The Interim Report of the Expert Review on Debt, Nature & Climate

Tackling the Vicious Circle

The Independent Expert Group

Co-chairs

Vera Songwe

Chair and Founder, Liquidity and Sustainability Facility, Former Executive Secretary, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, and UN Under-Secretary-General

Members

Moritz Kraemer Chief Economist, LBBW Bank, and former

Global Chief Ratings Officer, S&P Global (formerly Standard and Poor's)

Masood Ahmed

President Emeritus, Center for Global Development

Juan-Camilo Cardenas

Professor, Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts Amherst and Universidad de Los Andes, Colombia

Simon Cueva

Rector, Universidad Internacional del Ecuador and former Minister of Economy and Finance, Ecuador

Kevin Gallagher

Professor of Global Development Policy and Director, Boston University Global Development Policy Center

Sandrine Gaudin

Vice-Governor (Financial Strategy), Council of Europe Development Bank

Ma Jun

Founder and President, Institute of Finance and Sustainability, Beijing

Frannie Leautier

Partner and CEO, SouthBridge Investment, and former Chief of Staff to the President and Vice President, World Bank Group **Isabelle Mateos y Lago** Group Chief Economist, BNP Paribas

Wanjira Mathai

Managing Director for Africa and Global Partnerships, World Resources Institute

Irene Monasterolo Professor of Climate Finance, School of Economics, Utretcht University

Avinash Persaud

Special Advisor on Climate Change to the President, Inter-American Development Bank

Anthony Requin

General Inspector of Finance, French Ministry of Economy and Finance

Brad Setser

Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, Washington DC

Stacy Swann Founder of Resilient Earth Capital and former CEO, Climate Finance Advisors

Jeromin Zettelmeyer

Director, Bruegel think tank, Brussels, and former Deputy Director, Strategy and Policy Review Department, IMF

All members of the Independent Expert Group serve in an individual capacity. This report does not represent the views of the institutions to which they are affiliated.

The Expert Review on Debt, Nature and Climate has been established by the governments of Colombia, France, Germany and Kenya to examine how the structure, volume and analysis of sovereign debt impact on the ability of low- and middle-income countries to conserve nature, adapt to climate change, and decarbonize their economies; and how such debt can become more sustainable, both fiscally and environmentally.

Executive Summary

Addressing high and unsustainable debt levels is a precondition for securing a livable planet for all. Countries need sufficient fiscal space and borrowing capacity to invest in development, climate and nature, particularly given the higher upfront investment needs associated with the transition to more sustainable and resilient economic models. Shifting on to more climate-compatible and nature-positive economic paths is the only way to minimize long-term risks and costs, and secure prosperity for all. Debt is an essential fiscal tool in this endeavor. But many emerging markets and developing countries (EMDCs) are not able to mobilize the necessary resources because of high debt burdens and costs.

Many EMDCs now face a triple crisis, which is most acute in low-income and other particularly vulnerable countries. Changing land and sea use, overexploitation, pollution and invasive species threaten the biodiversity and ecosystem services on which life depends. The impacts of climate change are already apparent in the form of more frequent and severe extreme weather events such as heatwaves, cyclones and flooding, as well as slow-onset events such as coastal erosion due to sea-level rise or desertification. Nature loss and climate change also have mutually reinforcing effects. At the same time, many EMDCs have seen both the levels and cost of debt soar. This means that EMDCs can borrow less, at greater cost, at a moment when they need more and cheaper finance to limit the extent of future shocks and stresses through investments in resilience, climate mitigation and nature protection.

EMDCs have been subject to a series of external shocks that have fueled indebtedness and raised the cost of borrowing. EMDCs need to do more to strengthen their tax capacity and debt management systems and the efficiency of public expenditure. However, over the last three decades, many significantly improved their public financial management, mobilizing more domestic resources and borrowing more responsibly. While debt levels and costs rose in the late 2010s in most EMDCs, it was the external shocks and stresses of the early 2020s that devastated their people's lives and livelihoods, and accelerated the deterioration of their fiscal positions: the Covid-19 pandemic, fuel and food price inflation, a strengthening US dollar, soaring interest rates and – in many cases – climate and environmental disasters. In some cases, the impact of these external shocks was exacerbated by poor policy choices.

