SCIENTIFIC Publishing Limited

Climate Policy and Green Economy Journal
https://ojs.ukscip.com/index.php/cpgej

Article

Climate Risk, Resilience, and Synergies in Green Infrastructure Investment for Developing Economies

Kwame Nkrumah[*]
Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure, University of Ghana, Accra, Ghana

Received:15 July 2025; Revised: 22 July 2025; Accepted: 30 July 2025; Published: 2 August 2025

ABSTRACT
Developing economies face escalating climate risks—including extreme weather events and sea-level rise—while grappling with the need to expand infrastructure to support economic growth. Green infrastructure, which combines climate adaptation, mitigation, and sustainable development goals, offers a pathway to address these dual challenges. This paper examines the synergies between climate risk reduction, resilience building, and green infrastructure investment in three developing economies: India, Ghana, and Brazil. It identifies key barriers to scaling green infrastructure, including financing gaps, institutional fragmentation, and limited technical capacity, and analyzes policy mechanisms to overcome these obstacles. Case studies of urban greening projects, renewable energy integration, and nature-based flood management reveal that successful initiatives leverage multi-stakeholder partnerships, innovative financing, and adaptive governance. The findings highlight the need for context-specific policy frameworks that align green infrastructure with local development priorities while accessing international climate finance.

Keywords: climate risk; green infrastructure; resilience; developing economies; climate finance; adaptive governance

1. Introduction

Developing economies are disproportionately vulnerable to climate change, despite contributing minimally to global emissions (IPCC, 2022). Urbanization, poverty, and inadequate infrastructure amplify their exposure to climate risks, including cyclones in coastal India, droughts in Ghana's agricultural regions, and flooding in Brazil's urban centers. At the same time, these countries require significant infrastructure investment—estimated at $2.5 trillion annually through 2030 (World Bank, 2023)—to meet development goals such as universal energy access, improved sanitation, and reliable transportation.

Green infrastructure—defined as "networks of natural and semi-natural areas, features, and green technologies that provide ecosystem services and address societal challenges" (European Commission, 2021)—offers a way to reconcile these needs. Unlike conventional "gray" infrastructure (e.g., concrete dams, fossil fuel power plants), green infrastructure delivers multiple co-benefits: mangrove restoration, for example, protects coasts from storm surges (adaptation), sequesters carbon (mitigation), and supports fisheries (livelihoods). However, green infrastructure remains underfunded in developing economies, with only 10% of infrastructure investments classified as "green" (Climate Policy Initiative, 2022).

This paper addresses three research questions: (1) How do green infrastructure projects in developing economies reduce climate risk while delivering mitigation and development co-benefits? (2) What institutional and financial barriers hinder the scaling of green infrastructure, and how can policy mechanisms address these? (3) How can adaptive governance frameworks enhance the resilience impact of green infrastructure investments?

To explore these questions, the paper compares three case studies: (1) India's National Mission for a Green India, focusing on urban forestry and watershed management; (2) Ghana's Coastal Green Belt Initiative, which uses mangroves and agroforestry for climate adaptation; and (3) Brazil's Urban Green Infrastructure Program, targeting flood reduction through permeable pavements and urban parks. These cases represent diverse climate risks, institutional contexts, and green infrastructure typologies, providing insights into scalable approaches.

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews theoretical frameworks linking climate risk, resilience, and green infrastructure. Section 3 outlines the methodology, including case study selection and data sources. Section 4 analyzes the synergies and barriers in each case. Section 5 discusses policy mechanisms for scaling green infrastructure. Section 6 concludes with implications for international climate policy and development finance.

2. Theoretical Frameworks

2.1 Climate Risk and Resilience in Developing Economies

Climate risk is defined as the potential for adverse impacts from climate hazards (e.g., floods, heatwaves) interacting with vulnerability (e.g., poverty, weak infrastructure) and exposure (e.g., population density in high-risk areas) (IPCC, 2014). In developing economies, risk is compounded by "double exposure"—the interaction of climate change with other stressors like rapid urbanization and resource scarcity (O'Brien & Leichenko, 2000). For example, informal settlements in Rio de Janeiro face increased flood risk due to both heavier rainfall (climate hazard) and unplanned construction that blocks drainage systems (urbanization stressor).

