

**Yamazaki Katsuo**, Mr, Acad, Management, Japan, "*The United States' withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol in view of economy and democracy*"-E

**Yamazaki, Katsuo**, Shizuoka Sangyo University

### **1. What is Kyoto Protocol?**

Kyoto Protocol, or treaty, forces the industrialized nations that ratified it to limit their emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and other suspected global-warming gases that trap the sun's rays in the earth's atmosphere. The Protocol requires industrial countries to reduce their emissions an average of 5.2 percent (pct) below 1990 levels by 2012. For most countries that means much higher reductions by 2012 because of the growth in their emissions since 1990.

To change the situation, Germany will take steps to curb the growth of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to 21 pct from the 1990 level in 2010. In the same manner, United Kingdom will take actions to reduce 12.5 pct by 2010. France and Russia may maintain the same level in 2010 as one in 1990. Other European Union (EU) countries will curb the growth of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to eight pct from the 1990 level in 2010. Under the Protocol, Japan must reduce its average annual greenhouse gas emissions by 6 pct from 1990 levels in 2008-2012.

Transaction costs and institutional rigidities will reduce the attractiveness of the Protocol flexibility mechanisms compared to domestic greenhouse gas abatement options. The clean development mechanism (CDM) in particular is likely to entail considerable costs of baseline development, project registration, verification and certification. The activities implemented jointly pilot phase and the prototype carbon fund program give indications about these costs. There is evidence that projects with high implementation costs have high transaction costs as well. The size of the CDM will depend to a significant degree on transaction costs and institutional barriers in host countries.

In the action program, Japanese government, for instance, aims to cut the industry sector's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 8.6 pct in 2010, while allowing the emissions of the commercial sector to grow by 15.0 pct and those of the household sector by 6.0 pct.

On Feb.16, 2005, the Kyoto Protocol went into effect for 128 nations. The U.S. government opted out of this treaty. A slowdown in worldwide emissions of greenhouse gases has a new challenge. Countries that have ratified the agreement now face the daunting task of charting a course to stabilize emissions beyond 2012, when the protocol expires.

On the problem of global warming, a successor framework to the current Kyoto Protocol, which covers the period between 2008 and 2012, is expected to appear on the agenda of the G-8 summit meeting in Gleneagles, Scotland, on July 6-8 in 2005. The post-Kyoto framework is crucial, as emerging economies such as China and India are not obliged to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions under the Kyoto treaty and the United States, the world's biggest energy-consuming country, has withdrawn from the treaty. Support for Africa's poorest countries and the development of a post-Kyoto Protocol framework for the fight against global warming are also expected to be the dominant issues on the agenda.

The United States could not be persuaded to go along with the countries which have already ratified at the G-8 Summit.

President Bush indicated that the Kyoto Protocol did not work for the U.S., and did not work for the world, either because developing nations were not included. The U.S. government was said that it has been trying to find the common ground between its approach of the climate issue and the approach that the other G8 have taken, and to define where the common ground. No common ground was stated at this Summit.

## **2. Why Bush Administration refused to ratify the Treaty?**

The Bush Administration followed its March 2001 withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol by a February 14, 2002 proposal for unilateral action to reduce the intensity of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, with intensity defined as emissions per unit of GDP. The idea is to focus on the rate of decline of the emissions intensity of the economy, rather than the total amount of emissions (through the two are obviously related).

The U.S. energy industry has enthusiastically backed the Bush administration's decision to reject the Kyoto Protocol. U.S. industry and the administration viewed Kyoto's provisions as too burdensome, arguing in particular that they would put the U.S. at a competitive disadvantage against China and other developing countries, which aren't subject to the treaty's limits.

U.S. officials say it is "premature" to discuss the possibility of an international agreement on global warming beyond the Kyoto Protocol. They note that, though the U.S. has rejected the Protocol, the Bush administration has called on business to voluntarily reduce the rate of growth in global-warming emissions. They add that the U.S. has committed nearly \$5.8 billion to address global warming this year, mostly to research the phenomenon and to develop technology to address it.

President Bush might consider changing his tone on an even bigger subject that is the environment. Embracing greenery would be good for Bush, good for the Republican Party, good for relations with Europe, and, above all, good for the environment.

It's certainly the fear that global warming will lead to severe droughts and the extinction of some species.

