

BRIEFING BOOKLET 2011 DRAFT

CONTENTS:

Security in Africa	2
Food Crisis in Africa	4
Economic Reform	7
Democracy and Governance	10
Democratic Republic of Congo	13
Climate Change	14

SECURITY IN AFRICA

Over the past decade, Africa's status in U.S. national security policy has risen dramatically, for three main reasons: America's growing dependence on Africa's oil exports, Africa's importance as a major battlefield in America's "Global War on Terrorism," and Africa's central position in the global competition between America and China for economic and political power.

As a result, U.S. military involvement in Africa has escalated significantly. The total value of U.S. security assistance to Africa has risen from about \$100 million each year, to an annual level of about \$800 million and rising. To protect the U.S.'s interests in Africa the Bush Administration created AFRICOM, an independent military command for Africa that became operational on October 1, 2008. AFRICOM now oversees all U.S. military activities on the continent, including arms sales, military training, military exercises, naval operations in the oil-rich Gulf of Guinea, and air raids.

AFRICOM has overseen counterinsurgency operations in the Sahara and, through the Horn of Africa Joint Task Force, air raids on alleged terrorists. AFRICOM also asserted its independence from EUCOM (United States European Command) by setting up the no-fly zone in Libya and continues to work with NATO forces to unseat Ghaddafi. Strategic involvement of AFRICOM in some humanitarian crises and not others, like Ivory Coast, further shows its capacity as an arm of US policy and not the smooth hybrid of development and militarism it claims to be. No country in Africa, except Liberia, has expressed any interest in hosting the command's headquarters. This shows the maturity and strength of African civil society, and sends the clear message that the people of Africa do not want AFRICOM.

AFRICOM funding is increasing despite U.S. military failures in Congo and Mauritania.

Until African countries have stable, democratic, and accountable governments, increases in military support are likely to be detrimental. Our primary concern as organizations promoting peace, development, and justice in Africa lies in the projected structure and mandate of AFRICOM. We are concerned that U.S.-Africa policy will be driven by military engagement, rather than diplomacy, development, and a genuine partnership. The Obama administration is following an approach to Africa that is more focused on security and resources than on developing Africa's economies. This could lead to further instability and insecurity throughout the continent. While there is a need for security on the continent, it should come from Africans, not the increased presence of foreign militaries.

We are also concerned that AFRICOM is a further instance of the continuing transfer of control and funding of U.S. foreign policy actions from "civilian" agencies like the State Department and USAID to the Defense Department. Tasks such as drilling wells and building schools, once performed by civilian agencies, are now partly carried out by the military. The resulting dual nature of the military will not only confuse African civilians but also blurs the roles of armed forces and civil society. And along with control comes freedom from existing legislative restrictions and oversight mechanisms. It's clear AFRICOM will rely heavily on the services of U.S. private military contractors, who are already participating in large numbers on current operations in Liberia and Sudan, as well as in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is in the long-term strategic interest of the United States to amplify "soft power." An alternative framework based

on development and diplomacy rather than militarism would reduce conflict and sources of terror in the region. Instead of allying militarily with undemocratic or abusive regimes, the U.S. should seek to defend the true human needs of African civilians.

Our vision is of a comprehensive U.S. foreign policy grounded in true partnership with the African Union, African governments, and civil society on peace, justice, security, and development. Truthfully a democratic, peaceful Africa is better for the world, as well as for business. We urge Congress to abandon the path marked out by the Bush administration and chart a new path based on a multilateral partnership with Africa, as well as with other countries that have a stake in the continent (including China and India), to promote sustainable economic development, renewable energy creation, democracy, and human rights on the continent.

FOOD CRISES IN AFRICA

Global Food Security is a Critical Component of Global Economic Recovery and Political Stability

Sparked in part by high food prices, the uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt lit a volatile fire of political upheaval that has spread across the region. Though the rebellion that followed in Libya had less to do with food and more to do with freedom, the uprising circled back to impact food prices when fears that Gaddafi would sabotage oil production caused the price of crude oil to surge. Food and fuel are intricately linked, and the volatility in recent years in the commodity markets demonstrates that fact. The political instability in North Africa has served as a wakeup call for U.S. – Africa relations on many fronts. The U.S. must re-examine food and energy policies in light of recent events.