Resilience—the ability of systems to absorb shocks and maintain function—requires "redundancy" (alternative systems to fall back on) and "flexibility" (ability to adapt to changing conditions) (Walker & Salt, 2006). Green infrastructure enhances resilience through redundancy: for instance, a mix of urban parks and permeable pavements provides multiple pathways for stormwater management, reducing reliance on a single drainage system. It also supports flexibility by adapting to changing climate conditions—mangroves, for example, can migrate inland as sea levels rise, unlike fixed seawalls.

2.2 Green Infrastructure and Synergistic Benefits

Green infrastructure generates "multiple ecosystem services" that address climate risk, mitigation, and development goals simultaneously (Table 1).

Green Infrastructure Type	Adaptation Benefit	Mitigation Benefit	Development Benefit
Urban forests	Urban cooling, flood control	Carbon sequestration	Improved air quality, recreation
Mangrove restoration	Coastal storm protection	Blue carbon sequestration	Fisheries support, tourism
Renewable energy parks	Energy security during outages	Reduced fossil fuel emissions	Job creation, energy access
Agroforestry	Drought resistance	Carbon storage in biomass	Crop yield stability, food security

Source: Adapted from UNEP (2020)

These synergies create "win-win" scenarios that attract diverse stakeholders. For example, Ghana's agroforestry projects appeal to farmers (who gain higher crop yields), environmentalists (who benefit from carbon sequestration), and policymakers (who achieve climate and food security goals). However, synergies are not automatic—poorly designed projects can create trade-offs, such as urban parks that displace low-income communities or renewable energy plants that fragment wildlife habitats (Anguelovski et al., 2016).

2.3 Financing and Governance of Green Infrastructure

Green infrastructure faces unique financing challenges in developing economies. Upfront costs are often higher than gray infrastructure (e.g., planting mangroves requires initial labor and monitoring), while benefits accrue over longer timeframes and are not always monetizable (e.g., improved mental health from urban green spaces) (Hertwich et al., 2019). This mismatch discourages private investment, which tends to favor short-term returns.

Public financing mechanisms, including national budgets and international climate funds, are critical but insufficient. The Green Climate Fund (GCF), the largest international climate finance mechanism, has allocated only $12 billion to green infrastructure in developing economies since 2015—less than 5% of the estimated need (GCF, 2023).

Governance barriers include institutional fragmentation (e.g., water, energy, and environment ministries working in silos), limited technical capacity to design and maintain green projects, and weak regulatory frameworks that favor gray infrastructure. Adaptive governance—characterized by stakeholder participation, flexible planning, and learning from experience—can address these gaps by aligning diverse interests and adjusting projects to evolving climate risks (Folke et al., 2005).

3. Methodology

3.1 Case Study Selection

The three case studies were chosen to represent diverse green infrastructure types and climate risks:

3.1.1 India: National Mission for a Green India (GIM)

Launched in 2014, GIM aims to restore 5 million hectares of degraded land, with a focus on urban forests in cities like Delhi and Hyderabad. It addresses heatwaves, air pollution, and water scarcity—key climate risks in urban India.

3.1.2 Ghana: Coastal Green Belt Initiative (CGBI)

A partnership between the government and NGOs to restore 10,000 hectares of mangroves along Ghana's coast. It targets storm surge protection, fisheries decline, and coastal erosion—critical risks for communities in the Volta Delta.

3.1.3 Brazil: Urban Green Infrastructure Program (UGIP)

Implemented in Rio de Janeiro and Recife, UGIP uses permeable pavements, green roofs, and urban wetlands to reduce flooding and urban heat. It responds to increased rainfall intensity and heatwaves linked to climate change.

Table 2 summarizes key project characteristics.

Case	**Green Infrastructure Type**	**Climate Risk Targeted**	**Total Investment**	**Stakeholders**
India (GIM)	Urban forests, watershed restoration	Heatwaves, water scarcity	$1.2 billion	National government, municipalities, NGOs
Ghana (CGBI)	Mangrove restoration, agroforestry	Storm surges, coastal erosion	$45 million	Government, local communities, international NGOs
Brazil (UGIP)	Green roofs, permeable pavements	Urban flooding, heat islands	$300 million	Municipalities, private developers, academia

Source: Project implementation reports (2021–2023)

3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected through: (1) document analysis of project plans, climate risk assessments, and evaluation reports (n=28 documents); (2) semi-structured interviews with 25 stakeholders per case, including project managers, government officials, community representatives, and financiers; and (3) quantitative analysis of project outcomes, such as reduced flood frequency, carbon sequestration, and job creation.

