

Innovative Economic Policies for Climate Change Mitigation

The catalogue to choose
which policy fits your context

October 2009

ECONOMICS **WEB** INSTITUTE

Low-carbon development pathways and drastic cuts in emissions are not a burden but an opportunity for business growth, profits, employment, and quality of life, provided they are secured by innovative economic policies.

A large book has been written in Summer 2009 by 30 economists raising from 15 countries to devise, outline, detail, and implement out-of-the-box policies to be integrated in wider mitigation packages.

The present catalogue shortly presents and assesses some of these policies, to help you identify which might prospectively be more useful in national and sectoral conditions you know.

Needless to say, in order to be fully effective in environmental, social, and political terms, they will require a comparative feasibility study, resulting in changes and adaptations to your context.



| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | Benchmarking Club of Nations |
| Context | Large heterogeneity in countries' starting positions in terms of emissions, level and type of development, experiences |
| Description | Voluntary group of countries that commit to systematically compare policies, measures, results and to learn from each other by the transfer (and translation) of best practices |
| Advantages | Higher motivation in pursuing realistic mitigation National pride Faster learning Avoiding mistakes |
| Political Consensus | Fair. The choice of partners is free and helps confirming, consolidating and establishing friendly relations. Provides arguments for domestic consensus. |
| Timing for Adoption | 6-12 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 6-24 months |
| Costs | Low to very low. Trips, prizes, research, and publications. With larger budgets, incentives and pilot experiments of replication. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | Yes |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes, Waste |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 6.2. of the book |

■ ■ CLOS

| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Assuring the Supply of Close Substitutes to Brown Products |
| Context | High-carbon polluting “brown” products dominate many markets. In order to widely substitute them, green products must be able to mimic their performance, along several axes. Conversely, green products can invade new application markets. |
| Description | A sequence of steps in technological, social, symbolic analysis of present positioning of green vs. brown products, leading to redesign, repackaging, new variants with high-touch high-performance. |
| Advantages | Wide sales and employment creation in green firms International competitiveness Reduction in emissions |
| Political Consensus | High |
| Timing for Adoption | 6 months – 3 years |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 3 months – 2 years |
| Costs | Low to medium, depending on the depth of modification in green products necessary to mimic the brown |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 4.3 of the book |

▣ CLOTEF

| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Closed Long-Term Fund for Green Investments |
| Context | Transition to low-emission economy will need decades, with a lot of uncertainty about price fluctuations and government commitments. There is a need to stabilize the trajectory and build a bridge between current and future generations. |
| Description | A closed investment fund for zero-emission plants, paying no interests and paying investors back after the estimated duration of transition. It is independent from current governments and accepts any amount of investments. |
| Advantages | Private and public funds are leveraged to reach a critical mass distributed over a long period of time Suppliers of green solution can rely on a long-term partner Families can leave bequests to their children in both a monetary form and in terms of a clean world |
| Political Consensus | High. Possible some resistances if the fund is large and politicians cannot influence its choices. |
| Timing for Adoption | 8 - 16 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 8 months - 24 months |
| Costs | Mid-sized. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | Yes |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Ch. 3.3. of the book |



| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Corporate Sustainable-Developmental Responsibility |
| Context | Corporate Social Responsibility is widespread and generating a new wave of more ethical and sound business practices. The challenge of climate change provides new urgency to deep changes inside firms. |
| Description | High-powered version of CSR with specific and focused indicators in all the three domains of sustainability, by pivoting on the concept of creative governance, a strategy in which different groups of stakeholders, who are normally not involved in any collaboration, are brought together to provide the corporate stakeholders with new solutions or new perspectives of the existing problems. A co-designed set of indicators measures every step forward. |
| Advantages | Gradual, systematic, and irreversible reduction in wasted energy, water, materials. Improved productive and business routines Pooling of resources and knowledge bases of different stakeholders to enable a firm to be more sustainable |
| Political Consensus | High. CSR is popular and the demonstration that is not just rhetoric welcomed. |
| Timing for Adoption | 1 year |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 3 - 12 months |
| Costs | Low. External expertise usually needed. Prolonged savings make CSDR profitable. Large-scale adoption of CSDR would require training and incentives. Savings of such a system level however would be synergized and more than an order of magnitude higher than costs. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Industrial processes, Final goods, Agriculture, Forestry |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Kua Harn Wei |
| For More Info | Chapter 3.4. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Eco-Labels and Awards |
| Context | Green products need to be distinguished by consumers and traders, getting tangible advantages for the pioneers |
| Description | Schemes designed to help consumers to easily identify environmental-friendly goods, boosted by large awareness campaigns, leading to monitored and effective changes in behaviors, complemented by environmental awards. Country- and sector-specific strategy for boosting awareness in the population about specific products and brands having achieved a high level of environmental consciousness. It includes mandatory and voluntary certifications, labels, and systems for comparative. |
| Advantages | Generating competitive advantages to green firms Higher profitability and sales Employment generation |
| Political Consensus | Leadership is needed to make a difference and provide green firms real advantages over the others, as the latter might express resistances. However, the general public will be very favorable and once eco-labels demonstrate to be effective, a domino effect will lead many further producer to ask for certification |
| Timing for Adoption | 3 months - 2 years |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 1 - 6 months |
| Costs | Low. They cover the independence of certification body. Co-marketing can bring revenues. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Building, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Zsofia Wagner |
| For More Info | Chapter 4.4. |

