



Reporting the human dimensions of climate change in the developing world

	CLIMATECORE	ECOSYSTEMS	ENERGY	FOOD SECURITY	IMPACT	POLLUTION	POST-2015	WATER	
--	-------------	------------	--------	---------------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------	--

You Are Here: [Home](#) » [CLIMATECORE](#) » Does the UN's Green Climate Fund plan on using dirty energy?

Does the UN's Green Climate Fund plan on using dirty energy?

Posted by: **Jennifer Guay** Posted date: **May 22, 2014** In: **CLIMATECORE** | comment : 1

UNITED NATIONS, UNEARTH NEWS – A coalition of nearly 300 activist organizations and community groups is [protesting](#) the possibility that the United Nations-sanctioned [Green Climate Fund](#) (GCF) may be used to fund projects employing “dirty energy.”

In December 2011, The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change established the GCF as a structure to transfer funds from the developed to the developing world – where countries are most vulnerable to climate change – to help them adapt to and mitigate the effects of global warming. The green bank is expected to channel the \$100 billion in climate funds that the global north has pledged to raise for at-risk countries by 2020, but slow-moving negotiations have put a damper on donations.

The GCF is governed by a board of 24 members, including committees that represent both developed and developing nations. The Fund is based in Songdo, South Korea, where they are currently holding meetings [aimed at finally declaring the fund operational](#).

“Since 2008, we’ve been really excited about the idea of GCF as an alternative to institutions that have really bad climate track records, like the World Bank,” Janet Redman, Director of the [Institute for Policy Studies](#)’ Climate Policy Program, told **UNEARTH News**. “We felt that this fund was meant to be the world’s best answer to dealing with the climate change crisis, but the reality of it is that it’s just going to push people further into poverty as we see the consequences of low-carbon, low-emission development – which is not the same as clean development.”

The protesting coalition, led informally by the [Jubilee South Asia Pacific Movement on Debt and Development](#), is concerned that there is nothing in the Fund’s guidelines to prevent it from financing climate solutions that are not strictly “clean,” such as the use of fossil fuel, coal, natural gas fracking, destructive dams, biomass, and nuclear energy. Considering the GCFs goal – to provide financial support for lowering emissions and promoting sustainable development around the world – the coalition is calling on the Fund to draft an exclusion list and use clear language that excludes the use of all non-renewable energy.

“We think that there’s a risk that dirty energy projects could still be funded,” Zachary Hurwitz, Global Standards Coordinator at [International Rivers](#), told **UNEARTH News**. “If you look at the draft results management framework policy by GCF, then the draft safeguard of GCF, the language is still quite open. The devil is in the details, so we want to see an exclusion list that states exactly what types of energy are acceptable.”

During the GCF’s last meeting in February, the board could only agree on [two of the eight decisions](#) necessary to declare the fund operational. The pressure is mounting for the Fund to reach agreement before United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon’s Climate Summit in September this year.

Talks disintegrated when members could not agree over the role of the private sector and how much autonomy individual countries will have over the funds they are allocated.



A Friends of the Earth US rally against the Green Climate Fund. Photo credit: Friends of the Earth US

A representative from the GCF declined to comment.

"We want to make sure that whatever research going into and out of GCF is meant for good, ecologically sound, and environmentally responsible investments that really meet the needs of the people on the ground," Karen Orenstein, International Policy Analyst at Friends of the Earth US told **UNEARTH News**. "We don't want this to become what other funds have become – something that is green-wash, as opposed to actually green."

Like 1

 0

Tweet 2

Share

 0

[< Previous](#)

[Next >](#)

Comments (1)

Leave a Comment

Name*

Email*

Website



Please type the characters of this captcha image in the input box

Submit Comment