

**European Ideas Network - Summer University
18 - 20 September 2008**

**EIN POLICY ROUNDTABLE ON
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT**

RANIER FSADNI, RAPPORTEUR

Conclusions

The wide-ranging discussion had three main themes running through it.

First, sustainable development requires a strategy that is itself sustainable. Therefore, it should balance the protection of the environment with the protection of economic competitiveness, while ensuring the participation of the major emitting countries. An internal EU strategy could not be divorced from an external strategy.

There was disagreement about the degree of sustainability of the current EU Kyoto strategy. Generally, a contrast was drawn the top-down Kyoto approach with the bottom-up Japanese sectoral approach, with different speakers preferring one or the other, or even a mix of both. The criticisms of the Kyoto strategy were based on the difficulty of ensuring the participation of the major emitting countries, with one set of criticisms being based on the lack of US interest in Kyoto and the likely political difficulty of EU citizens accepting additional costs or tariffs at a time of financial crisis. The Japanese strategy was criticised for not being workable on its own, but only as a complementary tool.

Apart from discussions of the respective strategies per se, there was also some discussion of the details of the Kyoto strategy. One concern had to do with the insufficient data made available to legislators and consultative committees, which inhibited informed decisions on the options. Other questions were based on proposed specific initiatives, which might need revision if they were to fulfil their aim. For example, it was said to be unrealistic to expect establish targets for the steel industry that assumed that this would give incentives for the development of breakthrough technology in the medium term, since it was highly unlikely that such technology would be available before 2020 at the earliest.

The second themes concerned modes of governance. There was a general tendency to favour the combination of complementary approaches, with different mixes being proposed. One already mentioned was a combination of the European and Japanese strategies. Another concerned a 'global sectoral approach' that would include a public-private partnership between major industries and political negotiators. This second approach implies addressing the challenge via a multilevel network, whereas both the European and Japanese approaches assume a hierarchical pyramid-structure of action and decision-making.

The third theme concerned the different frameworks of action and regulation that go with different natural environments. For example, a European strategy for transport that focussed on

transferring some traffic from the roads to the sea, would need to take account of the International Maritime Organisation, on which the EU per se does not have a seat. The different framework of governance would affect how the issues raised in the first two themes are addressed. Perhaps further consideration, in future meetings of the working group, needs to be given to the consequences of factoring in the sea. The sea-air interface is an important factor affecting climate change. But negotiations over the management of the sea may not always be carried out as usual. High seas do not fall under national jurisdictions. Seas like the Baltic, the Mediterranean and the North Sea might be said to form independent sectors, but the boundaries of these sectors may not correspond with those of the sectoral approach based on national land territories. Each sea is particular, while at the same time being affected by developments happening elsewhere in ocean-space.

To sum up, each theme was concerned with the practical workability of a holistic approach to sustainable development. What the drift of the discussion suggested was that besides the promotion of all energy technologies and of energy efficiency as a driver of competitiveness, a sustainable European strategy on energy and the environment will also require institutional creativity to devise mechanisms of solidarity and regional/joint governance with third countries.