific goods that are not deforestation-free. On the one hand, critics state that it is unclear how the regulation is to be applied, that it is excessively bureaucratic and imposes technological barriers, especially for smallholders. Moreover, it may be instrumentalised by opportunistic governments within Europe as a de facto trade barrier (Brack, 2024). In doing so, governments could avoid deeper trade commitments with LMICs, reinforce existing inequalities and hinder a just transition, while protecting domestic agricultural interests. On the other hand, softening the regulation would undermine EU credibility, which would also limit the effectiveness of international partnerships.

Despite the potential negative effects of private business not aligned with climate goals, **the international private sector** can facilitate the scale up of local climate solutions, for example by offering local businesses access to markets with higher demand for environmental solutions. External cooperation with, and support for, youth-led innovations and start-ups helps businesses enter such markets. An example to follow is a project by the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ), which funds local start-ups engaged in decarbonisation and green hydrogen in Brazil. Other sectors mentioned by roundtable participants in which green start-ups can be promoted are agribusiness, infrastructure and mobility. Similarly, vocational training provides an entry point for international corporate cooperation embedded in skills development. In Brazil, various

start-ups and companies already collaborate with students and entrepreneurs in economic hubs to jointly develop context-specific solutions, supported by German and Brazilian vocational training institutions (BIBB, 2026). Another example illustrates how private-sector engagement enables scale-up via access to international markets. An international firm seeking to source certified ecological products for global markets identified certification for sustainability standards as a key barrier for small-scale farmers. It secured external financing to develop a tool that helps farmers qualify for sustainability standards.

Recommendations

Despite increasing recognition that cities, municipalities and other subnational communities drive some of the most innovative and socially grounded climate solutions, local climate action is often hampered by limited access to finance, insufficient technical capacity, and competing priorities. The scaling up of successful approaches is hindered by weak coordination across governance levels, rigid financing modalities, and little inclusion and pooling of information on best practices and the experience of local approaches. Finally, the context-specificity of local approaches may hinder their adoption in other contexts. International cooperation can support the scaling up of climate action through exchange of best practices, training, financial support and access to markets for green solutions.

Building on the insights of the roundtable and the reviewed literature, several priorities emerge for strengthening locally rooted, scalable and internationally relevant climate action. Key practices should include:

- Strengthening of equitable, community-centred, culturally grounded, iterative co-creation processes. Governments and external partners should invest in participatory institutions and methodologies that build a shared language, integrate diverse knowledge systems and enable eye-level collaboration. Early mapping of local needs, practices and leadership structures ensures ownership and long-term sustainability.
- Predictable, flexible and long-term funding for locally led climate action, including for the scaling up of solutions, such as the implementation of knowledge platforms and higher-level coordinative human resources.
- Creating entry points and incentives for private-sector engagement aligned with climate and community priorities, for example through market access for green products, certification support, vocational training and international value-chain regulations.
- Improving multilevel coordination and data interoperability through clear institutional pathways, policy baskets and other shared data platforms, to exchange successful practices, connect local action with national and international policy frameworks, leverage synergies and increase accountability.
- Reframing international cooperation towards green development opportunities and just partnerships. External actors should support local and Southern priorities by linking climate objectives with socio-economic opportunities. Partnerships should ensure fairness and avoid double standards.

References

Ayompe, L. M., Nkongho, R. N., Acobta, A. N., Tambasi, E. E., Masso, C., & Egoh, B. N. (2025). Review of conceptual frameworks for smallholder farmers to achieve sustainable palm oil production. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 506*, 145525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2025.145525

BIBB (Federal Institute for Vocational Education and Training). (2026). *Cooperation with Brazilian partner institution SENAI*. BIBB. https://www.bibb.de/en/9585.php

Biermann, F., Hickmann, T., Sénit, C.-A., & Grob, L. (2022). The Sustainable Development Goals as a transformative force? Key insights. In F. Biermann, T. Hickmann, & C.-A. Sénit (Eds.), *The political impact of the Sustainable Development Goals: Transforming governance through global goals?* (pp. 204-226), Cambridge University Press.

Brack, D. (2024). *Environmental measures, deforestation regulations and the multilateral trading system*. World Trade Organization & Forest Trends. https://www.forest-trends.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/FPTF-WTO-Paper_091624_v2.pdf

Castaldo, A. G., Gori Nocentini, M., Lemes de Oliveira, F., & Mahmoud, I. H. (2025). Nature-based solutions and urban planning in the Global South: Challenge orientations, typologies, and viability for cities. *Land Use Policy, 150*, 107439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2024.107439

Cisneros, P. (2019). What makes collaborative water governance partnerships resilient to policy change? A comparative study of two cases in Ecuador. *Ecology and Society, 24*(1). doi:10.5751/ES-10667-240129

de Moraes, R. F. (2025, October 8). *Operationalizing climate justice: A proposal to quantify and remediate climate debts* (Texto para Discussão No. 3167). Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada (Ipea). https://repositorio.ipea.gov.br/handle/11058/19302