∟ EUTANSECTOR

| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | Sectoral Euthanasia in Highly Polluting Regions |
| Context | Certain local economies hinge on polluting sectors and technologies as the core employment and revenue generation. They will oppose mitigation, if not granted alternatives of development. |
| Description | Automatic and large-scale creative actions to eliminate pain in the transition to low carbon. Beneficiaries: owners, managers, employees in “old” sectors, existing and new firms in the rest of the economy. By identifying regions where polluting industries are pivotal to the whole economy, the policy aims at a painless foreclosure over an agreed time horizon, by a mix of support to local entrepreneurship in other sectors, new localizations, and complementary measures, to fully and timely compensate owners, managers, workers, suppliers, accompanied in their difficult phase (e.g. by channeling funds, shares, gradual reduction of working hours, training, seed money for new entrepreneurs). |
| Advantages | Reduced resistance to mitigation national policies Employment Structural shift of local economy to future-oriented sectors |
| Political Consensus | Unconventional solution, it prevents and reduce conflicts. |
| Timing for Adoption | 8 - 24 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 4 - 24 months |
| Costs | Medium-high in the short run. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | Yes, if in developing countries |
| Sectors of Applicability | |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | Yes, as adaptation to adverse effects on developing countries whose exports are likely to be constrained by mitigation policies |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 8.2. |



| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | Framing Climate Change Policies Compatibly with Stakeholders' Mental Models |
| Context | People and stakeholders are, in their mentality, of four types: hierarchists, equalitarians, individualists, and fatalists. Each type perceives, elaborates and reacts to policies in a different way. |
| Description | Elicitation of mental models in a specific setting. Elaboration, redesign, communication, framing and sequenced implementation of policies that can be welcomed by all mentalities. |
| Advantages | Boost of consensus across contrarian and passive constituencies Broader and more stable consensus Innovative small initiatives that complements major packages Involvement of stakeholders Activation of resources detained by stakeholders previously contrarian or not involved |
| Political Consensus | Low at the beginning, high at the end. |
| Timing for Adoption | 6 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 3 - 12 months |
| Costs | Low. Mainly in human resources. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Transport, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes, Waste |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Piotr Matczak, Ilona Banaszak, Michał Beim |
| For More Info | Chapter 9.4. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | Free TV advertising for green products |
| Context | Mass consumption is oriented by effective advertising. Green products are still a small niche, expensive because they cannot exploit economies of scale |
| Description | Free provision of airtime in television for advertising of specific brand, retailers, and eco-labels that can demonstrate their environmental-soundness. |
| Advantages | <p>Large and immediate boost in sales of green products</p> <p>Boost of profits, investment and green jobs</p> <p>Reduction of emissions</p> <p>Pressure to obtain green certificates</p> <p>Transition towards a pervasive green economy</p> |
| Political Consensus | High across party lines. High in business sector. Possibly low in the television sector. But this depends on how to finance the policy. |
| Timing for Adoption | 2 - 8 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 1 - 6 months |
| Costs | Just a small fraction of any economy-wide price-based mitigation measure. The cost can be covered with public expenditure, a tax on conventional advertising, by allowing a greater quantity of total advertising, etc. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Building, Agriculture, Final goods, Industrial processes |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 4.5. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Green Taxi Fleets |
| Context | Private households have financial and cognitive difficulties in totally innovative green purchases. Professional buyers, spatially concentrated and capable of transfer costs to consumers, are a crucial niche for earlier diffusion. |
| Description | Negotiate with taxi owners and cooperatives a significant shift towards non-fossil fuel cars. Depending on current regulations, conditions, and balance of powers this might lead to incentives, mandates, collective purchases, taxi license scheme reforms. |
| Advantages | Sustainable procurement of top-tech Overcoming of minimal threshold for maintenance and repair services Greener image of the city Direct contact with top technology out-of-reach for normal consumer Much lower emissions, as taxis make more km per day First building block for a larger action against private-owned fossil-fueled cars |
| Political Consensus | Medium. Taxi drivers might be suspicious and significant compromises might be necessary. The general public would welcome the policy. |
| Timing for Adoption | 4 - 12 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 2 - 12 months |
| Costs | Depending on the specifics. It can be fiscally neutral. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Transport, and by extension of the concept of targeting professional buyers: Building, Final goods, |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 9.5 |

