



for a living planet®

Paragrafo che il WWF ha commentato della relazione annuale del presidente Ortis

“Per l'Europa si pone anche la necessità di superare le logiche, onerose e inefficaci, fino ad ora seguite per far fronte al cambiamento del clima: un problema globale che richiede soluzioni altrettanto globali. A questo proposito rilancio un'ipotesi di innovazione che già proponemmo anche in questa sede, quando ci permettemmo di suggerire un abbandono dello strumento unilaterale cap and trade (basato su emissioni nei territori di singoli Stati o Continenti), per considerare invece un approccio integrato (a livello internazionale) di politiche ambientali e commerciali, che scoraggi forme di dumping ambientale (di Paesi che tendano a sottrarsi a limiti e vincoli); ciò con accordi a livello WTO (piuttosto che con altri protocolli tipo Kyoto), che guardino al contenuto CO2 dei prodotti commercializzati, introducendo (su questa base tecnica e non per protezionismi) meccanismi di border tax adjustment”.

Su cosa il WWF non è d'accordo

Le logiche "onerose e inefficaci" europee sarebbero quelle del pacchetto clima ed energia dell'Unione Europea (20-20-20) e la riduzione unilaterale annunciata (di qui il riferimento alla necessità di soluzioni globali). Un pacchetto che invece oggi appare sottostimato rispetto alle esigenze non solo di riduzione delle emissioni, ma soprattutto dal punto di vista della politica industriali. Le emissioni, infatti, per via della crisi stanno scendendo.

Questa situazione è pericolosa sotto almeno due punti di vista, uno ambientale e l'altro economico. Dal punto di vista ambientale, una riduzione dello sforzo di riduzione in presenza di un rallentamento produttivo dei settori energivori (come l'acciaio) implica che una volta terminati gli effetti della crisi economica le emissioni ricominceranno a salire. Dal punto di vista economico, il fatto che le emissioni calino non per loro conto, e non grazie a investimenti, cambiamento dei modelli di consumo e innovazione tecnologica, rischia di far perdere all'Europa, e ai singoli Stati, una grande occasione e costituire uno svantaggio in termini di competitività a livello internazionale. Per questo la visione espressa nella relazione è vecchia: il punto di vista tiene conto di come il dibattito si era sviluppato anni fa.

L'abbandono dello "strumento unilaterale cap and trade (basato su emissioni nei territori di singoli Stati o Continenti)", dunque, non è all'orizzonte, perché l'obiettivo deve essere chiaro, quello di ridurre le emissioni di CO2, con un percorso che vada dal 2020 al 2050. L'Europa ha basato la propria politica sulla sicurezza energetica, oltre che sul clima, su questo. Siamo d'accordo sull'approccio integrato, ma questo per noi non vuol dire abbandonare gli obiettivi di riduzione, ma ampliare le misure: che vedano per alcuni settori lo scambio delle emissioni (ETS), in particolare per quelli più energivori e controllabili come l'elettrico, per altri delle carbon tax (trasporti, per esempio), ecc.

Sulla border adjustment tax, il contenuto di carbonio dei singoli prodotti potrà senz'altro essere considerato, **UNA VOLTA STABILITI gli OBIETTIVI DI RIDUZIONE**, ma al momento è solo un'intimidazione nei confronti dei paesi verso i quali le nostre stesse industrie hanno delocalizzato e come tale 1) non favorirà un accordo globale che faccia fronte ai cambiamenti climatici con l'ordine di grandezza necessario; 2) porterà questi paesi a esigere che le emissioni dovute a produzioni industriali delocalizzate siano attribuite e calcolate nel computo dei paesi delocalizzatori (è già stato ventilato). Non è un caso, quindi, che Confindustria non appoggi questa politica, come non appoggia l'incremento degli obiettivi di riduzione delle emissioni e l'emission trading: ovviamente, a perdere in questi veti incrociati tra i vari settori produttivi, sarà l'ambiente e gli stessi settori produttivi del futuro (vittime dei cambiamenti climatici), se non interverrà la Politica nella sua accezione più alta.

FT: Europe needs to reduce emissions by 30%

By Chris Huhne, Norbert Röttgen and Jean-Louis Borloo
Published: July 14 2010 19:55

Europe's current focus on recovery from recession must not distract us from the question of what kind of economy we want to build. Unless we set our countries on a path to a sustainable low-carbon future, we will face continued uncertainty and significant costs from energy price volatility and a destabilising climate.

This is why we today set out our belief that the European Union should raise its emissions target. A reduction of 30 per cent from 1990 levels by 2020 would represent a real incentive for innovation and action in the international context. It would be a genuine attempt to restrict the rise in global temperatures to 2°C – the key climate danger threshold – stiffening the resolve of those already proposing ambitious action and encouraging those waiting in the wings. It would also make good business sense.

The current target of a 20 per cent reduction now seems insufficient to drive the low-carbon transition. The recession by itself has cut emissions in the EU's traded sector by 11 per cent from pre-crisis levels. Partly as a result, the price of carbon is far too low to stimulate significant investment in green jobs and technologies.