EMDCs have been subject to a series of external shocks that have fueled indebtedness and raised the cost of borrowing. 6 Tackling the Vicious Circle – The Interim Report of the Expert Review on Debt, Nature and Climate

Figure ES1. Representation of the vicious circle of the debt, nature and climate crises.

Source: authors

Higher debt servicing creates incentives and requirements for is affects the climate increased resource

Climate/ nature shocks and stresses

Increased borrowing to fund disaster response and recovery.

Higher debt servicing reduces fiscal space for investment in nature and climate action.

Higher debt servicing increases the credit risk profile of countries, which in turn makes it more expensive to borrow for investment in nature and climate action.

Vicious circle

How the climate and nature crises as a sister a case of the climate and nature crises of the crises of the climate and the crises of the climate and the crises of the climate and the climate of the debt, nature and climate crises

Increased borrowing to meet the higher upfront costs associated with climate- and nature-positive development

Shocks and stresses constrain economic growth and public revenues, and therefore reduce capacities to service debt

Higher financing costs reduce the viability of capital-intensive climateand nature-smart measures.

HOW THE DEP CH



Higher debt levels and costs

Higher borrowing costs due to increased climate- and naturerelated risks, higher debt burdens and slower growth rates

The debt, climate and nature crises are coming together in a vicious circle for a growing number of countries. Increasingly frequent and severe environmental shocks and stresses are forcing many countries to borrow more to finance disaster response and recovery. Those same shocks and stresses make borrowing more expensive and slow economic growth. Countries with high debt burdens then have less fiscal space to pursue low-carbon, climate-resilient and nature-positive development paths. This in turn increases their vulnerability to such events – and will increase the severity and frequency of such events in the future. High levels of indebtedness may exacerbate environmental crises because those countries with abundant natural resource endowments may accelerate extraction and degradation to meet their debt servicing obligations and human needs.

A virtuous circle of green and resilient economic growth is possible. Sustainable infrastructure investment, technological innovation and improved resource productivity could drive strong, balanced and resilient growth while sustaining the ecosystem services on which economies and societies depend. However, it implies a profound change in our economies and societies, with transition risks and tradeoffs in key sectors. Still, a green growth model is feasible and sustainable. But shifting to this virtuous circle will demand a step change in financing. This will require significant increases in domestic resource mobilization by EMDCs themselves. But it will also require more international concessional finance and an effective response to unsustainable debt burdens and costs to enable countries to invest more in climateand nature-smart development.

This Interim Report of the Expert Review on Debt, Nature and Climate seeks to provide a diagnosis of the problems. Our Final Report, to be launched in the spring of 2025, will provide a set of recommendations that could help address the triple crisis and enable developing countries to shift to climate-compatible and nature-positive development. We anticipate that our recommendations will broadly fall into three categories:

- Whether and how countries can optimize their sovereign debt, complemented by enhanced domestic revenue mobilization and public finance management, to ensure sufficient funds for spending on nature protection and climate action, alongside other sustainable development priorities;
- Specific measures to selectively reduce current debt burdens to provide additional resources for sustainable development (such as debt pauses for countries affected by environmental disasters or debt-for-nature and debt-for-climate swaps); and
- Specific measures to ensure that future borrowing and lending redresses, rather than exacerbates, the triple crisis (such as expanding sustainability-linked debt and reducing resource-backed debt).

An immediate priority is to reform Debt Sustainability Frameworks (DSFs) to provide a better analytical and policy basis for addressing sovereign debt issues in the context of the climate and nature crises. DSFs provide a set of rules and methods used by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank to analyze the risks attached to a country's sovereign debt at a given time. The DSF defines which variables to forecast, what situations will be considered as risky, and how to make sure that the projections are realistic.

