Negative Brief: Green Climate Fund

By Rebecca Sumner

***Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reform its foreign aid.***

The Affirmative case is advocating a $3 billion donation to the Green Climate Fund, which is a global fund created to support the efforts of developing countries to respond to the challenge of climate change by helping limit or reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or mitigate the effects of climate change with infrastructure projects. AFF says their plan would help reduce pollution and help the environment in poor countries, which would in turn, help the United States.

Negative will argue that the Green Climate Fund needs far more than just $3 billion dollars, so the Affirmative’s plan would just be a drop in the bucket. Not only that, but the Green Climate Fund isn’t really going to help the environment by that much because there’s no real way to reduce emissions enough to make a real difference. Plus, the Green Climate Fund is terrible with money because there’s a lack of transparency, so the money would be wasted. They also have a couple hydropower projects, which harm the environment even more and produce a lot of methane.
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Negative: The Green Climate Fund

NEGATIVE PHILOSOPHY / OPENING QUOTES

Best thing we can do about climate change is not spend another dollar on it

Stephen Moore 2018 (Distinguished Visiting Fellow for Project for Economic Growth at The Heritage Foundation) 18 Dec 2018 “Follow the (Climate Change) Money” https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/follow-the-climate-change-money

Now here’s the real scandal of the near trillion dollars that governments have stolen from taxpayers to fund climate change hysteria and research. By the industry’s own admission there has been almost no progress worldwide in actually combatting climate change. The latest reports by the U.S. government and the United Nations say the problem is getting worse not better and we have not delayed the apocalypse by a single day. Has there ever been such a massive government expenditure that has had such miniscule returns on investment? After three decades of “research” the only “solution” is for the world to stop using fossil fuels, which is like saying that we should stop growing food. Really? The greatest minds of the world entrusted with hundreds of billions of dollars can only come up with a solution that would entail the largest government power grab in world history, shutting down industrial production (just look at the catastrophe in Germany when they went all in for green energy), and throwing perhaps billions of human beings into poverty? If that’s the remedy, I will take my chances on a warming planet.

BACKGROUND

What the Green Climate Fund is / does: It’s about climate change

Green Climate Fund’s official website 2017 (Global fund created to respond to the challenges of climate change) **ethical disclosure:** article was undated, but referred to events that took place in 2017, “About The Fund,” <https://www.greenclimate.fund/who-we-are/about-the-fund>

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) is a new global fund created to support the efforts of developing countries to respond to the challenge of climate change. GCF helps developing countries limit or reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and adapt to climate change. It seeks to promote a paradigm shift to low-emission and climate-resilient development, taking into account the needs of nations that are particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts.

INHERENCY

1. A/T: “On Financial Brink”—Ending further U.S. funding won’t cripple the organization

While it might be a bit of a blow, the loss of U.S. funds doesn’t necessarily kneecap the organization

Nurith Aizenman 2017 (Global Health and International Development Correspondent for National Public Radio. Her work has appeared in: NPR, WNYC-FM (New York, NY), KPCC-FM (Pasadena, CA), KPBS-TV (San Diego, CA), WBEZ-FM (Chicago, IL), WAMU-FM (Washington, D.C.), Colorado Public Radio, WLRN-FM (Miami, FL), and WESA-FM (Pittsburgh, PA). She has been quoted by KQED-TV (San Francisco, CA), and WABE-FM (Atlanta, GA)) 9 June 2017, “A Little-Known Climate Fund Is Suddenly In The Spotlight,” <https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2017/06/09/532106567/a-little-known-climate-fund-is-suddenly-in-the-spotlight>

**6) Trump's decision to end further U.S. funding deals the organization a blow — but doesn't necessarily kneecap it.** Of the $10.3 billion that donor countries pledged to the GCF during that initial fundraising round back in 2013, the U.S. promised $3 billion. Under President Barack Obama, the U.S. has already handed over $1 billion in two installments of $500 million.   
[**ARTICLE GOES ON TO SAY IN THE SAME CONTEXT, QUOTE**]  
But while Trump claimed in his speech that he had “terminated” the GCF, Melanie Nakagawa, a former deputy assistant secretary for energy transformation at the U.S. Department of State under Obama, notes that the $1 billion that the U.S. did provide “is already in the system. The check is in and it is already having an impact.”

