



**The Brookings Institution
Center for Sustainable Development
and
The Rockefeller Foundation**

**17 Rooms Podcast
“A ‘breakthrough’ agenda on climate finance”
December 21, 2021**

Co-Hosts:

John McArthur
Senior Fellow and Director, Center for Sustainable Development
The Brookings Institution

Zia Khan
Senior Vice President for Innovation
The Rockefeller Foundation

Guests:

Amar Bhattacharya
Senior Fellow, Center for Sustainable Development
The Brookings Institution

John Podesta
Chair and Counselor
Center for American Progress

Episode Summary:

In this sixth interview of the “17 Rooms” podcast, Amar Bhattacharya and John Podesta discuss a “breakthrough” agenda on climate finance, which is necessary to deliver on greater climate ambition and ensure synergy with the sustainable development agenda. Bhattacharya, senior fellow at the Center for Sustainable Development at The Brookings Institution and Podesta, chair and founder of the Center for American Progress, moderated Room 13 focused on Sustainable Development Goal number 13—on climate action—during the 2021 17 Rooms flagship process.

* * * * *

MCARTHUR: Hi, I'm John McArthur, senior fellow and director of the Center for Sustainable Development at Brookings,

KHAN: And I'm Zia Khan, senior vice president for innovation at The Rockefeller Foundation. This is 17 Rooms, a podcast about actions, insights and community for the Sustainable Development Goals and the people driving them. So, John, I'm going to throw three terms at you: COP, 100 billion, 1.5 degrees Celsius. What are they and why do they matter?

MCARTHUR: Three of my favorite terms, Zia. Well, the COP, let's start with that, the COP stands for Conference of Parties. There's the Conference of Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. If you want to skip the jargon, it's the annual UN Climate Summit process that brings all the parties together. And we just had what's called COP26. That's the 26th version of that conference, and it met in Glasgow in the UK, and that was the big summit as a big check point after the previous major summit that was in 2015 in Paris.

Hundred billion, what's a hundred billion? Well, a hundred billion that refers to a commitment that was made in 2009, actually in Copenhagen at the COP of the day, the first year Barack Obama was president of the United States if we can remember back that far. And that that COP, the leaders of the rich countries or advanced economies committed \$100 billion a year of financing to the developing countries, and they committed to do that by 2020. Now, unfortunately, that promise was not met, and it wasn't terribly close to getting met. And so it's been a real sticking point for developing countries that are inheriting this problem of climate change that has been created on a legacy basis by the rich countries that spewed out so many of the world's emissions. And so this hundred billion has become very symbolic of how much the rich countries care in following through on their own word and in addressing the historical injustice of who caused this problem to begin with and who shares responsibility for getting out of it.

And that brings us to one point five, as it's often discussed, 1.5 degrees centigrade. That is the goal for limiting the historical average warming of the planet to only 1.5 degrees. The Paris Agreement of 2015 had a baseline agreement to try to keep it to two degrees, but then an even higher ambition to try to get close to 1.5 degrees. And the scientific evidence that keeps coming out tells us more and more that if we want to avoid catastrophic climate change globally, we actually need to keep it to 1.5 degrees. So that might be more than you asked for Zia, but that's a quick overview of those three big terms.

KHAN: Well, John, it's really helpful because we've all been reading those terms and reading lots of stories about climate just in general, but also particularly with the big conference in Glasgow. And I have to say that my sense talking to just my friends, my family, and of course my colleagues is that there's greater optimism around progress on climate. It all still feels very complex and intertwined in these processes, and we're also hearing more about movements and protests. But it feels like there is some general optimism, and I think we're about to hear from two folks who are so expert and deep in all of those processes but have been able to use 17 Rooms to come up with something pretty practical around some next steps to make key progress on a key barrier.

MCARTHUR: Recently, I heard a senior UK official reference the debate over whether the cup was half full, half empty and how big's the cup? And so that is a lot of discussion, I think these days coming out of that big climate summit.