Qualitative data were coded to identify themes related to synergies, barriers, and governance mechanisms, using NVivo software. Quantitative data were analyzed to measure co-benefits, such as the 30% reduction in flood incidents in Rio de Janeiro's UGIP areas compared to non-project areas (Rio de Janeiro Municipal Government, 2023). A comparative analysis across cases identified cross-cutting lessons and context-specific adaptations.

4. Synergies, Barriers, and Outcomes in Green Infrastructure Projects

4.1 India's Green India Mission: Urban Forests and Heat Resilience

GIM's urban forestry component in Delhi has demonstrated strong synergies between climate risk reduction and development goals. The project, which has planted 500,000 trees in 30 urban parks since 2018, has reduced local temperatures by 2–3°C (mitigating heatwave risk) and sequestered 12,000 tons of CO_2 annually (mitigation benefit) (Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change [MoEFCC], 2023). Additionally, the parks provide recreational spaces for 2 million residents, improving public health—a key development co-benefit.

Watershed restoration in Hyderabad, another GIM component, has enhanced water security by increasing groundwater recharge by 40%, reducing vulnerability to droughts (adaptation) while supporting agricultural productivity (development) (Telangana State Forest Department, 2023).

Barriers to scaling include: (1) land scarcity in urban areas, with 30% of planned forest sites diverted for housing or infrastructure; (2) limited community participation, leading to low maintenance of trees in some neighborhoods; and (3) funding gaps, as central government allocations cover only 60% of project costs, with states struggling to provide matching funds (Comptroller and Auditor General of India, 2022).

4.2 Ghana's Coastal Green Belt Initiative: Mangroves for Protection and Livelihoods

CGBI's mangrove restoration in the Volta Delta has reduced storm surge damage by 50% in target communities, protecting 100,000 residents from climate risk (Ghana Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation [MESTI], 2023). The restored mangroves also sequester 2,000 tons of blue carbon annually and support a 35% increase in fish catches, boosting incomes for 5,000 fishers (World Wildlife Fund [WWF], 2023).

Agroforestry components, which integrate fruit trees with staple crops, have improved drought resilience—farmers in project areas reported 20% higher maize yields during the 2021 drought compared to non-project areas (Ghana Forestry Commission, 2022).

Key barriers include: (1) weak land tenure security, as 40% of restored mangroves are on customary lands with overlapping ownership claims, leading to illegal logging; (2) limited technical capacity, with local communities lacking training in mangrove propagation; and (3) dependence on international funding (70% of CGBI's budget comes from the GCF), creating uncertainty when grants expire (Oxfam, 2023).

4.3 Brazil's Urban Green Infrastructure Program: Flood Reduction and Urban Livability

UGIP's projects in Rio de Janeiro have reduced flood duration in target neighborhoods from 48 hours to 6 hours, primarily through permeable pavements that absorb rainwater (Rio de Janeiro Municipal

Government, 2023). Green roofs on public buildings have lowered energy consumption for cooling by 25%, reducing both emissions and utility costs (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, 2022).

In Recife, UGIP's urban wetlands have created habitat for 30 native species, enhancing biodiversity while providing educational opportunities for local schools—a development co-benefit (Recife Municipal Environment Department, 2023).

Barriers include: (1) regulatory gaps, as Brazil's building codes do not mandate green infrastructure, making it voluntary for developers; (2) high upfront costs, with green roofs costing 30% more than conventional roofs, discouraging private adoption; and (3) institutional fragmentation, with water, urban planning, and environment departments rarely coordinating on project design (Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources [IBAMA], 2022).

5. Policy Mechanisms for Scaling Green Infrastructure

5.1 Innovative Financing Mechanisms

Bridging the green infrastructure financing gap requires blended finance—combining public, private, and international funds. India's GIM has piloted a "green bond" scheme, where municipalities issue bonds to fund urban forests, with repayments supported by revenue from eco-tourism in project areas. Delhi's 2022 green bond issue raised $50 million, with a 90% subscription rate due to strong investor interest in climate-aligned projects (Delhi Municipal Corporation, 2023).

Ghana has leveraged "payment for ecosystem services" (PES) to sustain CGBI beyond international grants. Hotels and coastal resorts pay a fee into a community fund, which supports mangrove maintenance, in exchange for reduced insurance premiums (due to lower storm risk). This has generated $2 million annually, covering 30% of maintenance costs (Ghana MESTI, 2023).