SOLVENCY

1. Funding “shortfall” is way more than the AFF provides

GCF says they need $100 billion

Hiroko Tabuchi 2017 (Climate reporter for The NY Times; previously, she was a Tokyo correspondent for The Wall Street Journal; graduated from the London School of Economics and Political Science) 16 Nov 2017, “U.N. Climate Projects, Aimed at the Poorest, Raise Red Flags” <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/16/climate/green-climate-fund.html>

The United States had promised to contribute $3 billion — more than any other country, though less than other donors on a per-capita basis — of which the Obama administration delivered $1 billion. Industrialized nations have indeed pledged to generate $100 billion a year by 2020 to help developing countries reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and address the effects of climate change. The fund has so far secured $10.3 billion in financing.

The shortfall is a little more like $99 billion

Christopher Booker 2015 (English journalist and author) 2 Nov 2015, “Climate change treaty will be the flop of the year,” <https://www.smh.com.au/opinion/climatechange-treaty-will-be-flop-of-the-year-20151102-gkod0l.html>

And what about that Green Climate Fund, supposed by 2020 to be dishing out $100 billion every year to help developing countries to “adapt to climate change”? Firm pledges received so far total just $700 million, leaving $99.3 billion still to go. The only real question that will remain after the failure of this bid for a binding treaty in Paris is how much longer it can be before the most expensive and foolish scare story in history finally falls apart.

2. GCF will have no substantial benefit

Green Climate Fund (GCF) goal is trying to reduce CO2 emissions to help with climate change

Willis Eschenbach 2018 (Contributor to Watts Up with That?, which is the world's most viewed site on global warming and climate change) 4 July 2018, “The Green Spent By The Green Climate Fund,”   
 <https://wattsupwiththat.com/2018/07/04/the-green-spent-by-the-green-climate-fund/>

To see just how bad the GCF waste is, I took a look at the Green Climate Fund “mitigation” projects. These are the projects that are supposed to reduce the amount of CO2 emitted. To date, there have been 22 of them, with a total funding (GCF + other public and private) of $6.9 billion dollars. And according to their undoubtedly rosy predictions of CO2 saved by windmills, solar panels, building insulation, and the like, all of the projects together will save just under two gigatonnes (Gt) of CO2.

In the best case, GCF will cause a temperature reduction of 0.0015°C

Willis Eschenbach 2018 (Contributor to Watts Up with That?, which is the world's most viewed site on global warming and climate change) 4 July 2018, “The Green Spent By The Green Climate Fund,”   
 <https://wattsupwiththat.com/2018/07/04/the-green-spent-by-the-green-climate-fund/> [ellipses and emphasis in original]

And according to their undoubtedly rosy predictions of CO2 saved by windmills, solar panels, building insulation, and the like, all of the projects together will save just under two gigatonnes (Gt) of CO2. Two billion tonnes! That’s a huge weight of CO2 … but what does that all mean? To understand it, let’s convert that to parts per million by volume (ppmv) of CO2. At present, we’re at 410 ppmv. Back in 1750, we were at about 278 ppmv of CO2. And according to the UN IPCC, that increase in CO2 is claimed to have caused a temperature increase of 2.0787°C. The reason for the number of decimals will become apparent in a moment. Now, to increase the atmospheric CO2 concentration by 1 ppmv, you need to emit about 16.8 Gt of CO2. The Green Climate Fund has avoided the emission of 2 Gt of CO2 … so IF their estimates are correct, and IF we got all of the savings today, instead of 410 ppmv it would make the CO2 concentration 409.88 ppmv. And in turn, this would make the claimed temperature increase caused by CO2 to be smaller … at 2.0771°C. So IF their estimates are correct, and IF we got all the savings today, and IF CO2 actually were the secret temperature control knob for the planet … if all that were true, **the total of all the projects funded by the GCF would cause a temperature reduction of … wait for it … 0.0015°C.**