Debt Sustainability Analyses (DSAs) are of critical importance for two reasons.

- **1** DSAs determine whether, and the conditions under which, EMDCs have access to funding from the IMF, World Bank and some bilateral lenders.
- 2 DSAs determine the extent of debt restructuring and relief required when a country is in debt distress. The DSFs therefore have a powerful impact on the economic prospects and fiscal situation of the countries to which they are applied.

The current DSFs used by the IMF and World Bank do not adequately reflect the relationships between debt, climate and nature. DSAs need to better reflect the funding and financing needs of countries to address the climate and nature crises. They also need to allow creditors to better anticipate future risks, and tailor their financing terms accordingly. To this end, we offer three recommendations for reform of the DSFs for consideration by the staff, management and boards of the IMF and the World Bank.



Recommendation 1 Incorporate climaterelated risks and measures to reduce them. DSA should clearly and consistently incorporate the projected impacts of climate change, including both rapid onset shocks and slow onset stresses, in their underlying baseline macroeconomic and fiscal projections. The analysis should encompass higher potential liquidity risks stemming from environmental shocks, as well as solvency risks stemming from a deterioration in forecast economic growth rates and fiscal positions. The analysis should also account for the likely fiscal savings and greater economic stability associated with pre-arranged disaster risk financing, investments in resilience and other climate actions.

Recommendation 2 Incorporate nature-related risks and measures to reduce them. DSAs should start to incorporate the risks associated with nature loss in their underlying baseline macroeconomic and fiscal projections. Improved data collection and modelling will be necessary to do so robustly. The analysis should also account for the economic and fiscal benefits associated with nature protection and recovery.

Recommendation 3 Make greater use of different environmental and financing scenarios. DSFs should make more extensive use of different climate and nature scenarios, including ones with early and ambitious investments in resilience, nature protection and avoided emissions. These scenarios could illustrate how different financing sources and terms for those investments may affect debt sustainability over various time horizons. In data-poor contexts, an alternative approach might be to put a lower weight on debt incurred for climate and naturerelated investments, if its implementation can be verified.

Engagement and consultation

The Independent Expert Group is grateful to the stakeholders who have engaged with the Review to date: Asian Development Bank, Emerging Markets Investment Association, Group of 24 (G24), Fitch Ratings, French Finance Ministry, German Finance Ministry, Government of Colombia, Government of Kenya, Institute of International Finance, Inter-American Development Bank, International Institute for Environment and Development, International Monetary Fund, Moody's Investor Service, Paris Club, S&P Global, Sustainable Debt Coalition, UN Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, UN Environment Programme, US Treasury and the World Bank.

Secretariat

The Expert Review on Debt, Nature and Climate is supported by a Secretariat drawn from four independent research institutes: the Africa Centre for Economic Transformation (ACET – Accra, Ghana), the Finance for Development Lab (Paris, France), ODI Global (London, UK) and the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (UN CEPAL/UN ECLAC – Santiago, Chile). Gabriel Oddone of UN ECLAC serves as Director and Sarah Colenbrander of ODI Global serves as Deputy Director of the Secretariat. Michael Jacobs of ODI Global serves as Senior Advisor to the Independent Expert Group.

The Independent Expert Group is grateful to the members of the Secretariat who drafted and managed this Interim Report: John Asafu–Adjaye (ACET), Martin Kessler, Yoan Raih, Sima Kammourieh (Finance for Development Lab), Sarah Colenbrander, Catriona Foley, Michael Jacobs, Oliver Moyles, Maegan Rodricks, Emily Wilkinson, Dina Zayed (ODI Global), Gabriel Oddone, Cecilia Alves, Clara Canepa, Santiago Lorenzo, Martin Pereyra and Francisco Rosas (UN CEPAL/ECLAC).

The Secretariat are grateful for the funding provided by the Governments of France, Germany and Ireland, and by the Children's Investment Fund Foundation.



Design by Creative Concern

Expert Review on Debt, Nature & Climate