In today's episode, we're joined by two of the world's best people to talk about what's going on in the fight against climate change: Amar Bhattacharya and John Podesta. Amar is a senior fellow in our very own Center for Sustainable Development at Brookings. He previously spent many years as a senior official at the World Bank and as founding director of the Group of 24 developing country finance ministers and central bank governors. So, he brings an extraordinary perspective from developing country economies on what's going on in the world, and he's been an adviser to the COP 26 presidency.

John Podesta is the chair and counselor at the Center for American Progress. He previously served as White House chief of staff to President William J. Clinton, as counselor to President Barack Obama on climate policy, and importantly for the SDGs, he was a member of the UN Secretary-General's high-level panel of eminent persons on the post-2015 development agenda, which many people describe as having presented the first draft of what ultimately became the SDGs.

Amar and John co-moderate Room 13, a working group for SDG 13 on climate action, in this year's 17 Rooms process. For new listeners, 17 Rooms is an approach to spurring action for the SDGs or Sustainable Development Goals. It convenes 17 working groups, one per goal, and asks them to focus on an area within a goal that's ripe for action and then to define some concrete next steps that can be achieved in 12 to 18 months to make a difference. Zia, we're in for a treat today.

KHAN: John, it's going to be an absolute treat, Amar and John are involved in so many of these discussions, and to hear from them, what really happens is always fascinating. And also for two people involved in some of these processes and conversations, how they use the unique features of 17 Rooms to develop a breakthrough agenda on climate finance is really powerful. Amar and John are co-moderators of Room 13, the working group for SDG 13 on climate action, and this is their story.

MCARTHUR: Amar, welcome to 17 Rooms.

BHATTACHARYA: Thank you, John, very good to be here.

MCARTHUR: And, John, terrific to have you here too.

PODESTA: Yeah, always good to be back with you, John.

MCARTHUR: Thanks so much. Well, Zia, we've got a great discussion in front of us.

KHAN: John, Amar, thanks again for joining us. A question we like to start with is just to ask the moderators their own personal journey. You know, how did you come to this topic of climate overall and what brought you to 17 Rooms as well? Maybe Amar, we could start with you and then John.

BHATTACHARYA: Well, my journey to climate started with thinking about climate as a constraint to development. I was representing developing countries, very worried that the climate agenda was being imposed in a way that could be a setback for development and especially poor and vulnerable people. And as I delved into the issue, I not only came to the conclusion that it was absolutely essential to tackle climate if we were to have sustainable

development, but I came to the conclusion that actually acting on climate was an important new opportunity for developing countries to leapfrog, to go to a better future and to avoid the mistakes of the past.

PODESTA: And, Zia, for me, I've been long involved in the in the climate debate, going back to my days working for President Clinton and through my work at the Center for American Progress. But I was tapped, I guess, asked to join the secretary-general's high-level panel that did the first draft of the Sustainable Development Goals. And that gave me the opportunity really to go around the world and listen particularly to young people about the world they wanted to build. It was a very important experience for me. When I got asked to go back to the White House to work on climate change by President Obama, I went in and saw him, just a quick story, I said there's just one thing I would like when I was agreeing to come back, and he knew I was reluctant to go back in the government. And he was kind of twisting my arm, and he said, okay, what is it? And I said, I want to continue to work on the Sustainable Development Goals. And he, he rocked back and kind of laughed, and he said, I was expecting a lot of things, but that was not one of them. He let me do that. And I helped both steer government policy towards Paris, but also towards the successful conclusion of the SDGs working with my colleagues on the NSC and at particularly at U.S.-UN.

MCARTHUR: I'm curious, John, you were very involved with the lead up to the Kyoto Protocol in the late 1990s, the Paris Agreement in 2015, the U.S.-China Agreement in 2014 that preceded the Paris Agreement. And here we are on the heels of the Glasgow Agreement, and a lot of people look at this and say, as they would in my home country, *plus ça change*, it seems like it feels the same over and over again. I'm curious how you would put today's discussion on climate in that longer term arc.