0.0015°C is trivial: It’s the difference from the floor to half-way up to your knee. Not worth $6.9 billion

Willis Eschenbach 2018 (Contributor to Watts Up with That?, which is the world's most viewed site on global warming and climate change) 4 July 2018, “The Green Spent By The Green Climate Fund,”   
 <https://wattsupwiththat.com/2018/07/04/the-green-spent-by-the-green-climate-fund/> [ellipses in original]

Well, temperatures drop about one degree C for every hundred metres you go up in altitude. So in climbing a flight of stairs, you’d experience a temperature drop of about 0.03°C. Three-hundredths of one degree. Far too small to detect without special instruments. But that’s still twenty times the possible temperature reduction from the $6.9 billion dollars wasted on these GCF mitigation projects, a reduction which was only 0.0015°C. So we’ve spent $6.9 billion dollars for a POSSIBLE decrease of about the temperature difference from the floor to half-way up to your knee…

It would take $4.6 trillion (with a T) to drop the temperature 1°C

Willis Eschenbach 2018 (Contributor to Watts Up with That?, which is the world's most viewed site on global warming and climate change) 4 July 2018, “The Green Spent By The Green Climate Fund,”   
 <https://wattsupwiththat.com/2018/07/04/the-green-spent-by-the-green-climate-fund/> [ellipses and emphasis in original]

But that’s still twenty times the possible temperature reduction from the $6.9 billion dollars wasted on these GCF mitigation projects, a reduction which was only 0.0015°C. So we’ve spent $6.9 billion dollars for a POSSIBLE decrease of about the temperature difference from the floor to half-way up to your knee … be still, my beating heart … Or we could look at it another way … how much would we have to spend to drop possible temperatures by one measly degree? Since we are spending $6.9 billion for a possible theoretical drop of 0.0015°C, that would mean that a drop of 1°C would cost us a mere $4.6 TRILLION DOLLARS … with absolutely no guarantee of success.

Entire U.S. federal budget for FY2019 is $4.407 trillion -- less than it would take to drop the temperature by one degree

Kimberly Amadeo 2018 (President of WorldMoneyWatch.com. She has 20 years senior-level experience in economic analysis and business strategy working for major international corporations; M.S. in Management from the Sloan School of Business at M.I.T. in 1987, an M.S. in Social Planning from Boston College in 1978 and a B.A. in Psychology from the University of Rochester) 19 July 2018, “U.S. Federal Budget Breakdown,” <https://www.thebalance.com/u-s-federal-budget-breakdown-3305789>

In Fiscal Year 2019, the federal budget will be $4.407 trillion. The U.S. government estimates it will receive $3.422 trillion in revenue. That creates a $985 billion deficit for October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019. Spending is in three categories: Mandatory, which is at $2.739 trillion; Discretionary at $1.305 trillion; and Interest on the National Debt, $363 billion.

2. Growth in emissions worldwide will more than offset

Link: The world’s largest emissions emitters are not cutting emissions

Christopher Booker 2015 (English journalist and author. He has been a columnist for the Sunday Telegraph since 1990) 2 Nov 2015, “Climate change treaty will be the flop of the year,” <https://www.smh.com.au/opinion/climatechange-treaty-will-be-flop-of-the-year-20151102-gkod0l.html>

China, now easily the world's largest emitter, contributing 24 per cent of the total, plans by 2030 to double its CO₂ emissions, not least by building 363 more coal-fired power stations. India, now the third-largest emitter, plans by 2030 to treble its emissions. The fourth-largest emitter, Russia, despite slashing its emissions after 1990 by closing down much of its old Soviet industry, now proposes to increase them from their 2012 level by up to 38 per cent. Japan, the fifth-largest emitter, does claim that it will cut its emissions by some 15 per cent, but is still planning to build more coal-fired power plants. Although South Korea, the world's seventh-largest emitter, claims that it will cut emissions by 23 per cent (not least by buying "carbon credits" that will allow it to "offset" its continuing production of CO₂ for cash), even its proposed target will still be 100 per cent higher than it was 25 years ago.

