



HAL
open science

The Copenhagen summit: the French perspective

Eloi Laurent

► **To cite this version:**

Eloi Laurent. The Copenhagen summit: the French perspective. Copenhagen Climate-Change Conference: “What is the Deal?”, Center for German and European Studies at Brandeis University (CGES), Dec 2009, Waltham, MA, United States. hal-03461650

HAL Id: hal-03461650

<https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-03461650>


Submitted on 1 Dec 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - ShareAlike 4.0 International License




The Copenhagen summit: the French perspective

Éloi LAURENT (Sciences Po, OFCE, Paris, France ; CES Harvard)
eloi.laurent@sciences-po.fr




Forum on Environmental Crisis
Center for German and European Studies - Brandeis University
2 December 2009




Outline

- Why Copenhagen? Latest data on emissions by developed and developing; Kyoto's "crisis of credibility"; latest proposals on the table;
- The French position on mitigation: "Climate-energy package" deal at EU level (December 2008) + carbon tax in 2010;
- The French position on adaptation: the "Climate Justice" Plan.





Why Copenhagen?

- Emissions of developed countries and developing countries have crossed paths in 2006: developing now 55% of global emissions;
- But “developing” misleading : in 2007, China became the world’s biggest GHG emitter. Now accounts for 23% of global emissions (US = 19%, EU 15 = 18%);
- Kyoto: “common but differentiated responsibilities” = only developed countries (and ex-USSR) have binding targets; Need to include “developing” (= emerging = mostly China); How?
- Copenhagen: cooperation between developed and emerging possible, but relies on trustworthiness and credibility: insufficient efforts so far of developed countries on mitigation (and adaptation);



Where we are: the global chiasm


Co2 emissions from fossil fuels between 1990 and 2008: + 41%




Source: Le Quéré C, Raupach MR, Canadell JG, Marland G et al. (2009)
Trends in the sources and sinks of carbon dioxide. Nature geosciences.

A breakdown between BRICs and N11

Co2 emissions from fossil fuels between 1990 and 2008




Data Source: Global Carbon Project.




The Chinese proposition on CE

Co2 emissions from fossil fuels between 1990 and 2007





Data Source: EIA; graph and calculations: Éloi Laurent.

What we can do about it: the **twin** curves




Source: HDR o8.


The Kyoto “crisis of credibility”



Data source: United Nations.




How do the EU and the US compare?



The EU emits 40% less GHG than the US with a GDP 10% higher and a population 20% higher; gap between US and EU GHG dynamic between 1990 and 2007 = **over 21 percentage points**.

Data source: United Nations; graph and calculations: Éloi Laurent.



Mitigation and adaptation



- Two types of climate policies: adaptation and mitigation.
- Mitigation: An **anthropogenic** intervention to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases (IPCC, 2001);
- Adaptation: Adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities (IPCC, 2001);



Mitigation: what can France do?

- EU climate-energy package (“20-20-20” strategy): franco-german effort (two Presidencies = 1st semester 2007 + 2nd semester 2008);
- EU ETS at the center of the strategy: European carbon market (cap-and-trade) created in Jan 2005. 64% of world carbon markets. Volume increased 66% between 2007 and 2008. But price signal too low, unstable + “carbon leakage” and offsets; Auctioning today: 3% of permits. Powerful instrument that needs **fixing**;
- Covers only 40% of EU emissions (energy and energy intensive sectors). Will eventually cover 50% (aviation + methane). Need for other economic instruments to deal with diffuse GHG emissions (transports: + 25% increase since 1990);
- National Carbon taxes (European carbon tax, Swedish Presidency of the EU).
- France’s GHG profile: looks very good from afar, but problem of **diffuse** emissions (“nuclear complacency”).


France GHG profile: looking good...




Source: WDR 2010 and French Minister of Industry.

... and not so good

2/3 of emissions not covered by EU ETS,
road transport **up by 490%** since 1960




Source: Laurent & Le Cacheux, 2009.



The French carbon tax (2009-2010)

- Carbon tax voted last month in 2010 budget; will be introduced early 2010: France will then become biggest economy to have a carbon tax;
- Ecological efficiency is problematic because initial level too low : 17 euros (Commission of experts recommended 32 euros, “ideal price”, ie, scientific and not political = 45 euros).
- Why so low? Because **EU ETS used as reference**. Level for 2030 = 100 euros, but we don't know how we'll get from here to there.
- Overall impact weak. Tax = 4,6 bn euros = 0,23% of GDP, 0,47% of total tax revenues;



Adaptation: what can France do?

- Adaptation financing: **100bn per year** to be found from developed world to developing world (developed countries responsible for 75% of the problem while developing countries will bear 80% of the impact);
- Idea of the “Mexican fund”. But where to find the money = connection to mitigation because revenues of taxes and cap and trade can be used to finance adaptation;
- French “Climate Justice” plan, right focus on Africa (3% of global emissions, huge impact) with 250bn \$ + tax on financial transactions;
- But lack of coordination within EU (“franco-brazilian plan”) + squabble among EU member states about distribution of financial burden = adaptation financing still uncertain...