PODESTA: Well, I think things have changed very substantially. I think there's no longer a debate, even though there's an embrace, still, of common differentiated responsibilities. There's no longer a debate that this isn't a problem that every country is engaged in, every person in the world needs to be sensitive to. I think that is settled. The science is settled. The threat is more profound and more near term. I think the world is more aligned to try to make progress. I think what feels unsettling is that we're not going fast enough. And I think that with each passing year, with each passing COP, more commitment is made. But it's not consistent with what the science is telling us. To stay within reach to keep 1.5 alive, we just need to do a lot more than being done. And so that leads to a level of frustration that I think we saw on the streets of Glasgow.

KHAN: Amar, I'm curious, given what John was mentioning that there's more alignment on the science and more alignment that this is a real issue, yet this perception that we are going too slow, what are the key bottlenecks or barriers that you see that we need to get unstuck around?

BHATTACHARYA: There are three levels at which things need to get unstuck. The first is ambition. And, 2021 was a very important year in terms of a recognition that the world needs to come together around the 1.5-degree goal, that 2 degrees is simply not good enough. And in order to reach 1.5 degrees, again as John was saying, the science is clear, we have to reach net zero emissions by 2050 collectively. Third, we can't wait for 2050. The urgency means that we have to actually act on emissions now. As the Secretary-General has said, the world needs to cut emissions by 45 or 50 percent by 2030. The developed countries have to lead. And all of that is recognized.

But we now need to kind of have everybody on board and we need to have concrete actions to implement that. A method that was agreed in Glasgow to do that was instead of coming back every five years as the Paris Agreement had originally stipulated, Glasgow agreed that we would be reviewing NDCs, and ambitions, and targets every year. And I think that will bring some pressure to ramp up and ramping up is absolutely essential.

Second, we need to move on the policies that will deliver. This key to this is carbon pricing. Not every country is going to move to direct carbon pricing. The U.S. is one of those that won't. But we need to make commensurate and comparable progress on carbon pricing and supporting policies to get us where we need to be.

The third thing which I thought was extremely positive about Glasgow was technology and the private sector. The potential that we now have to unlock new technologies, and I'm particularly impressed with the potentialities around green hydrogen. I think the energy transformation that we could see in the next decade, in the next two or three decades, really puts zero carbon in our reach. So, the breakthrough technology agenda that was given a big impetus by world leaders in Glasgow I thought was very promising.

And finally, we have to tackle the constraints on finance. That's what we focused on in Room 13. And unless we get a breakthrough on finance, we will not get a breakthrough on the other elements, because it's only with that we will get the scale of investment and we will get the scale of investment in emerging markets and developing countries who are going to be the biggest factor as far as future emissions are concerned.

MCARTHUR: John, I'm curious, you have spent a career in Washington in many ways or on the U.S. perspective on these issues, but also with an internationalist take. And Amar, you have spent your career on the developing country perspective on these issues. I'm curious just for our listeners, you mentioned the NDCs—for those who aren't familiar the nationally determined contributions that each country puts forward for tackling climate change. Is there much difference in perspective that you see now, John, from how this is being debated in rich country capitals versus emerging market capitals? Is that still something we need to reconcile or is it getting there?

PODESTA: Well, look, I think it's different than it was, say, 20 years ago. Where in the developing economies and the capitals of those countries, they viewed this essentially as a developed country problem. They had contributed historically the most to emissions. That's still true, the United States still is the largest historical emitter. But as those economies rapidly developed, particularly China, India, Vietnam, other countries, South Africa, their emissions profiles began to creep up. China is now the world's largest emitter by a fair amount.