If we stick to a 20 per cent cut, Europe is likely to lose the race to compete in the low-carbon world to countries such as China, Japan or the US – all of which are looking to create a more attractive environment for low-carbon investment.

By moving to a higher target, the EU would have a direct impact on the carbon price through to 2020 and also send a strong signal of our commitment to a low-carbon policy framework in the longer term. We must not forget that building a low-carbon future depends overwhelmingly on the private sector. Moving to a 30 per cent target would provide greater certainty and predictability for investors.

Europe's companies are poised to take advantage of the new opportunities. They currently have a global market share of 22 per cent of the low-carbon goods and services sector, thanks to Europe's early leadership in tackling climate change. But the rest of the world is catching up. The Copenhagen commitments, though less ambitious than we had hoped, have triggered widespread action, notably in China, India and Japan.

Because of reduced emissions in the recession, the annual costs in 2020 of meeting the existing 20 per cent target are down a third from €70bn (\$89bn, £59bn) to €48bn. A move up to 30 per cent is now estimated to cost only €11bn more than the original cost of achieving a 20 per cent reduction. In addition, delayed action would come with a high price tag: according to the International Energy Agency, every year of delayed investment on low-carbon energy sources costs €300bn to €400bn at the global level.

Furthermore, these costs were calculated on the conservative assumption that oil will cost \$88 (€69, £58) a barrel in 2020. Given the current constraints on supply-side investment, rapid growth in consumption in Asia, and the impact of the Gulf of Mexico oil spill, oil prices may well rise further; under one IEA scenario, the price could reach a nominal \$130 a barrel. Rising oil prices would lower the costs of hitting any targets and, under some scenarios, the direct economic effects of hitting the 30 per cent target by 2020 actually turn positive.

Some energy-intensive sectors will be exposed to greater costs than the average. We already try to safeguard them through free emissions allowances where necessary, and alternative measures might be needed over time. The real threat that such industries face, though, is not carbon prices but collapsing demand in the European construction and infrastructure markets. One sure way to increase demand for the materials these sectors produce is through incentives to boost investment in large-scale low-carbon infrastructure – a voracious user of steel, cement, aluminium and chemicals. Our industry departments are working to ensure that we manage the transition effectively and maximise opportunities for these sectors.

Ducking the argument on 30 per cent will put us in the global slow lane. Early action will provide our industries with a vital head start. That is why we believe the move to 30 per cent is right for Europe. It is a policy for jobs and growth, energy security and climate risk. Most of all, it is a policy for Europe's future.

The writers are UK climate change secretary, German federal environment minister and French environment minister

Copyright The Financial Times Limited 2010. You may share using our article tools. Please don't cut articles from FT.com and redistribute by email or post to the web.

FT: Ministers toughen stance on emissions

By Fiona Harvey in London

Published: July 14 2010 20:12 | Last updated: July 14 2010 20:12

Europe's targets for cutting greenhouse gas emissions should be drastically toughened, three of the European Union's most powerful member states say today in a surprise development that will leave businesses fuming.

Ministers from Germany, France and the UK come together for the first time in the Financial Times to call for the EU to slash emissions by 30 per cent by 2020, instead of the current 20 per cent target.

They say moving to the higher target unilaterally would not be difficult and would prevent Europe from lagging behind in the global race for green technology.

"If we stick to a 20 per cent cut, Europe is likely to lose the race to compete in a low-carbon world to countries such as China, Japan or the US, all of which are looking to create a more attractive environment for low-carbon investment," the ministers said.

Research from Bloomberg New Energy Finance this week showed China had leapt ahead in green technology investment, attracting \$40.3bn (€31.6bn) of asset finance for clean energy in the past year, compared with \$29.3bn in Europe.

But the move by the three countries has reopened a debate most businesses regarded as settled. In May, the European Commission reported a 30 per cent reduction would be €22bn a year cheaper than thought because the recession had trimmed emissions. But an outcry from businesses forced a concession that raising the target would have to wait "until the time was right".

Today's move marks a U-turn for Germany, which has long opposed a unilateral move to 30 per cent, favouring the EU's previous pledge to raise its target only if other countries showed similar ambitions, which they did not at last year's Copenhagen climate summit. France also had strong reservations, but the UK's Liberal Democrat party scored a coup when the ruling coalition of which they are a part backed the change.

Influential European business groups oppose the higher target. "We believe a unilateral move by the EU could disadvantage manufacturers by subjecting them to higher costs than their international competitors," said Neil Bentley, director, business environment, at the UK's CBI employers' organisation.

Gordon Moffat, director-general of Eurofer, the European steelmakers' association, said: "It would be absurd to take the economic downturn as justification for more ambitious climate change targets."

But some businesses, including those with interests in green technology, support the tougher target. Joan MacNaughton, senior vice-president of policy at **Alstom**, the engineering group, said: "A 30 per cent target could really help to incentivise the low-carbon investment that Europe needs."