There is no way to cut emissions by as much as proposed without shutting down the economy

Christopher Booker 2010 (English journalist and author. He has been a columnist for the Sunday Telegraph since 1990) 29 May 2010, “The woolly world of Chris Huhne,” <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7783317/The-woolly-world-of-Chris-Huhne.html>

But Britain already stands alone as the only country in the world committed by law – the 2008 Climate Change Act – to cutting its emissions in the next 40 years by a staggering 80 per cent, at a cost estimated by Mr Huhne’s energy department at £18 billion every year until 2050. (The ministry claims that this would amount to £404 billion, but it can’t do its sums properly: 40 times 18 is not 404 – the total is £734 billion.) The fact is that there is no one in the world, least of all Mr Huhne, who can explain how we could cut our emissions by four fifths without shutting down virtually all our existing economy. What carries this even further into the higher realms of lunacy is that such a Quixotic gesture would do nothing to halt the world’s fast-rising CO2 emissions, already up 40 per cent since 1990. This point is made very forcefully in a new book, Climate: The Great Delusion (Stacey International), by a much-respected French engineer, Christian Gerondeau. As this convert from global warming orthodoxy to hard-headed scepticism explains, it is now more obvious than ever that the developing countries, led by India and China (the world’s largest CO2 emitter), haven’t the slightest intention of cutting back their emissions. China plans to build a new coal-fired power station every week until 2030. Each year it now adds more to global CO2 emissions than the entire contribution made by Britain (which is responsible for less than 2 per cent of the world total).

Impossible to have a real impact. Can’t make up for what China and India are adding yearly.

Christopher Booker 2015 (English journalist and author. He has been a columnist for the Sunday Telegraph since 1990) 2 Nov 2015, “Climate change treaty will be the flop of the year,” <https://www.smh.com.au/opinion/climatechange-treaty-will-be-flop-of-the-year-20151102-gkod0l.html>

Which leaves the European Union as the only part of the world committed to cutting its emissions by 40 per cent within 15 years. However, Poland is already refusing to sign the treaty, as it builds more fossil-fuel power stations to keep its lights on, while Germany, the sixth-largest emitter does the same. The only government in the world wholly committed to meeting that 40 per cent target by 2030 is Britain, the 14th-largest emitter, responsible for just 1.3 per cent of global emissions. This is less than China or India are now adding every year, as we shut down those fossil-fuel power plants that still manage to provide 70 per cent of our electricity.

3. Natural forces block success

Reducing man-made CO2 emissions won’t matter because natural forces beyond our control are moving the climate

Christopher Booker 2010 (English journalist and author. He has been a columnist for the Sunday Telegraph since 1990) 29 May 2010, “The woolly world of Chris Huhne,” (brackets added) <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7783317/The-woolly-world-of-Chris-Huhne.html>

There is no way, [French engineer, Christian] Gerondeau argues, for us to prevent the world’s CO2 emissions from doubling by 2100. Fortunately, he goes on to explain why this will have remarkably little effect on climate: he has come to agree with all those eminent scientists who believe that this is largely shaped by natural factors beyond our control, such as the sun and ocean currents.

4. No credibility

The Green Climate Fund has very diminished credibility among recipient countries

Megan Darby 2017 (Climate Home's deputy editor. She previously wrote about UK energy and water industries for leading sector publication Utility Week. She holds a Mathematics degree from Newcastle University) 4 June 2017, “Green Climate Fund ‘a laughing stock’, say poor countries,” <http://www.climatechangenews.com/2017/04/06/green-climate-fund-laughing-stock-ethiopia-bid-left-limbo/>

Tosi Mpanu Mpanu, a board member from DR Congo, warned the indecision was diminishing the fund’s credibility among recipient countries. “They are saying the GCF board is a laughing stock, they are seeing people to go the extra mile and when we do it is still not good enough,” he said.