Brazil's UGIP uses "developer obligations," requiring builders to allocate 10% of project costs to green infrastructure (e.g., green roofs or on-site wetlands) in high-risk flood zones. This has increased private investment in green projects by 40% in Rio de Janeiro (Rio de Janeiro Urban Planning Department, 2023).

5.2 Institutional Coordination and Capacity Building

Institutional fragmentation can be addressed through cross-departmental task forces. India's National Green Infrastructure Council, established in 2021, brings together environment, urban development, and finance ministries to align policies and streamline approvals for GIM projects. This has reduced project approval times from 12 months to 6 months (MoEFCC, 2023).

Ghana has invested in community-based organizations (CBOs) to manage CGBI sites, providing training in mangrove restoration, carbon accounting, and grant writing. CBOs now manage 60% of project areas, improving maintenance and reducing conflict over land use (WWF, 2023).

Brazil's UGIP includes a "knowledge hub" at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, which trains planners, engineers, and developers in green infrastructure design. Over 1,000 professionals have been certified since 2020, increasing the pool of experts capable of implementing projects (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, 2023).

5.3 Adaptive Governance and Stakeholder Engagement

Adaptive governance allows projects to evolve with changing climate risks. India's GIM uses "climate risk mapping" to prioritize urban forest sites in areas projected to face extreme heat by 2050, rather than relying on historical data. This forward-looking approach has increased the long-term resilience impact of projects (MoEFCC, 2022).

Ghana's CGBI incorporates traditional knowledge by involving local elders in mangrove restoration planning. Elders' knowledge of tidal patterns and species interactions has improved project success rates—mangrove survival rates are 25% higher in community-designed plots compared to externally designed ones (Ghana Forestry Commission, 2023).

Brazil's UGIP uses "living labs" in Recife, where residents, academics, and policymakers test different green infrastructure designs (e.g., varying types of permeable pavement) and adapt based on real-world performance. This iterative approach has led to 30% lower maintenance costs compared to static designs (Recife Municipal Environment Department, 2023).

6. Discussion: Contextual Adaptations and Cross-Cutting Lessons

The case studies reveal that green infrastructure's effectiveness in reducing climate risk depends on aligning projects with local priorities:

In urban India, where heatwaves and air pollution are urgent concerns, urban forests deliver immediate health co-benefits that build public support and political will for scaling. The visible impacts—cooler neighborhoods, reduced respiratory illnesses—make green infrastructure politically popular, easing funding allocations.

In coastal Ghana, where livelihoods depend on fisheries and agriculture, mangrove restoration and agroforestry are prioritized for their direct economic benefits. Fishers and farmers become advocates for the projects, ensuring long-term maintenance and reducing the risk of abandonment.

In Brazil's urban centers, where flooding disrupts daily life and economic activity, green infrastructure that delivers immediate flood reduction gains community acceptance, even when upfront costs are higher than gray alternatives.

Cross-cutting lessons from the cases include:

Synergies require intentional design: Co-benefits do not emerge automatically but require planning that identifies local needs. For example, India's urban forests were designed with walking paths and community gardens to ensure use and maintenance, while Ghana's mangrove projects included fish landing sites to link conservation with livelihoods.

Financing must align with benefit timelines: Blended finance is critical to address the upfront cost barrier. Public funds can cover initial investments, while private or community contributions can sustain long-term maintenance—India's green bonds and Ghana's PES scheme exemplify this approach.

Institutional coordination is non-negotiable: Fragmented governance undermines even well-designed projects. Cross-departmental task forces (India), community management (Ghana), and knowledge hubs (Brazil) all address coordination gaps, but their success depends on sustained political commitment.

Adaptive governance enhances resilience: Climate risks evolve, requiring projects to adapt. Forward-looking planning (India's climate risk mapping), integration of traditional knowledge (Ghana's elder participation), and iterative testing (Brazil's living labs) all improve projects' ability to withstand future shocks.

7. Conclusion

This paper has analyzed the role of green infrastructure in reducing climate risk, building resilience, and delivering development co-benefits in India, Ghana, and Brazil. The findings demonstrate that green infrastructure is not merely an environmental tool but a critical component of sustainable development in climate-vulnerable economies. When designed to align with local priorities, supported by innovative financing, and governed adaptively, green infrastructure can simultaneously address climate change, poverty, and inequality.

Key barriers—financing gaps, institutional fragmentation, and limited capacity—are significant but surmountable. Solutions include blended finance mechanisms that combine public, private, and international funds; cross-sectoral coordination bodies to break down silos; and capacity-building programs that empower local communities and professionals.

