Unlocking climate finance for livestock adaptation and mitigation in Africa

INSTRUMENT-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Fernando Florez, Ciniro Costa Jr., An Notenbaert, Stefan Burkart
International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)



LiveSys
Catalysing Transformation towards Sustainable Livestock Systems

The following table complements Flórez et al. (2026), *Mobilizing Climate Finance for Livestock Transformation in the Global South: Pathways for Investment Readiness*, by outlining the instrument specific technical, institutional, and financial requirements for deploying grants and concessional loans, carbon credits, and green bonds in support of livestock mitigation and adaptation in Africa.

		Grants and Concessional Loans	Carbon Credits	Green and Climate Bonds
Type of finance		Public / blended finance (GCF, GEF, AfDB, bilateral donors)	Carbon Market (VCM / Article 6)	Capital markets (labelled debt)
Technical requirements	**Mitigation projects**	Clear identification of mitigation practices (pasture management, silvopastoral systems, animal nutrition, animal health) Explicit theory of change (practice > productivity > emissions reduction) including proxies where full accounting is not feasible) Integration of gender, social inclusion, and environmental safeguards Basic MRV systems (not necessarily full carbon accounting)	Use of approved methodologies (VCS, Gold Standard, Plan Vivo) Robust baseline definition and demonstration of additionality Advanced MRV systems (models, field measurements, remote sensing) Permanence and risk management mechanisms (buffer pools, fire/grazing risk) Aggregation design suitable for smallholders	Clear definition of eligible livestock-related activities Standardized impact metrics (tCO_2e reduced/removed, hectares restored, productivity gains) Annual reporting systems aligned with international standards Aggregated projects at landscape or value-chain level
	Adaptation projects	Climate vulnerability and risk assessment based on historical trends and forward-looking projections Clear theory of change linking adaptation measures to measurable resilience outcomes Definition of context-specific resilience indicators (e.g., reduced livestock mortality, improved forage security, adaptive capacity proxies) Use of locally appropriate and climate-resilient practices (e.g., drought-tolerant breeds, water management systems, rangeland restoration) Monitoring framework focused on resilience and vulnerability reduction, including gender and social inclusion considerations	NA	NA
Institutional requirements		Accredited implementing entity or partnership with an accredited entity Explicit alignment with NDCs, livestock sector strategies, and national climate plans Administrative and fiduciary capacity for fund management and reporting Coordination mechanisms with local governments and extension services	Functional national regulatory framework (authorization, Article 6 where relevant) Clear carbon rights and land tenure arrangements Local governance structures and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) Transparent benefit-sharing agreements	Credible issuer (government, development bank, financial institution) Alignment with green taxonomies and ICMA / Climate Bonds standards Independent monitoring and verification capacity Enabling legal framework for green bond issuance
Financial requirements		Detailed and realistic budget Co-financing requirements in some cases Post-grant sustainability plan (how practices continue after grant period) Capacity to absorb funds in rural and low-capacity contexts Main bottlenecks in Africa Weak project preparation capacity in livestock Low sector prioritization Dependence on external technical assistance	Upfront capital for project development (typically 3–5 years before revenues) Ability to manage carbon price volatility Clear and transparent payment mechanisms to producers Recurrent validation and verification costs High transaction costs Legal and reputational risks Limited MRV capacity	Minimum portfolio size (tens to hundreds of millions USD) Predictable cash flows for debt repayment Issuance, certification, and reporting costs Exposure to currency risk in weak local currencies Difficulty reaching scale Limited bankability of smallholders
Strategic role in livestock mitigation and adaptation		Foundational instrument for pilots, capacity building, and early-stage risk reduction	Recurring revenue stream, complementary to grants; effective at scale with strong governance	Scaling instrument, best suited for national or regional livestock programs

References

Climate Policy Initiative. (2025). Global Landscape of Climate Finance 2025. bit.ly/4rJq9nl

Green Climate Fund. (2022, November 17). Pathways to dairy net zero: Promoting low carbon and climate resilient livestock in East Africa. Pathways to Dairy Net Zero: Promoting Low Carbon and Climate Resilient Livestock in East Africa. bit.ly/3PcYoVL

Herrero, M., Henderson, B., Havlík, P., Thornton, P. K., Conant, R. T., Smith, P., Wirsenius, S., Hristov, A. N., Gerber, P., Gill, M., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Valin, H., Garnett, T., & Stehfest, E. (2016). Greenhouse gas mitigation potentials in the livestock sector. Nature Climate Change, 6(5), 452–461. doi: 10.1038/nclimate2925

ICMA. (2025). Green Bond Principles Voluntary Process Guidelines for Issuing Green Bonds. bit.ly/4lfZrjR

Initiative Climate Bonds. (2021). Climate Bonds Launches Green Criteria for Agriculture Investments: Now Including Livestock. bit.ly/46BJQ8j

Verra. (2025). Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) by Verra. Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) by Verra. bit.ly/4l7ZDSi

World Bank. (2021). Opportunities for Climate Finance in the Livestock Sector: Removing Obstacles and Realizing Potential. bit.ly/3NgIcSV

Acknowledgements

This study was financed by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) within the framework of the LiveSys project (Catalysing Transformation Towards Sustainable Livestock Systems). Additional support was provided by the Low-Methane Forages project, funded by the Bezos Earth Fund and the Gates Foundation, as well as by the CGIAR Science Programs on Sustainable Animal and Aquatic Foods (SAAF) and Climate Action (ClimAct). We gratefully acknowledge all donors who support our work globally through their contributions to the CGIAR System. The views expressed in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of GIZ, BMZ, or the other donors and supporting organizations.

CONTACT

Stefan Burkart
Thematic Leader, Tropical Forages Program
s.burkart@cgiar.org

March 2026