5. Endless paperwork

Poor countries don’t actually get much money from GCF, they just get a big stack of paperwork

Saleemul Huq 2016 (*director of the International Centre for Climate Change and Development at the Independent University of Bangladesh*) 12 Jan 2016 Why the UN’s Green Climate Fund is not fit for purpose https://www.climatechangenews.com/2016/12/01/why-the-uns-green-climate-fund-is-not-fit-for-purpose/

Developed countries have already contributed around US $10 Billion to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) whose board has taken the laudable policy decision to allocate half of that amount to finance adaptation activities in the poorest and most vulnerable countries. However, if the proof of the pudding is in the eating, then the poor and vulnerable countries are not eating any pudding at all. Instead they are on a perpetual treadmill of paperwork to even qualify to receive any of the funds that are already earmarked for them.

Countries that need it most are the ones least able to qualify for the funds and programs. Can’t do the paperwork!

Saleemul Huq 2016 (*director of the International Centre for Climate Change and Development at the Independent University of Bangladesh*) 12 Jan 2016 Why the UN’s Green Climate Fund is not fit for purpose https://www.climatechangenews.com/2016/12/01/why-the-uns-green-climate-fund-is-not-fit-for-purpose/

Finally let me make a point about the intended beneficiaries of adaptation funding. I believe that the priority recipients for adaptation funding (which I believe the funders also want) is for the most vulnerable communities in the poorest countries. However, the current modality of micro-scrutinising paperwork puts these very communities and countries at a disadvantage as they are least able to generate the required level of paperwork (unless they hire so-called international experts to do it for them!).

6. No expertise

Nobody knows how to mitigate climate change because the world has never done it before. So GCF has no value to add

Saleemul Huq 2016 (*director of the International Centre for Climate Change and Development at the Independent University of Bangladesh*) 12 Jan 2016 Why the UN’s Green Climate Fund is not fit for purpose https://www.climatechangenews.com/2016/12/01/why-the-uns-green-climate-fund-is-not-fit-for-purpose/

Painful as this may be for GCF board members and staff, I believe we need a radically different model that will be fit for purpose. First we need to recognise that adaptation to climate change is a new activity for which there is no real pre-existing “expertise” available. Hence the entire process, at least for the first decade, will be a learning-by-doing process where expertise will be developed by practitioners and others over time.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Misused funds

Link: Lack of transparency with GCF funds

Hiroko Tabuchi 2017 (Climate reporter for The NY Times; previously, she was a Tokyo correspondent for The Wall Street Journal; graduated from the London School of Economics and Political Science) 16 Nov 2017, “U.N. Climate Projects, Aimed at the Poorest, Raise Red Flags” <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/16/climate/green-climate-fund.html>

A landmark pledge seven years ago by the world’s richest nations to spend billions to help developing countries tackle climate change seemed like a godsend for Kiribati, the Pacific island nation threatened by rising seas. The result of that promise was the Green Climate Fund. But Kiribati — like many of the poorest countries most vulnerable to climate change — has yet to see any project funding. Instead, many of the projects that have won early backing were approved despite concerns raised by current and former observers on the fund’s board over whether officials had done due diligence on projects — especially on those involving the private sector, which make up half of the approximately $2.6 billion in project financing authorized so far. “We raised our objections, but the gavel just came down,” said Liane Schalatek, one of two civil society observers on the fund’s board and associate director at the Heinrich Böll Foundation North America, an environmental group associated with the Greens party in Germany. “There’s a real lack of transparency,” she said.