Only three years ago, a global food crisis pushed 100 million people into hunger and extreme poverty, many of them in Africa. In the second half of 2010 prices of food and oil began to rise again. The World Bank estimates that 44 million people fell below the extreme poverty line of living on less than \$1.25 a day between June and December of 2010. This alarming statistic was calculated before the political instability in North Africa and the spiking food and oil prices in the first quarter of 2011. A series of excellent harvests have helped to keep many African countries from bearing the brunt of the recent price volatility, but African governments and nongovernmental development and human rights organizations have been preparing for another possible global food crisis to emerge in 2011.

There are several clear U.S. policy changes that can help protect African nations from food price volatility. Recurring global food crises threaten economic recovery and national security in the U.S. and around the world. **The U.S. must take leadership globally to prevent price shocks and reduce volatility in global food markets and fulfill pledges to increase investment in smallholder agriculture and adapt to climate change.**

In times of crisis, the U.S. must take the following action to support food security in Africa:

- **Contribute to the World Food Program.** Congress can make sure that the U.S. does its fair share to shore up the World Food Program so that this global agency can monitor prices, support vulnerable countries to mitigate the problem and when necessary provide food assistance.
- **Reform food aid.** When food aid is necessary from the U.S., local and regional purchases of food –where possible from smallholder farmers – would be the most efficient and cost effective way to address a crisis. Local and regionally purchased food aid has the added benefit of rolling resources back into developing economies.
- **Protect the most vulnerable from export bans.** The U.S. must work towards international guidelines to minimize harm if countries employ trade measures such as export bans. Sovereign governments must retain the right to enforce trade restrictions to safeguard domestic food supplies during food emergencies. But major food exporters also

must recognize the harmful impact their policies may have on import-dependent countries. The U.S. should promote a set of guidelines that would ensure that food aid and essential exports destined for countries experiencing food emergencies are exempted from such restrictions.

To prevent future global food crises we must address the causes of recurring crises. The U.S. must:

- **Maintain current levels of foreign assistance for nations in poverty, especially to fight hunger.** When smallholder farmers have the tools and capacity to feed themselves, they will be less affected by global price fluctuations. The U.S. must meet the pledges it made at the G-8 summit in L'Aquila towards this end and resist cutting hunger programs during a food crisis as the budget that recently passed the House would do.
- **Establish regional food reserves.** The U.S. must work with other countries through the G20 and the CFS to establish virtual and, where appropriate, physical regional food banks. Where possible, procurement for physical reserves should be made from smallholder farmers. Food reserves have been keeping the price crisis at bay in many countries in Asia this year, and a commitment by the U.S. and other major producer nations to release grains in an emergency can help to calm the markets. Policy makers will have to re-think ethanol targets in order to actually ensure that the U.S. could deliver emergency corn, since we have shrunk our stocks to the lowest point in decades.
- **Look at alternatives to renewable energy other than biofuels.** During the State of the Union address, the President hailed biofuels as an answer to energy dependence. Rising oil prices also tempt many to look to biofuels as the answer. However, shifting crops from food and feed to fuel is wreaking havoc on food prices. Already the U.S. has diverted 40% of the corn crop from food and feed to fuel (ethanol). The growing demand for corn ethanol combined with rising demand for corn has shrunk stocks. Low stocks and high demand push prices up. We can save money by cutting the ethanol subsidy and freezing biofuels targets at this year's level. The U.S. must not renew the \$6 billion tax credit to oil and gas conglomerates to blend ethanol with gas. The triple incentives to the mature ethanol industry fuel corn ethanol, but distract the nation from developing truly sustainable advanced biofuels that could offer more promise in our quest for energy independence.
- **Help Farmers to Adapt to Climate Change.** Part of the problem with rising prices is related to supply, and climate change plays a role on this. Severe droughts, floods, and heat waves, linked to climate change, are straining food production. Climate-related declines in food production are only expected to get worse: the Nobel-prize winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change projects that in less than 10 years, yields

from rain-fed agriculture in some countries in Africa could be decreased by half. We don't need to increase deficits to fund climate adaptation – taxing the financial sector, using IMF Special Drawing Rights, and taxing maritime bunker fuels to finance climate adaptation are all viable options that can generate significant funding. The U.S. must employ these strategies to fund climate change adaptation and mitigation.

- **Implement the Dodd/Frank Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act.** Food and oil have become increasingly linked. Oil is in every part of our agricultural system from transport fuel to fertilizer, so as oil prices rise, so do food prices. Oil prices have risen above \$100 a barrel this year. Announcements like these start speculators spinning, hedging short and long to profit off volatility. This law puts sensible limits on speculation but it has not yet been implemented. Until this law is implemented, food and oil prices will continue to ping-pong. The U.S. must ensure that the law is implemented fully this year and work internationally to harmonize U.S. regulations with similar rules in other countries.