Hadfield, P., Ningrum, D., Aditya, B., et al. (2025). Transformative principles for circular economy transitions in the Global South. *npj Urban Sustainability, 5,* 34. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42949-025-00225-9

Hanson, B., McCann, R., Smiley, D., Hinck, S., Archie, A. R., & Butler, N. (2025). Building relationships for meaningful co-created indigenous climate education. *Community Science, 4*. https://doi.org/10.1029/2023CSJ000054

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2022). Summary for policymakers. In H.-O. Pörtner et al. (Eds.), *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability* (pp. 3–33). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844.001

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2025). *The Climate Action Monitor 2025*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/1819c631-en

Roll, M., Almansi, F., Hardoy, J., Gatti, S., Samios, A., Turmena, L., Campos, M., & Zubicaray, G. (2024). Urban labs beyond Europe: The formation and contextualization of experimental climate governance in five Latin American cities. *Environment & Urbanization, 36*(1), 173–194. https://doi.org/10.1177/09562478241230462

Romanello, M., Walawender, M., Hsu, S.-C., Moskeland, A., Palmeiro-Silva, Y., Scamman, D., et al. (2025). The 2025 report of the Lancet Countdown on health and climate change: Climate change action offers a lifeline. *The Lancet, 406*(10521), 2804–2857. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(25)01919-1

Scholz, W., & Fink, M. (2022). *Green jobs in cities: Challenges and opportunities in African and Asian intermediary cities* (Discussion Paper No. 7/2022). German Development Institute. https://doi.org/10.23661/dp7.2022

Singh, C., West, C., Pacheco, P., Croft, S., Cook, J., & Persson, U. M. (2025). *Drivers of Amazon deforestation in agricultural supply chains: Amazon Footprint Report 2025* (Technical brief). WWF. https://www.wwf.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Technical_brief_%E2%80%93_Amazon_Deforestation__1__compressed__1___1_.pdf

van den Berg, R. (2025). *Why COP30 was a breakthrough for cities*. World Resources Institute (WRI). https://www.wri.org/insights/cop30-breakthrough-local-climate-action

van der Heijden, J. (2023). Towards a science of scaling for urban climate action and governance. *European Journal of Risk Regulation, 14*(3), 513-525. https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2022.13

Links to projects mentioned

AdaptaCLIMA: http://adaptaclima.mma.gov.br

DETER real-time deforestation monitoring, the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR) and the Land Management System (SIGEF): https://revistapesquisa.fapesp.br/en/multiple-systems-use-satellites-to-monitor-deforestation-in-the-amazon/

Painel Clima Brazil: https://sites.tcu.gov.br/painelclimabrasil/news.html

Transformative Urban Coalitions: https://urbancoalitions.org/en

Lena-Marie Putz is a researcher at the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) in Bonn.

Email: lena-marie.putz@idos-research.de

Dr Paula von Haaren is a senior researcher at the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) in Bonn.

Email: paula.vonhaaren@idos-research.de

Dr Axel Berger is deputy director (interim) of the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) in Bonn.

Email: axel.berger@idos-research.de

Rafael de Moraes Baldrighi is a senior researcher at the Institute for Applied Economic Research (Ipea).

Email: rafael.baldrighi@ipea.gov.br

Guísela Pereira is a project and research associate at Southern Voice.

Email: guisela@southernvoice.org

This project is funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and supported by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH. The German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) is institutionally financed by the BMZ, based on a resolution of the German Bundestag, and the state of North Rhine-Westphalia (NRW) as a member of the Johannes-Rau-Forschungsgemeinschaft (JRF).

This Policy Brief is written in the context of the Hamburg Sustainability Conference (HSC). The HSC aims to bring together global decision-makers and stakeholders from politics, the private sector and civil society in order to accelerate progress and achieve breakthroughs towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In particular, it aims to enhance trust and create new alliances, while providing an open space to discuss challenges and solutions in the implementation of the SDGs. The conference is organised jointly by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Michael Otto Foundation, and the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg. IDOS supports the HSC with its scientific expertise and through its global partnerships on the various dimensions of the SDGs and its interlinkages. This Policy Brief provides research-based recommendations on key overarching issues of the HSC process.

HSC

Supported by the

Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development

Suggested citation:
Putz, L.-M., von Haaren, P., Berger, A., Baldrighi, R. de M., & Pereira, G. (2026). *Mobilising and scaling up local climate action* (IDOS Policy Brief 5/2026). IDOS. https://doi.org/10.23661/ipb5.2026

Disclaimer:
The analyses expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS).

CC BY

Except otherwise noted, this publication is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0). You are free to copy, communicate and adapt this work, as long as you attribute the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) gGmbH and the author(s).

IDOS Policy Brief / German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) gGmbH

ISSN (Print) 2751-4455
ISSN (Online) 2751-4463

DOI: https://doi.org/10.23661/ipb5.2026

© German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) gGmbH
Tulpenfeld 6, 53113 Bonn
Email: publications@idos-research.de
https://www.idos-research.de

Printed on eco-friendly, certified paper.

JRF
MEMBER OF Johannes-Rau-Forschungsgemeinschaft