R11 2% of GDP towards climate solutions

Proposer: Jong Groen
Agenda item: 1. Resolutions

Motion text

To keep global warming below 1.5°C, strong action by national governments is needed urgently. One way these governments can contribute to climate solutions is by investing structurally in a just transition. Scientists at Sapienship calculated that the 1.5°C target could be achieved with only 2% of global GDP invested in climate solutions. The Global North bears a historic responsibility in the climate crisis. As long as GDP is the main indicator for the financial situation of a country, European governments should incorporate 2% of their GDP towards a just transition in their (annual) budgeting.

Translating the 1.5°C goal agreed on in the international Paris Agreement into a national commitment of 2% of GDP towards climate solutions, makes the fight for 1.5°C more tangible. This clear and reasonable demand allows young green activists to effectively put pressure on the budgeting of their governments, and keeping them accountable in the execution of their financial plans.

The focus of these investments should be in line with the focus points and priorities stated in the FYEG Political Platform for a just transition towards climate neutrality. Technical fixes thus cannot be the center of these investments. National governments should think how they could invest public money towards climate solutions in the most cost-effective way, aligned with their national policy matters. Climate solutions oftentimes are interlinked and feed into each other. For thematic practical implementation, we again refer to our views in the FYEG Political Platform. Since more than 75% of greenhouse gas emissions in the EU stem from the energy sector and as example case, the investments of public money towards a just energy transition will be displayed in the following:

The most effective way to save energy is by not using it. Energy efficiency should be the number 1 priority for public spending by national governments. Investments should go towards the insulation of all homes and buildings by 2030. For a society that runs on 100% renewables, as it should by 2050, the energy grid needs to be electrified. Public money should thus flow towards the electrification of the energy grid and energy infrastructure.

Energy should be generated from renewable sources. Investments in wind and solar energy would be part of the 2% GDP towards climate solutions package. Although nuclear energy emits less carbon emissions, they cannot be included in this budget, as they have other environmental implications (like the extraction of uranium, security risks and the production of nuclear waste). Investment in fossil fuels does not belong within this budgeting package, as it's an energy source from the past and needs to be phased out of the energy mix completely as soon as possible. As the production of hydrogen is energy-intensive, it can only be considered a sustainable and green source of energy if produced in a 100% renewable way and used when no more energy efficient options are available. Investments in research & development on hydrogen are eligible, yet should not be the core objective of the 2% of GDP towards climate solutions. In this investment package, the focus stays on the funding of an urgent just transition, rather than the development of technical fixes. Also 'green hydrogen' imported from the Global South can not be considered an investment in a sustainable energy transition, as the transportation of hydrogen is an energy-intensive process in itself and threatens the energy security of communities in the exporting countries.

These investments will not only save us from climate catastrophe, but will also generate economic & societal gain. This resolution focuses on 'national governments', but 2% of of budgeting towards climate solutions should be the goal of every government & could also be a goal for budgets of non-state actors (organisations, universities, schools, …) all from their own focus & competence. From the economic and financial gain that will emerge from these investments, European governments have more budgetary room to pay up for 'loss & damage', to countries in the Global South. 'Loss & damage' is not part of this financial plan, but should get its own program in government spending.

Reason

Some references: **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SiCvGQnweAg** & **https://www.sapienship.co/decision-makers/2-percent-more?_gl=1*1bgswg0*_up*MQ**