ECONOMIC REFORM FOR AFRICA

Beyond retaining and reforming aid, the 112th Congress has the opportunity to enable African governments to bring in their fair share of revenue and serve their own people by establishing fair international trade, tax accountability, and responsible lending.

Fair Trade

An increase in trade for sub-Saharan Africa could mean greater revenue for the continent. In 2008, sub-Saharan Africa's share of world trade was 3.5%, down from 6% in 1980. Even a 1% gain in global trade would be worth \$195 billion, more than five times annual development assistance to the region.¹

At the same time, growth in trade is not sufficient to assure poverty reduction and quality of life. A host of complementary conditions and policies is needed to assure that the benefits of trade and economic growth are shared widely.

The U.S. Congress should work to:

- Anchor trade and corporate involvement with Africa in strong international labor and environmental standards. Current extractive and plantation agriculture exports represent highly exploitative relationships with the U.S.
- Stop putting poor African farmers out of business and increasing food insecurity on the continent by flooding African markets with highly subsidized U.S. industrial agricultural goods.
 - As they stand, U.S. agricultural subsidies also damage American smallholder farmers because they primarily benefit large industrial farms: 90% of subsidies go to producers of corn, cotton, wheat, rice, and soybeans, with just 10% of farms receiving 74% of the support.
- Remove trade barriers and tariffs on all products exported from African countries.
- Refuse U.S. backing for trade and lending agreements that stunt African economic development. These include agreements that restrict African countries from regulating their financial sectors; implementing capital controls; lowering interest rates; investing in the conditions necessary for business development such as education, health, and infrastructure; or using adequate levels of trade protection for nascent industries.

¹ Based on 2008 figures. See <http://www.one.org/c/us/issue/17/>

Taxation

According to Christian Aid estimates, low-income countries lose \$160 billion each year to corporate tax evasion, more than all official development aid combined and enough to reach the UN Millennium Development Goals several times over.

Numerous policies could enable African countries to retain their fair share of corporate profits earned within their borders. The U.S. Congress should work to:

- Require country-by country reporting of corporations' profits and expenditures
- Improve international tax information exchange
- Take action to end the use of tax havens, which encourage \$20-40 billion in capital flight from poor countries into secret offshore accounts every year.
- Strengthen taxation rights for developing countries
- Invest in capacity building for African tax authorities

Extractive Industry Reporting: A Congressional Victory for Transparency and Anti-Corruption

Last year's Wall Street Dodd/Frank reform legislation required companies filing reports with the Securities and Exchange commission to submit annual reports on payments for each project involving the exploration and extraction of oil, gas and minerals in every country of operation. This represents a step in the right direction to promote transparency and curb the flood of extractive industry money into conflict and corruption. Congress should ensure the full enforcement of this law and expand country-by-country reporting standards to all industries.

Lending Practices and Debt

The total external debt of the very poorest countries (the 'low income countries' which have an annual average income of less than \$975 per person) was US \$168 billion in 2008. During 2008, these countries paid over \$8.3 billion to the rich world in debt service (payments of interest and principal) – that is over \$23 million a day.

Debts that a country **can't afford** to repay without meeting its people's basic needs. For instance, in 2005/06, Kenya's budget for debt payments was as much as for water, health, agriculture, roads, transport and finance combined.

African debt campaigners are also calling for the establishment of a debt arbitration mechanism, to address the difficulties many countries are facing as they attempt to service debt arrears to international lenders. A debt arbitration process could balance the interests of both creditors and debtors, particularly in the current global financial crisis. Now is the time to break the chains of debt and bring the change Africa so desperately needs.

International Financial Institutions

In 2009, the G-20 tripled the lending capacity of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), including a \$100 billion additional contribution from the United States. Historically, the IMF has demanded economic policies in Africa that have prevented nations from hiring public health professionals and teachers, diverted aid into reserves, and pushed a “privatization” and trade liberalization agenda that has undermined workers rights, food sovereignty, and governments’ ability to invest in development.

While the IMF claims to have changed some of these policies, nearly every loan agreement signed in recent months includes the same policies. Congress should instead support progressive, expansionary IMF policies with an eye toward their impact on basic services and development.

Maintain and Reform Foreign Aid

Diplomacy and development is only about 1.3 percent of the federal budget. About half of that 1.3 percent is spent on poverty-focused development aid. That’s roughly 0.6 percent of our tax dollars for programs that improve livelihoods and create lasting solutions to world poverty.