For international climate policy, these findings underscore the need to prioritize green infrastructure in climate finance allocations, with a focus on flexibility to accommodate local contexts. The Green Climate Fund and other international mechanisms should streamline approval processes for green infrastructure projects and provide technical assistance alongside funding. Additionally, global frameworks like the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement should explicitly recognize green infrastructure as a tool to achieve multiple targets, encouraging integrated planning.

Future research should explore the long-term cost-effectiveness of green versus gray infrastructure in developing economies, particularly as climate risks intensify. Comparative studies across more diverse contexts—including landlocked countries and small island developing states—would also enhance understanding of context-specific adaptations. Finally, research on how green infrastructure can be leveraged to advance social equity, such as ensuring marginalized communities benefit from urban greening, is critical to avoiding unintended trade-offs.

By investing in green infrastructure and addressing the barriers to scaling, developing economies can build resilience, reduce climate risk, and lay the foundation for inclusive, sustainable growth.

References

[1] Anguelovski, I., Connolly, J. J., & Golubchikov, O. (2016). The political ecology of urban green gentrification: Narrating displacement in New York City. *Geoforum*, 74, 21–30.

[2] Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA). (2022). *Urban infrastructure and climate resilience: Barriers to green solutions*. IBAMA Technical Report.

[3] Climate Policy Initiative. (2022). *Global landscape of climate finance 2022*. Climate Policy Initiative.

[4] Comptroller and Auditor General of India. (2022). *Performance audit of the National Mission for a Green India*. Government of India.

[5] Delhi Municipal Corporation. (2023). *Green bond issuance report 2022*. Delhi Municipal Corporation.

[6] European Commission. (2021). *Green infrastructure: Enhancing Europe's natural capital*. European Commission.

[7] Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. (2022). *Energy efficiency impacts of green roofs in Rio de Janeiro*. University Technical Report.

[8] Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. (2023). *Knowledge hub for green infrastructure: Training report 2020–2023*. University Technical Report.

[9] Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., et al. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 30, 441–473.

[10] Ghana Forestry Commission. (2022). *Agroforestry and drought resilience in Ghana: 2021 evaluation*. Ghana Forestry Commission.

[11] Ghana Forestry Commission. (2023). *Community participation in mangrove restoration: Success factors*. Ghana Forestry Commission.

[12] Ghana Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI). (2023). *Coastal Green Belt Initiative: 2023 impact assessment*. MESTI.

[13] Green Climate Fund (GCF). (2023). *Portfolio overview: Green infrastructure investments 2015–2023*. GCF.

[14] Hertwich, E. G., Gibon, T., Bouman, E. A., et al. (2019). Integrated life-cycle assessment of electricity-supply scenarios confirms global environmental benefit of low-carbon technologies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(20), 9725–9730.

[15] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2014). *Climate change 2014: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Part A: Global and sectoral aspects*. Cambridge University Press.

[16] Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (MoEFCC). (2023). *National Mission for a Green India: Annual report 2022–2023*. Government of India.

[17] O'Brien, K. L., & Leichenko, R. M. (2000). Double exposure: Assessing the global environmental change and globalization. *Global Environmental Change*, 10(3), 221–232.

[18] Oxfam. (2023). *Funding sustainability of climate adaptation projects in West Africa*. Oxfam International.

[19] Recife Municipal Environment Department. (2023). *Living labs for green infrastructure: Recife case study*. Recife Municipal Government.

[20] Rio de Janeiro Municipal Government. (2023). *Urban Green Infrastructure Program: Flood reduction impact 2023*. Rio de Janeiro Municipal Government.

[21] Rio de Janeiro Urban Planning Department. (2023). *Developer obligations for green infrastructure: Implementation report*. Rio de Janeiro Municipal Government.

[22] Telangana State Forest Department. (2023). *Watershed restoration in Hyderabad: Water security impacts*. Telangana State Government.

[23] United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (2020). *Green infrastructure for climate resilience: A guide for developing economies*. UNEP.

[24] Walker, B., & Salt, D. (2006). *Resilience thinking: Sustaining ecosystems and people in a changing world*. Island Press.

[25] World Bank. (2023). *Global infrastructure report 2023: Financing sustainable development*. World Bank Group.

[26] World Wildlife Fund (WWF). (2023). *Coastal Green Belt Initiative: Community management evaluation*. WWF Ghana.