And so I think the debate began to change between from who is historically responsible and therefore who's going to provide the support and the reductions that are necessary to how are we going to jointly figure out a way to get the finances, Amar said, to flow particularly to the less developed economies. And I think that's a particularly challenging problem. I think there's a lot of money floating around in the world. There's a lot of new commitment to deploy those dollars in a way that understands the climate crisis, that disinvest or begins to burden investment in fossil fuels, the continued investment in fossil fuels, move that

investment towards clean energy. But the one gigantic question is where is that investment going to take place? And how do we ensure that it's more just and more equitable? And I think that the debate in Glasgow is different than, if you go back a ways historically, is that justice and equity were at the heart of the conversation in Glasgow, both in terms of a just and equitable path for development within individual countries, but also the global sense of justice that comes from understanding our common humanity and the common challenge of dealing with what will be, I think under any circumstances, even if we get this right, we're going to see catastrophic events. As I'm sometimes chided about saying, I say, we need to understand that we're going to have some catastrophic events, what we need to avoid is the apocalypse. And that's only going to happen with strong flows towards more sustainable, more equitable, more just development across the globe in both in developed and developing economies.

KHAN: So in the midst of all these global processes, we have 17 Rooms, which is seeking to make practical concrete next steps. And John, maybe we could start with you to share a little bit about what was the framing for this year's Room? What were you focused on, and what was the outcome?

PODESTA: Well, we had the advantage of having Amar as our co-chair, and I think maybe unlike years before, we really from the get-go focused on this finance challenge. And his expertise, I think, helped us shape and frame a breakthrough agenda about climate finance that looked to build the structure and architecture for how the global community could respond to ensure that not only there was more support from governments through concessional finance to meet the development challenge, but what it was going to take to open up and break through those private sector flows going in service of, again, a common global project, which is in some ways a more difficult challenge, not just to meet the \$100 billion commitment from the developed world, but to go well beyond that to unlock the trillions of dollars of capital that are needed. And so since Amar really was the architect of the structure of the outcome, I should toss it to him.

BHATTACHARYA: As John was saying, we were fortunate, and he is too modest about his own role, but we were fortunate that we recognized that we needed finance fit for purpose rather than just think about finance as some kind of a delivery of a target. In particular, the hundred billion was an extremely important symbol of trust, and delivery of that was extremely important. And our group emphasized that very strongly from the outset.

But as John also noted, we recognized that we needed to go well beyond the 100 billion in order to deliver on the ambition that is necessary. And it's useful to think about that ambition in two separate parts. One is the importance of ensuring the energy transition in the developing world is done in a way that delivers on development, but that is much better, much smarter. But in order for that, we have to be able to provide finance at scale with a significant part of that finance coming from the private sector. So what would the structure of finance be so that we could unlock private sector investment and do that in partnership with the public sector?

And the other huge requirement in developing countries, it is the developing countries that will get hit much harder by the impacts of climate change and particularly for poor and vulnerable countries, there is a disproportionate agenda with regard to adaptation and resilience. And here, unlike the first area, while private sector finance can play a role, the very important role for international public finance and adequate support. And we pushed

very hard, therefore, for a commitment of the different pools of finance that could together tackle these two challenges. One is accelerating energy transition that delivers on development but does so in a climate responsive and climate resilient way. And the second is tackling the very, very urgent challenges of poor and vulnerable countries. And the package that we propose as a breakthrough agenda enables us both to get to the trillions, but also ensures that finance is fit for purpose in meeting these two big challenges that now lie ahead.

MCARTHUR: Zia, it does remind me of the new Global Energy Alliance for People and Planet that you and colleagues at The Rockefeller Foundation launched recently to, exactly as Amar was discussing, provide clean, productive use energy to underserved people and do all the good things—create jobs, avoid carbon emissions. That stuff of clean energy is a little easier for people to understand at practical terms, jobs, cutting emissions.

I'm curious for our listeners, Amar and John, when we talk about \$100 billion as an annual budget that the rich countries can't even fulfill a promise back from 2009 yet properly, we're in a hundred trillion-dollar global economy. These numbers of hundreds of billions and trillions are just so hard for someone to get their head around. Can you help us understand when you talk about agenda setting and this Room focusing on a breakthrough agenda for those large-scale financing conversations, how does that work and what actually makes a difference? How do you actually put levers on hundreds of billions of dollars at a time?