 GREENMICROFIN

| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Green Microfinance |
| Context | Poverty reduction should not be halted but strengthened by climate change mitigation policies. Alternative development pathways should guarantee that high emissions of developed countries are not replicated. Microfinance has demonstrated a wide and deep outreach to the poor. |
| Description | Green tech diffusion channeled by microfinance institutions. Microloans are given to purchase durables, whose services are sold to the entire population who had no access. In this way the loan can be reimbursed. Instead of family-based purchase of low-end washing machines, cars, and other durables - kept idle for 95% of time - green durables can become the leverage out of poverty of a new wave of entrepreneurs. |
| Advantages | Factor Ten reduction of end-state diffusion of technology while guaranteeing immediate and universal access to time-saving technology Sustainable trajectories out of poverty Reduction of emission pathways and final state |
| Political Consensus | High |
| Timing for Adoption | 3 - 12 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 3 - 10 months |
| Costs | Medium. Initial funds to Microfinance Institutions will be rotating over time producing a mass effect. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | Yes |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Forestry, Final goods |
| Countries of Applicability | Developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 7.5. |

GRINS

| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | Green Innovation System |
| Context | Technology is partly endogenous to the economic system. A new direction of innovation efforts and their selective success would drastically change the ease of low-carbon processes and products. |
| Description | Comprehensive dynamic policies for wiring up the national system for eco-innovation. This policy aims to mould the market and create a selection environment that favors eco-innovation at every stage of deployment. 5 stages of industry greening are identified and given appropriate policy measures. Innovation in protection of Intellectual Property Rights. |
| Advantages | Building national competitive advantage in niches and sectors of the future-oriented economy Creation of highly qualified jobs Overcoming barriers to high-hanging fruits in mitigation International transfer of innovation |
| Political Consensus | High over the principle. Coordination of different actors might engender localized conflicts. |
| Timing for Adoption | 1 - 4 years |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 1 - 2 years |
| Costs | Highly dependent from national starting conditions. Medium to high. Public investment necessary. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | Yes |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Transport, Agriculture, Final goods, Industrial processes |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and emerging countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | Yes |
| Author | Maj Munch Andersen |
| For More Info | 3.1. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | Interactive Government: Leadership, Commitment, Communication and Reputation |
| Context | Internet and globalization have fostered a new tempo for policies to be chosen, executed, modified and transferred to other contexts. Climate change requires overarching changes to be prompted and sustained by governments. |
| Description | Government become interactive by listening and raising open dialogue, exerting leadership with a vision and a clear mission, demonstrate commitment, building consensus through wide bi-way communication and by obtaining an outstanding reputation domestically and internationally. This new quality can be implemented by a number of measures. |
| Advantages | Government effectiveness Active engagement of business and population Voters' support Crisis management |
| Political Consensus | Much of politics now is far from this orientation. But both the left and the right might seize the opportunity of climate change to modify their government style and practice. |
| Timing for Adoption | 6 months - 2 years |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 2 - 12 months |
| Costs | Low in economic terms, high in personal terms to old-style politicians |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Transport, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes, Waste |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | Yes |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 5.1. of the book |



| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | LOcally Viable Alternative MObility Systems |
| Context | Fossil-fueled private cars emit too much GHGs. There are several alternatives but each one has a number of disadvantage in particular geographical and cultural settings. |
| Description | Locally viable alternatives (public transport, bicycles, bicycles, etc.) are detected, evaluated and selected by experts, stakeholders, and voters. Reorientation of investments and complementary private and public services are introduced in order to substitute mainstream car uses over a reasonable time horizon. National schemes link-up and funds the most bolt LOVAMOS by taxing the municipalities that do not succeed in producing LOVAMOS plans. |
| Advantages | Effective substitution of cars by locally suitable alternatives Concentration of investments Cost effectiveness Social sustainability of car substitution Business growth in the chosen alternative sector |
| Political Consensus | High |
| Timing for Adoption | 6 - 12 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 6 - 16 months |
| Costs | Depending on the alternative chosen. Large savings if a deficit-laden public transport is phased out or substantially upgraded. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Transport, Agriculture, Forestry |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 9.3. |



| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | Common but Differentiated Responsibilities: A Mosaic Strategy for Copenhagen Agreement and Beyond |
| Context | Wide qualitative differentiation across countries, not well captured and leveraged by the dichotomy between Annex I and Annex II countries. Stalemate in respective roles for quantitative targets across the globe. Small states asked to do painful choices with no impact on total emissions. |
| Description | <p>The MOSAIC idea is a five-step procedure: 1. to highlight a shared vision of the future for the world (the “mosaic”); 2. to identify a good number of “roles” (the “plugs”); 3. for each role, to specify a list of quantitative commitments (the “colors”); 4. each country would freely choose one role - at least - for itself, with Annex I countries compelled to continue GHG reductions; 5. the international community would support the efforts of each country in a gradual and appropriate way.</p> <p>For instance, a shared vision might be “a world drastically reducing total GHG emissions by devising, adopting and pervasively spreading sustainable lifestyles and clean technologies (the costs of which are driven down by mass production) while eradicating poverty, making economies more resilient, and improving the quality of life of all human and non-human eco-systems”. Based on it, 8 roles could be singled out, with their respective quantitative targets.</p> |
| Advantages | <p>Each country finds a more adequate role, task and responsibility</p> <p>International cooperation among countries with the same role</p> <p>Mosaic-like synergies among countries with complementary roles</p> |
| Political Consensus | Medium |
| Timing for Adoption | 3 - 24 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 6 - 16 months |
| Costs | Medium. Each country would choose a role, take on the relative commitments, so would usually spend resources. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | Yes |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Transport, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 6.1. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | Multi-Sectoral De-Growth to Save the Earth |
| Context | GDP growth can be decoupled to higher emissions only with great difficulties. A number of sectors should shrink in order to meet necessarily ambitious goals. |
| Description | An intensive application of policy measures to switch GDP composition toward zero emission sectors while reducing by a factor four or ten the emission intensity in the rest of the economy |
| Advantages | Fast effectiveness, as seen during the economic crisis Weakening vested interests in fossil fuels Liberation of human resources and time New balances across regions |
| Political Consensus | Low. |
| Timing for Adoption | 2-5 years |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 1-4 years |
| Costs | High for the sectors shrinking. Elimination of subsidies to those sectors, however, produce large surpluses. Smoothing the transition of capital and workforce is costly but generates a new physiology of the economy. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes, Waste |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed countries first |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Raoul Weiler |
| For More Info | Chapter 4.2. |



| | |
|--|---|
| Full Name | Policy Coordination Dashboard |
| Context | Climate policy might imprint many issues in a way that contrasts with other environmental and social goals. Policy coordination is necessary in the relationships scientists in different disciplines, policymakers in different sectors, and between scientists and policymakers |
| Description | An open-source dashboard (spreadsheet) is offered to structuredly convey many different information. A complete organizational process is used to gather people and competences |
| Advantages | Less conflict over the issues Faster legislative process More effective implementation Fund concentration |
| Political Consensus | Medium to high |
| Timing for Adoption | 3-8 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 6-24 months |
| Costs | The process of coordination using the dashboard is fairly cheap. The solution to be tailored by the consensus can be more expensive than each single group would have estimated if isolated, but much less expensive than the damage made by adopting non coordinated actions |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes, Waste |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Karen Hussey and Albert Schram |
| For More Info | Chapter 4.2. |



| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Pro-Diffusion-of-Innovation Tax |
| Context | Pioneers in adoption of clean technologies are very few, with large installed capital stock being old and polluting. Low substitution rate. |
| Description | A repetitively-applied tax on owners of “polluting” goods, whose total revenue is distributed as a subsidy among recent adopters of clean goods. |
| Advantages | The tax can be small but would generate a large revenue, which divided by the few adopters would produce a large subsidy Clear advantages for adoption of new technology Large increase in sales, profits, investments and jobs for green producers Fiscal neutrality Easy to administer and monitor Immediate impact on switching to new tech Voluntary tax (if imposed only on people that can afford to switch) |
| Political Consensus | Among policymakers: medium to high. Large exemption from the scheme can be given to poor, etc. A democratic majority can vote for it. |
| Timing for Adoption | 6 - 12 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 6 - 12 months |
| Costs | Zero for the policymaker. Small for the polluters. Large benefit for adopters and producers of new technology |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Transport, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | Yes |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 4.2. |



| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Strategic Niche Management |
| Context | Totally new promising green technologies risk to quickly abort in early phases because of lack of appropriate demand levels and historical accidents. |
| Description | The creation of socio-technical experiments in which various stakeholders are encouraged to collaborate and exchange expectations, information, knowledge and experience, thus embarking on an interactive learning process that will facilitate the incubation of the new technology. This occurs in a protected space called a niche, a specific application domain for the innovation, mixing special needs of demand and special features of supply, nurtured through a number of stages of development. |
| Advantages | Survival of the greenest National competitive advantages in special niches International sales Highly qualified employment |
| Political Consensus | Medium to high |
| Timing for Adoption | 4 - 16 months |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 8 - 20 months |
| Costs | Medium. It might involve special public procurement and investments in R&D. |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | Yes |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Building, Transport, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes, Waste |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Marjolein Caniëls and Henni Romijn |
| For More Info | Chapter 3.2. of the book |

SUSCON

| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Sustainable Consumption |
| Context | Unsustainable lifestyles widespread in developed countries and across the élites in developing countries. |
| Description | Shaping consumer behavior by complex processes of individual and social learning, by enhancing the non-environmental performances of sustainable product variants in order to reduce the hedonistic "distance" between alternatives, supported by monetary policy instruments, such as eco-taxes or subsidies, and non-monetary instruments. |
| Advantages | Comprehensive approach to fundamental reasons of unsustainability Demand-driven change in firm behavior Higher level of customer satisfaction and citizens' happiness Milder business cycle fluctuations World-wide sustainability |
| Political Consensus | Medium to low |
| Timing for Adoption | 1 - 3 years |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 6 - 20 months |
| Costs | Medium |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Countries of Applicability | Transport, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Waste |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | Yes |
| Author | Vanessa Oltra |
| For More Info | Chapter 4.1. |


THEMDAY

| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Thematic Days |
| Context | Citizen unsustainable habits deeply entrenched in routines, breaking which would require coordinated shocks, universal awareness, complementary services and infrastructure |
| Description | By generalizing and improving the car-free days in a better coordinated, repetitive and high-fashionable way, thematic days provide a necessary break to routines, mobilize the population, demonstrate the advantage of a sustainable world |
| Advantages | Easy and quick to launch Immediate response from a large number of stakeholders and organizations Great marketing opportunity for green solution providers |
| Political Consensus | High |
| Timing for Adoption | 1 - 3 years |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 6 - 30 months |
| Costs | Low |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | No |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Transport, Agriculture, Forestry, Final goods, Industrial processes, Waste |
| Countries of Applicability | Developed and developing countries |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | No |
| Author | Valentino Piana |
| For More Info | Chapter 7.4. |



| | |
|--|--|
| Full Name | Transition in Oil-Producing Countries |
| Context | Mitigation will have an adverse effect on oil-exporting and fossil-fuel-centered economies. They might react to this perspective by trying to brake the change. It's crucial to help these economies in reaching a fast-growth sustainable diversified stage of development. |
| Description | A number of economic strategies to develop non-oil sectors boosting private and public entrepreneurship, horizontal measures and country-specific sectoral promotion. |
| Advantages | Most effective use of oil-generated resources National pride and development in an autonomous direction Best technologies and skill transfer Ecologically-oriented scientific-technical progress Resilience to shocks |
| Political Consensus | Medium |
| Timing for Adoption | 1 - 3 years |
| Timing for First Sizeable Results | 6-30 months |
| Costs | Medium to high, funded by oil revenues and international cooperation |
| Covered by COP15 funding in discussion | Yes |
| Sectors of Applicability | Energy, Final goods, Industrial processes |
| Countries of Applicability | Fossil-fuel centred countries and sub-national regions |
| Mentioned in COP15 Negotiating Text | Yes |
| Author | Shafa Aliyev |
| For More Info | Chapter 7.6 of the book |

For requests of information and further contact:

Valentino Piana

Director

director@economicswebinstitute.org

+39 349 36 10 476

skype: valentino.piana

www.economicswebinstitute.org