Example: Projects without necessary details and projects with funds going toward the private sector are approved

Hiroko Tabuchi 2017 (Climate reporter for The NY Times; previously, she was a Tokyo correspondent for The Wall Street Journal; graduated from the London School of Economics and Political Science) 16 Nov 2017, “U.N. Climate Projects, Aimed at the Poorest, Raise Red Flags” <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/16/climate/green-climate-fund.html>

The observers took issue, for example, with a proposed project that would hand out $265 million in equity and grants to Geeref Next, a Luxembourg-based investment fund that proposed to finance renewable energy or energy efficiency projects in about 30 countries — with no explicit plan to disclose what those projects would be. The fund’s 24-member board approved the proposal. The board observers have also asked why the fund’s finances, set up to back locally owned projects that reach the most vulnerable communities, were going toward private-sector enterprises led by global investment firms — like $110 million in loans and grants for solar projects in Kazakhstan led by London-based United Green Energy and the investment arm of Kazakhstan’s sovereign wealth fund. Those concerns also went unaddressed.

Funds are misused. Money is being given toward projects destined for failure. 3 Examples

Hiroko Tabuchi 2017 (Climate reporter for The NY Times; previously, she was a Tokyo correspondent for The Wall Street Journal; graduated from the London School of Economics and Political Science) 16 Nov 2017, “U.N. Climate Projects, Aimed at the Poorest, Raise Red Flags” <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/16/climate/green-climate-fund.html>

According to funding proposals for the 54 projects approved so far, as well as a record of objections raised by board observers, other projects that have raised red flags include:|  
- $25 million in equity and grants administered from Mauritius, a corporate tax haven, for off-grid solar power in Rwanda, Kenya and Uganda;  
- $50 million in loans and grants to repair a Soviet-era dam in Tajikistan, even though experts have warned that hydropower there is vulnerable to the retreat of the snow melt that feeds dams;  
- $9 million in loans to a renewable energy project in rural Mongolia that observers worried would be used to power coal mining.

Impact: Misused funds. Less than 10% of funding has gone to projects that fall under the fund’s mandate

Hiroko Tabuchi 2017 (Climate reporter for The NY Times; previously, she was a Tokyo correspondent for The Wall Street Journal; graduated from the London School of Economics and Political Science) 16 Nov 2017, “U.N. Climate Projects, Aimed at the Poorest, Raise Red Flags” <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/16/climate/green-climate-fund.html>

Critically, the early mix of approvals has meant that less than a tenth of the funding has gone to the kind of projects that make up the fund’s mandate: those owned and controlled by the poorer nations themselves. “There’s little enough, as it is, of public funds for climate, and so much of it is going toward sweetening returns for the private sector,” said Lidy Nacpil, coordinator of the Asian People’s Movement on Debt and Development and another observer on the fund’s board.

2. Hydropower projects

Link: Some of the Green Climate Fund’s projects are hydropower

Joshua Klemm and Florencia Ortúzar 2017 (**Klemm**—Policy Director at International Rivers; previously, he worked for over 8 years with the Bank Information Center (BIC), an NGO based in D.C. As Africa Program Manager, he worked closely with civil society and community representatives in Africa to challenge problematic hydropower, mining, coal, and other World Bank-financed projects, and to seek remedy for the negative impacts they cause; served on the Steering Committee of the CSO Coalition on the African Development Bank; Bachelor’s degree from James Madison University in International Affairs, spent 3 years working with local NGOs in Ghana and Sierra Leone on governance issues; **Ortúzar**—attorney with the Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense) 4 Apr 2017, “Large hydropower dams have no place in the Green Climate Fund,” <http://www.climatechangenews.com/2017/04/04/large-hydropower-dams-no-place-green-climate-fund/>

But what if scarce climate dollars, already likely to take a large hit with the Trump presidency, are used to fund projects that don’t make climate sense? Worryingly, the GCF is poised to consider financing its first large hydropower investments at its board meeting this week. Large hydro is a non-innovative, last-century technology with no place at the GCF, whose mandate is to promote a paradigm shift toward low-emission and climate-resilient sustainable development. Not only does large hydro – a fully mature technology – lack any potential to transfer new technologies, it’s also a bad bet for reducing greenhouse-gas emissions or helping countries adapt to a warming world.