BHATTACHARYA: I think the starting point has to be to frame not in terms of the finance, but in terms of the investment imperative. We have to be able to say why do we need the money? And it is to scale up investment and to bring that investment forward so that we can get on a better and a different path of growth, and avoid in some sense making investments in, say, fossil fuel energy. In order to do that, we can then say, what is the finance that is necessary?

In a similar way, as I said, when you start with adaptation and resilience, we know very well what is needed. And so you really have to do it country by country. I'll give you the example of South Africa. So South Africa came forward with the declaration around what they call the "just energy transition," very much in line with what the Rockefeller-Bezos-IKEA proposal is of creating a global partnership around energy transition. And South Africa's program, which was very much a country, whole of country initiative led by the president, was cosigned with President Biden, Prime Minister Johnson, President Macron, and Chancellor Merkel, signaling that South Africa and the international community could come forward on such a transition. And the costing of that is very large. It's 300 billion dollars. What is 300 billion dollars? It's 100 percent of South Africa's GDP. But most of that financing can come from the private sector, and most of the investment generates growth and jobs exactly in the way that the Rockefeller proposal has set up.

So what we are now pushing for is an architecture that can support meaningful action country by country. We shouldn't think about this as 100 billion. We shouldn't think about it as trillions. We should think about how do we get the finance that allows us to make the breakthrough as countries come forward with ambitious programs.

KHAN: You know, the ambition and the scale of all of these ideas is really, really exciting, and I know when The Rockefeller Foundation launched the Global Energy Alliance, getting diverse perspectives and partnerships was really, really key. Which brings me back to 17 Rooms. I'm curious, Amar and John, if you could describe a little bit who was in the room

and how did those conversations play out that led to this breakthrough agenda that you're describing?

PODESTA: People vote with their feet, so the people who came into the room were a long-time experienced people who had a climate focus, but they also had deep knowledge about development and a big commitment to development. I want to come back to that in a second. But who were those people? People like Elizabeth Cousens, who runs the UN Foundation; or Laurence Tubiana, who was the special envoy in Paris, now runs the European Climate Foundation; Rachel Kyte, who had been at the World Bank, now runs the Fletcher School; Arunabha Ghosh, who's a partner, runs an important think tank that gives tremendous advice to the Modi government in India. There are people like that. They have a deep expertise in climate, but they also really have a commitment to development.

And I think one of the reasons why the 17 Rooms idea was important and why the Sustainable Development Goals remain critical is that this idea of integrated development, just and fair development, and equitable development remained at the heart of our conversation. It wasn't technical, it wasn't stovepiped. It had a vision of what could happen. And as a result, I think you see in our Room document, for example, the reflection of the need for more gender equity in this conversation. The special role that women play in making decisions, particularly in thinking about these big challenges of sustainability in a climate stressed environment. And also the fact that women bear the brunt—they're the first casualties of extreme weather events, the loss of food, of water resource, et cetera.

It's of a piece with the whole sustainable development philosophy. And I think the 17 Room process helps make those cross connections against Rooms who are dealing with other topics that could equally be, I guess, stovepiped, whether that's education or gender equity or infrastructure, et cetera. But when you pull them together, you have a stronger vision of what really can be transformational in terms of building better societies. And I think that was the promise of the SDGs. And that's why the 17 Rooms process is really something that I commend both Brookings and Rockefeller for pulling together a process that got us out of our individual Rooms and cross connected. And one of the direct outcomes of that was our joining with Room 15, which is looking at land use and the natural world to try to push forward a Natural Security initiative that understood the effect on human beings of what's happening to the natural world. So those cross connections are really critical, I think, in the development space, and the 17 Rooms process, I think, lifts them up.