The US spent 0.18 percent of its national income on foreign aid in 2006 . That puts the US in 21st place among OECD members and behind most industrialized nations.

Our specific recommendations to the United States are:

- **Consolidate aid under USAID leadership.** Today, USAID oversees only 45 percent of US foreign aid. Meanwhile, the Foreign Assistance Act is more complicated than ever, featuring 33 different goals, 75 priority areas, and 247 directives, and being executed by at least 12 departments, 25 different agencies, and almost 60 government offices. This mix of agencies with different missions has made the efficient delivery of aid increasingly difficult
- **Stop the militarization of aid.** The Department of Defense (DOD) has started to make forays into political and diplomatic foreign aid—territory that has historically been managed by the State Department. Second, the Department of State has begun to exert increasing control over USAID’s poverty-focused development aid. While coordination among the DOD, Department of State, and USAID needs improvement, the agencies ultimately have different mandates. The DOD fights wars and protects the US from attack. The State Department manages the US’s diplomatic and political agenda. USAID responds to humanitarian emergencies, seeks long-term economic development, and works to improve conditions of people living in poverty.

DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA

It is the in the United States' immediate and long-term interests to promote democracy among African states. The recent uprisings across the continent expose the hypocrisy between the United States' rhetoric of democracy promotion and its practice of propping up dictators when suitable. Although President Obama said in his March 19 speech on Libya that "wherever people long to be free, they will find a friend in the United States", the reality is that the United States is often a friend of those that actively suppress freedom. The revolutions in Egypt and Tunisia exposed to the world to the oppression faced by citizens under dictators who maintained extremely close relations with the United States. It was United States extensive financial and military assistance maintained their decades-long rule.

Likewise in Sub-Saharan Africa, Swaziland, Djibouti, Burkina Faso, and Uganda, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Angola, and Mozambique have recently faced popular unrest. Suppression of opposition parties and brutal violence against protestors is occurring from dictators and presidents who refuse to cede power. Yet the United States maintains good bilateral relations with these corrupt and autocratic leaders, offering aid money and military training. For example, the United States has refused to even comment on Djiboutian President Guelleh's clearly fraudulent April election because he has welcomed the United States military base there. It seems establishing stable, just, and democratic states is subsidiary to the short-term gains of engaging corrupt regimes. Why should oppression only be condemned when convenient? If the United States continues to take its relations with Africa for granted, it does so at the high cost of its values and its security.

2011 brings an unusually high number of 17 presidential elections to Africa, along with a myriad of parliamentary and local elections and constitutional reforms. Now, more than ever, is the time for the United States to begin genuinely promoting democratic processes in African states, rather than its current pick-and-choose method of democracy promotion only when it is convenient. While dictators like Libya's Qaddafi and Zimbabwe's Mugabe are heavily condemned, the United States simultaneously turns a blind eye to other equally brutal regimes on the continent because of naïve and short-sighted strategic and national interests. The Obama administration must instead conduct US-Africa relations with foresight and focus toward legitimate regional stability and equity.

A similar narrative repeatedly unfolds among African states: an elite political class vies for regime maintenance rather than partaking in the necessary nation building within the highly artificial state boundaries carved out by colonial powers. Raw resource extraction, such as oil, diamonds, and minerals, continues to be the primary impetus for external involvement on the continent. Far too many African dictators and United States policymakers maintain cozy relationships. The leader gains aid packages, military assistance, and financial revenues to keep his regime in power, while the United States' is ensured strategic alliances, access to military facilities, and a continuous supply of raw materials. It is the vast majority of ordinary citizens who bear the brunt of scare government investment in civil society, serious environmental pollution, and land grabs.

This scenario plays out again and again across the continent. Six African states currently have leaders who have been in power for 30 or more years. Cameroon's Paul Biya and Chad's Idriss Deby are

guilty of engaging in unlawful arrests, extortion, and torture in order to suppress opposition to their decades-long rule. Despite such brutality, the United States maintains 'close' relations with these leaders in order to ensure access to the Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline built by a consortium of U.S. companies. In 2006, Condoleezza Rice greeted Equatorial Guinea's leader Teodoro Obiang with open arms, calling him 'a good friend'. Described as worse than Mugabe, Obiang came to power in 1978 by a bloody coup; he has since laundered millions from the oil revenues that pour into his country and is a brutal tyrant and violator of basic human rights.

Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni has been in power 24-years via corruption, destruction of civic institutions, and war profiteering. Likewise, under Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, the Ethiopian government has massacred protestors, led ethnic cleansing, arrested opposition leaders, and maintained control of the media. Yet the United States props up these dictatorial states through financial, political, military assistance because they agree to fight the 'War on Terror' in Somalia. In return, the United States turns a blind-eye to rigged elections and human rights abuses. Yet by supporting the suppression of fair and open societies, the United States is actually furthering the very insecurity that it seeks to eradicate. Terrorism flourishes under corrupt regimes, while democratic societies promote peace and stability rather than violence and extremism.

U.S. policy makers should have learned better by now. During the Cold War, policymakers gave billions of dollars in aid to corrupt dictators for military cooperation and access to strategic bases. Four of the five largest recipients – Sudan, Somalia, Liberia, and former Zaire – subsequently faced long, brutal civil wars. While these partnerships may have had some short-term benefits, in the long-term they clearly proved disastrous. Millions have been displaced or died, including U.S. soldiers in Somalia. The resulting failed states are some of the most pressing international situations. The 'War on Terror' the United States now faces is the direct result of aiding dictators; the same mistake is being repeated once again.

The United States must acknowledge its contribution to violent and destabilizing conflicts across Africa that create complex humanitarian and security crises. Rather than responding retroactively – after blood has been shed and decisions are difficult and costly – the Obama administration must commit to proactively fostering democratic processes. Creating the conditions for a fair and responsive political system to thrive needs to be the United States' top priority in Africa rather than a secondary consideration. As Africanist scholar Sulayman Nyang heeded to Congress in 2007, "America's moral currency should be as strong as the dollar bill".

The current forms of resistance taking place across the African continent should be a clear indicator to the Obama administration that remaining complicit to the demands of dictators is no longer acceptable, that allowing U.S.-made weapons to shoot down protestors is no longer acceptable. This is not only a moral imperative, but a strategic consideration too. Instability and violent conflict create large influxes of refugees into neighboring countries. National unrest can quickly threaten the stability of entire regions. Military intervention to deescalate a situation incurs immense cost in lives and money, not to mention is a largely ineffective strategy to secure long-term stability

Simply promoting free and fair elections in the name of democracy is not enough. Democracy extends far beyond the existence of a ballot box. Strong civil society and institutions are a vital component of states' political legitimacy. The electoral system is only the final output of democratization.

Functioning political spaces require the freedom of expression, association, and personal autonomy. Citizens need the right to speak and take leadership positions within society in order for political pluralism to develop. Executive leaders need to have enough checks on their power within the government that they cannot arbitrarily change term limits. Protestors cannot be attacked on the streets and opposition members kidnapped. As recent unrest across the continent has demonstrated, elections are only the final culmination of the democratic process, not their foundation.

A strong civil society is necessary in order to avoid many of the pitfalls that plague African electoral processes: the corruption, patronage, and ethno-political manipulation by elite. Effective institutions are necessary to ensure that politicians are not able hand people machetes as a tactic to win an election. By strengthening political participation, leaders can be elected that truly represent the needs of the people. The United States can support Africa's long-term security by engaging with states in a manner that promotes broad institution-building measures. The greatest strength of the United States should lie in its legitimacy among foreign populations that it supports democratic political processes rather than corrupt regimes.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

According to the 2007 International Rescue Committee's Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) mortality survey, 5.4 million people have died as a consequence of the war and its persistent effects since 1998. In Eastern DRC, the conflict financed by illicit mineral trade continues to claim countless lives. American, Canadian, European and Asian corporations are linked to the Congo crisis as they respond to the growing industrialized nation's demand for Congo's gold, diamonds, copper, cobalt, coltan, tin, tungsten, chromium, germanium, nickel, and uranium. Some of these are central to the production of cell phones, computers, video games, kitchen appliances, automobiles, airplane, and numerous other electronic devices. Although the United States of America passed a law on conflict mineral (Section 1502 of public law 111-203) with the goal to disrupt the illicit trade network of minerals from the DRC which finances the rebel groups operating in Eastern DRC, it has yet to be fully enforced or implemented. The widespread use of rape as a weapon of war is ongoing in eastern provinces of North and South Kivu.

During his trip to Ghana, President Obama called for a more democratic Africa, saying that Africa does not need strong men, but strong institutions. The DRC faces chronic social, economic and political challenges, particularly the lack of strong institutions, good governance, rule of law and independence of judiciary. DRC must be assisted in overcoming the insecurity, systemic corruption and human rights violations. In 2006 President Georges W. Bush signed into law on the "Democratic Republic of the Congo Relief, Security, and Democracy Promotion Act of 2006" (Public Law 109-456) which states US position on some of these issues. We call on the administration to fully implement this law.