The Green Climate Fund approved two different projects with hydropower

Axel Reiserer 2017 (Contributor for The European Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)) 6 Apr 2017, “Green Climate Fund approves EBRD project proposals in Tajikistan and Morocco,” <https://www.ebrd.com/cs/Satellite?c=Content&cid=1395255685617&d=Mobile&pagename=EBRD%2FContent%2FContentLayout>

Two EBRD climate resilience project proposals for the modernisation of a hydropower plant in Tajikistan and an irrigation scheme in Morocco have been approved for co-financing by the Green Climate Fund (GCF) today. The total project volume for the two projects is US$ 415 million, of which US$ 81 million will be provided by the GCF in the form of concessional loans and grants:  
- In Tajikistan the EBRD and other co-lenders are providing US$ 158 million for the climate-resilient upgrade of Qairokkum hydropower plant, with co-financing of US$ 50 million from the GCF.

Impact 1: Hydropower dams in poor countries are dangerous and deadly. They need to move AWAY from it.

Joshua Klemm and Florencia Ortúzar 2017 (**Klemm**—Policy Director at International Rivers; previously, he worked for over 8 years with the Bank Information Center (BIC), an NGO based in D.C. As Africa Program Manager, he worked closely with civil society and community representatives in Africa to challenge problematic hydropower, mining, coal, and other World Bank-financed projects, and to seek remedy for the negative impacts they cause; served on the Steering Committee of the CSO Coalition on the African Development Bank; Bachelor’s degree from James Madison University in International Affairs, spent 3 years working with local NGOs in Ghana and Sierra Leone on governance issues; **Ortúzar**—attorney with the Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense) 4 Apr 2017, “Large hydropower dams have no place in the Green Climate Fund,” <http://www.climatechangenews.com/2017/04/04/large-hydropower-dams-no-place-green-climate-fund/>

Many countries in the global South are already alarmingly over-dependent on climate-vulnerable hydropower, making them especially prone to energy crises. These countries urgently need to diversify their energy mix in order to improve their resilience to climate change. Even worse, increasingly common extreme weather events make large dams dangerous for people living downstream, as they become vulnerable to failures. Most recently, heavy rains nearly overwhelmed the Oroville Dam in California, forcing the evacuation of nearly 200,000 people in danger of facing an uncontrolled 30-foot wall of water.

Impact 2: Turn the “Climate Change” harms - More methane, greenhouse gases. Impact 3: More blackouts

Joshua Klemm and Florencia Ortúzar 2017 (**Klemm**—Policy Director at International Rivers; previously, he worked for over 8 years with the Bank Information Center (BIC), an NGO based in D.C. As Africa Program Manager, he worked closely with civil society and community representatives in Africa to challenge problematic hydropower, mining, coal, and other World Bank-financed projects, and to seek remedy for the negative impacts they cause; served on the Steering Committee of the CSO Coalition on the African Development Bank; Bachelor’s degree from James Madison University in International Affairs, spent 3 years working with local NGOs in Ghana and Sierra Leone on governance issues; **Ortúzar**—attorney with the Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense) 4 Apr 2017, “Large hydropower dams have no place in the Green Climate Fund,” <http://www.climatechangenews.com/2017/04/04/large-hydropower-dams-no-place-green-climate-fund/>

Large hydropower reservoirs emit considerable amounts of methane, which is 30 times more climate intensive than CO2. A recent study by researchers at Washington State University found that methane emissions released from dam reservoirs are far greater than previously believed, accounting for 1.3% of all human-caused climate change. In some cases, hydropower projects can emit more greenhouse gases than coal-fired power plants, generating the same amount of electricity. Large hydropower is also particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Droughts have crippled hydropower generation all over the world, leading to energy rationing and blackouts from the US to China, from Brazil to Southern Africa.