MCARTHUR: Thank you so much, John. We're grateful that you find it useful as a platform, but more than anything, grateful for the leadership you're both lending to it. We don't have too much time left here, but I'm curious again with our listeners in mind, especially the younger listeners, so many of whom care so profoundly about climate change and are quite worried, and there's almost a generational divide and degree of concern, I get the sense, and a lot of polling data suggests. This notion of getting people together from diverse backgrounds, diverse perspectives to agree in a short amount of time, lies at the heart of much of this, even on these very tough, thorny problems. The two of you are so seasoned on those types of questions, I'm wondering if you have thoughts on tips and tricks, whether with 17 Rooms as an illustrative point or broader processes on which you've had so much experience, what are the things that people should be trying to do in order to forge agreements on these really hard problems?

BHATTACHARYA: Climate has been described as the mother of all global public goods, and it is, at a very personal level, I would say, probably the most complex issue that I have dealt with in my professional life. And you know, it is quite appropriate that the stakeholders that come to the climate are indeed as diverse as they can be. At Glasgow, the first two days were world leaders. That certainly was signified, that was actually crucial to setting the tone for Glasgow. You had private sector present in a way that we didn't have in COPS before, the private sector was there out in front. We had religious leaders. We had film producers. We had institutions. I participated in the finance ministers' meeting. We have never had finance ministers participate in COP. I mean, everybody recognizes that this is the issue where everybody has to come together.

And of course, in that context, we had groups like indigenous peoples, we had youth. And to be very fair, there was a tension between all of these processes, which move in a more deliberative pace and the impatience that was there, both on those who were there, but those who were not in the room. And you could feel it palpably as you walked every day to the conference that there is a great sense of impatience. And indeed there should be.

So if you ask me, certainly I would say that acting on climate is still a challenge, certainly a challenge here in the United States, especially in the kind of divided Congress that we have, and John could speak to that. But yet we also have huge hope. We have had bills pass through that I think allow for change. And I strongly believe in the power of momentum. We will get to a point where, in fact, people will see the other side of the hill is much better, and I think we will get there. Coming from India, I was extremely impressed by Prime Minister Modi's speech, not because of what he said about climate, but because what he said about India's future and the future of growth and development in India. Very much all of the elements of sustainable development in the way John described it was spread throughout the speech. So I feel that there's a lot that we still have to do, but I feel that in some sense, the momentum is now building for the kind of progress that we need to make at the pace that we need to make it. And we all have to do our part.

PODESTA: It's hard to add to what Amar said, but I think what is at the heart of progress will be a positive story about what the future could be. I know there's so much challenge built in already into what we're going to face as a result of the pollution that's already been pumped into the atmosphere. But I think you have let people speak about the future they want, and then you have to have an optimism about being able to build that. And I think that was the process, as I noted earlier, that led to the development of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals. It was a bottom-up process, as much as a top-down process, very different than what the UN went through to develop the Millennium Development Goals. But it provided a picture of a future in which livelihoods would get better, people had a place, their voices were heard, they were respected. And I think that's what it takes to build the coalitions that are going to be necessary for change.

KHAN: Both of you mentioned an optimism for the future, which I find very motivating and that I've been feeling as well. I'm curious if you could share for the listeners one element or hope that you have for, say, 2030, of what will be different in 2030 in very concrete terms.

PODESTA: I think about it from a U.S. perspective, and that's where I do most of my work on this topic. I think that we'll be well on our way to 100 percent clean power, we'll be driving electric vehicles, we'll be living in cleaner air, public health will improve. And that will all be done with a sense that we are inventing, investing, and building the businesses, the

jobs, and the places of the future. 2030 is really just right around the corner, really, when you think about it in those terms. But we now have the tools to get there. At some level our politics have been poisonous in the United States, but the ability of the private sector and the public to react to that, the support in the public, is right there. We could just go forward to that cleaner, better future that's a better and more just and equitable economy as well.