CLIMATE CHANGE IN AFRICA

“I am a farmer. My mother was a farmer. For my mother, rains used to come from October to April. Today, because of climate change, the rains come in December and end in March. Our local varieties do not have time to mature. We are forced to buy hybrid crops, which are much more input intensive, and we cannot afford these inputs. We are poor. So we are starving in Malawi.”

- Joyce Tembenu, a widow and mother of three who farms in the Salima district of Malawi

Climate change is one of the greatest obstacles to ending poverty and one of the gravest equity challenges of our time. Impoverished countries have done least to create the climate crisis, yet are being hit first and worst by its impacts, including extreme weather events, sea-level rise, drought, and disruption of water and food supplies. Poor countries and communities have the least capacity to deal with such impacts.

Africa is one of the continents that will be most affected by climate change, and food production will be particularly threatened. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), in some countries in Africa, yields from rain-fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50% by 2020 as a result of climate change.ⁱ This will mean increased hunger and famines across an already food insecure continent. Water resources across Africa will also be severely impacted; by 2020, 75-250 million people across Africa could face more severe water shortages due to climate change.ⁱⁱ

Women in Africa who are primarily responsible for food production and provision and for gathering water will be particularly affected. As crop yields decline and water resources diminish, women’s workloads will expand, jeopardizing their chances to work outside the home, attend school, or attend to other tasks.

In order to halt the impacts of climate change that will deeply affect Africa, it is essential for developed countries to drastically reduce their emissions of greenhouse gasses which are causing climate change. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Africa is expected to warm at around 1.5 times the global average. It is essential that the United States work with other developed countries to ensure that global temperatures do not rise beyond 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels. Warming beyond this level will have devastating impacts for Africa.

It is equally important for developed countries to dedicate substantial new resources to help countries in Africa adapt to the impacts of climate change, and to ensure that funding gets channeled through a fund or institution accountable to poor people. In December 2010, at the Cancun climate conference, developed countries agreed to jointly mobilize \$100 billion per year by 2020 for adaptation and mitigation in developing countries. The US portion of this funding is approximately \$25 billion per year by 2020.

There are numerous mechanism available to developed countries to allow them to scale-up public financing for climate change and ensure that funding is new and additional to Overseas Development Assistance (ODA), is in the form of grants, and does not draw and already deep

deficits in developed countries. Taxing the financial sector, redirecting fossil fuel subsidies, using IMF Special Drawing Rights, and mechanism within the shipping and aviation sectors are all viable options which can generate billions of new public finance.² The US must is yet to publically support for any of these mechanisms; it must do so by the climate summit in Durban, South Africa, in December 2011 (referred to as COP 17).

Finally, it is essential that this funding gets channeled through an institution which is accountable to poor people. The Cancun climate conference in December 2010 launched the Green Climate Fund (GCF). The GCF will be designed this year by a Transitional Committee, which includes the participation of the United States. It is essential that the Green Climate Fund gets designed in a way to ensure: 1) a representative governance structure with civil society and affected communities on the board, 2) community participation in all layers of decision making of the GCF, 3) streamlined and direct access to funding, 4) no economic policy conditionality, and 5) sustainable and compensatory funding.

Our specific recommendations to the United States are:

- **Establish a plan to ensure a US emission reduction commitment beyond the 3% below 1990 levels already committed.** The US should endorse a global temperature rise no more than 1.5 percent beyond preindustrial levels.
- **Dedicate new and additional funding for adaptation.** The United States must show its support by COP 17 for innovative mechanism to generate public funding. Possible mechanisms to generate the needed finance include the use of levies in the shipping and aviation sectors, a financial transaction tax, and use of Special Drawing Rights.
- **Work through the Transitional Committee** to ensure that the Green Climate Fund 1) is governed by a representative board which includes civil society and affected communities with voting power, 2) includes community participation in all layers of decision making of the GCF, 3) ensures streamlined and direct access to funding, 4) includes no economic policy conditionality, and 5) provides sustainable and compensatory funding.

ⁱ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) 2007.

ⁱⁱ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) 2007.

² For more information on the various innovative finance mechanism, please see: US Climate Action Network. Investing in The Future: Options for the Future the U.S. Can Support: <http://blog.usclimatenetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/investing-in-the-future2.pdf>