Impact 2: Climate harms turn- Hydropower produces methane, a potent warming gas

Warren Cornwall 2016 (Freelance journalist. His work as a journalist has appeared in The NY Times Magazine, The NY Times, Science, Slate, The Boston Globe Magazine; won awards for his environmental reporting, investigative work and feature writing; faculty advisor for Western Washington University’s The Planet magazine, a student-run publication based at the Huxley College of the Environment), 28 Sept 2016, “Hundreds of new dams could mean trouble for our climate,” <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/09/hundreds-new-dams-could-mean-trouble-our-climate>

Using rivers and dams to make electricity is often touted as a win for the climate, a renewable source of electricity without the greenhouse gases that come from burning fossil fuels. But it turns out hydropower isn’t quite so squeaky clean—and with countries around the world poised to erect hundreds of new dams, that could have big implications for future emissions. Reservoirs already contribute roughly 1.3% of the world’s annual human-caused greenhouse gas emissions, the study finds—about as much as the entire nation of Canada. It also suggests future reservoirs will have a bigger impact than expected, largely because they emit much more methane, a potent warming gas, than once believed. The methane is produced by underwater microbes that feast on the organic matter that piles up in the lake sediments trapped by dams.

Impact 2: Turn Climate Change harms. Hydroelectric dams produce more methane than previously thought

Warren Cornwall 2016 (Freelance journalist. His work as a journalist has appeared in The NY Times Magazine, The NY Times, Science, Slate, The Boston Globe Magazine; won awards for his environmental reporting, investigative work and feature writing; faculty advisor for Western Washington University’s The Planet magazine, a student-run publication based at the Huxley College of the Environment), 28 Sept 2016, “Hundreds of new dams could mean trouble for our climate,” <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/09/hundreds-new-dams-could-mean-trouble-our-climate>

At a time when nations have as many as 847 large hydroelectric dams in the works, the finding “suggests that the impact of that global impoundment will be greater than previously thought,” says John Harrison, a biogeochemist at Washington State University, Vancouver, and one of the authors of the paper, scheduled to be published next week in *BioScience*. Harrison and colleagues compiled and analyzed the findings of more than 100 studies of emissions from more than 250 reservoirs around the world. They also took account of a factor some previous studies of reservoir emissions had overlooked: bubbles. Some greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide, readily dissolve in water and then diffuse into the atmosphere in a fairly uniform way. Methane, in contrast, often surfaces in sporadic bubbles. That’s made it hard to get a clear picture of how much of the warming gas—which is 34 times more powerful than carbon dioxide—is rising off a reservoir. But new tools, such as special bubble-tracking sonar, have turned up a lot more methane. On average, studies that included methane bubbles found more than double the amount of the gas coming from reservoirs. Overall, the researchers concluded that each square meter of reservoir surface exhaled 25% more methane into the atmosphere than previously thought.

Impact 4: Environmental, social, and economic impacts, widespread population displacement, damaged livelihoods and ecosystems

Joshua Klemm and Florencia Ortúzar 2017 (**Klemm**—Policy Director at International Rivers; previously, he worked for over 8 years with the Bank Information Center (BIC), an NGO based in D.C. As Africa Program Manager, he worked closely with civil society and community representatives in Africa to challenge problematic hydropower, mining, coal, and other World Bank-financed projects, and to seek remedy for the negative impacts they cause; served on the Steering Committee of the CSO Coalition on the African Development Bank; Bachelor’s degree from James Madison University in International Affairs, spent 3 years working with local NGOs in Ghana and Sierra Leone on governance issues; **Ortúzar**—attorney with the Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense) 4 Apr 2017, “Large hydropower dams have no place in the Green Climate Fund,” <http://www.climatechangenews.com/2017/04/04/large-hydropower-dams-no-place-green-climate-fund/>

Meanwhile, the negative environmental, social and economic impacts of large hydropower are well documented. By interrupting rivers and flooding lands, large dams cause widespread population displacement and irreversibly harm livelihoods and ecosystems. Because they routinely cost double their estimates, large dams are a bad investment for borrowing governments.
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