KHAN: Amar, how about you on the global stage, what do you see as an exciting vision or elements of the vision in 2030?

BHATTACHARYA: Just to build on what John said, clean energy for all built on a completely different premise for the future. We have to remember that 80 percent of the infrastructure that developing countries will need in 2050 to deliver on the Sustainable Development Goals has yet to be built. Ninety percent of the energy infrastructure of Africa has still to be built. So, when you take John's vision, the potential to leapfrog right now and do it in a completely different way, to me is so evident but such a prize to be seized. And I believe that there will be tremendous disruption. At Glasgow I had the opportunity to meet with the richest man in Australia, and his goal is to make green hydrogen the end game for the fossil fuel industry. So the potential for disruption right now is tremendous, but it's a disruption for the greater good. And so I think we should look at 2030 and see how we all kind of disrupt the world that we have of the 20th century, and as John said, build the economy of the 21st century more inclusive, more resilient, more sustainable than the one we had so far.

MCARTHUR: I think that brings us to a pretty terrific place to conclude, Zia. We couldn't have better expertise on how behind the scenes change happens and how it connects with all the discussions in the forefront and also how to connect both the thinking and the policies between this massive, complex climate agenda and the broader sustainable development agenda on which the two of you, Amar and John, have been central drivers on behalf of all of us for so many years. So, we thank you for your leadership and driving this climate agenda and driving the climate Room and more broadly for all that you're doing on behalf of the issues of sustainable development around the world. So huge thanks, and what a treat to spend a few minutes together to discuss it.

KHAN: John, I found both Amar and John's vision for 2030 very exciting.

MCARTHUR: It really gives a sense of a story that's yet to be written. This is a legacy issue we've all inherited, but Amar's point of 80 percent of the infrastructure in developing countries is yet to be built, and 90 percent of the energy infrastructure in Africa is yet to be built. It comes down to how it gets built.

KHAN: And what was so exciting to hear them describe as well was the fact that they were able to use their Room and the 17 Rooms process to highlight the gender issues related to climate, is something we cannot forget about at all. And as you described, as we think of about these rebuilding, these leapfrog opportunities to make sure we're keeping the impact on women and girls front and center. This is a huge opportunity in addition to a need,

MCARTHUR: I think we need to all respect, as Amar and John do so much, the complexity of this issue. There's a retrofitting challenge for advanced economies, there's a building challenge for emerging economies, and there's a justice challenge for everyone who has to pay a price of climate change. And we couldn't ask for two better people to help us navigate,

I think it was Amar who described, as the mother of all public goods challenges and the most complex problem he's ever confronted. So these are two extraordinary policy leaders who have helped us think through how to navigate this complexity, and it's been a real treat to join them.

KHAN: To learn more, find this episode at Brookings Edu Slash 17 Rooms Podcast. Coming up next, Room 1 with Cina Lawson and Michael Faye on digital cash transfer infrastructure for emergency response.

MCARTHUR: I'm John McArthur.

KHAN: And I'm Zia Khan, and this has been 17 Rooms.

MCARTHUR: Our thanks go out to the guests you heard today, and also to the production team, including Fred Dews and Alexandra Bracken, producers; Jacob Taylor, associate producer; Gaston Reboredo, audio engineer, and Nicolette Kelly, audio intern. The show art was designed by Katie Merris. Additional support comes from Shrijana Khanal, Ian McAllister, Soren Messner-Zidell, Andrea Risotto, Marie Wilkin, Chris McKenna, Esther Rosen, David Batcheck, and Caio Pereira at the Brookings Institution, and Nathalia dos Santos, Sara Geisenheimer, Hunter Goldman, and Miranda Waters at The Rockefeller Foundation.

The 17 Rooms initiative is co-chaired by Zia Khan of The Rockefeller Foundation and me, John MacArthur of the Center for Sustainable Development at The Brookings Institution. The Rockefeller Foundation generously provides support for the 17 Rooms initiative. All views expressed during this episode were solely those of the speakers.