## **3. No hope in the U.S.?**

In the wake of inaction at the U.S. federal level, communities around New England are taking a stand in support of clean air, energy independence and clean technological development. In Worcester, Massachusetts, to help reduce harmful air pollution, consumers must support the production of more energy from clean, renewable sources, such as the sun, wind and water. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists in the U.S., when a single 1.5 megawatt (MW) wind turbine replaces fossil fuel generation, emissions are reduced by approximately 2,700 tons of carbon dioxide, 14 tons of sulfur dioxide and 8 tons of nitrogen oxides annually.

State of California (population: 36,800,000) have been well-aware of cutting emission of the greenhouse gases, despite Federal Government refusal of Kyoto Protocol. The following is how the state and the municipal office, and private enterprises carry out their own emission-reduction programs in democratic method for considering environment.

California-based Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) is carefully assessing the innumerable facets of its California power network, cutting back its output of greenhouse gases such as sulfur hexafluoride and gradually switching to generators that use renewable energy technologies. It has, for example, signed up an additional 158 MW of clean, renewable wind energy resources to help meet its customers' future electricity needs. All together, generation from these new renewable energy resources will add enough generation to supply nearly 120,000 PG&E customers. In addition, it entered into a contract with Shiloh I Wind Project, LLC to purchase up to 75 MW of clean, renewable wind energy resources to help meet its customers' future electricity needs. With this agreement, PG&E has met its annual goal of increasing its renewable purchases by a minimum of 1 pct of retail load.

The City of Mountain View (called MV City with population of 72,000) in California adopted bicycle transportation plan in September 16, 2003 and have executed it systematically in the city. Cycling offers residents a number of benefits, including improved health, reduced air pollution and reduced traffic congestion. These benefits, combined with MV City's generally flat terrain and mild year-round climate, make cycling a truly viable commute alternative and an enjoyable recreational activity.

At least 3 pct of MV City residents commute by bicycle. To accommodate the needs of the bicycle commuters and those of casual bicycle riders, MV City has developed over 40 miles of bikeways in the past 25 years at a combined cost of approximately \$20 million. The bikeway network in MV City

connects neighborhood with employment centers, shopping areas and public facilities, such as parks and community building. Most users of this system are the employees for commuting inside, and even from outsiders who commute by railroad into MV City.

According to the city officials, most cities in Santa Clara County (population: 1,760,000) have adopted their own bicycle plans. Palo Alto, in the same county, is executing more aggressive for bicycle transportation plan than Mountain View.

In 1990, California embarked on a plan to reduce vehicle emission to zero through the introduction of the Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Program. At that time, the Air Resources Board (ARB), part of California Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA), required that in 1998, 2 pct of the vehicles produced for sale in California had to be ZEVs, increasing to 5 pct in 2001 and 10 pct in 2003.

The ZEV mandate was adjusted in 1996 to eliminate the completion years but left in place the 10 pct ZEV requirement for 2003, and in 1998 to allow partial ZEV (PZEV) credits for extremely clean vehicles that were not pure ZEVs.

In January 2001 the Board once again considered the status of the ZEV program leading to more proposed modification. The 2001 modification allowed large manufacturers to meet their ZEV requirement with the following mix of vehicles.

2 pct Gold----Pure ZEVs

2 pct Silver---Advanced Technology PZEVs (ATPZEVs)

6 pct Bronze---Partial Zero Emission Vehicle (PZEV)

Note: ZEV is battery electric vehicles or hydrogen fuel cells with zero emission tailpipe emissions. ATPZEV have extremely low emission (PZEV) levels and also employ ZEV-enabling technologies such as electric drive. PZEV meet the most stringent tailpipe emission standards and come with a 15 year /150,000 mile emission warranty.

In June 2002, due to a lawsuit filed against the ARB, a federal district judge issued a preliminary injunction that prohibited the ARB from enforcing the 2001 ZEV amendments with respect to the sale of new motor vehicles in model years 2003 or 2004.

In September 2004, the California ARB regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emission from new motor vehicles. The Board took this action pursuant to the previous Statutes of 2002, which directed the Board to adopt regulations that achieve the maximum feasible and cost effective reduction in greenhouse gas emission from motor vehicles. The regulations, which will take effect in 2006 following an opportunity for legislative review, apply to new passenger vehicles and light duty trucks beginning with the 2009 model year.

This ARB action might be a second best policy to push reluctant car manufacturers in reducing emissions forward to the right rail, although California likewise has a long history of actions undertaken in response to the threat posed by climate change.

#### **4. What PEKEA can do for the Kyoto Protocol?**

Alan Lloyd, secretary of CEPA, said "California needs to take action because it is particularly vulnerable to global warming" and cited a study published in June by the National Academy of Sciences that predicted global warming will have dire effects on the state. The study, carried out by 19 scientists at universities and research institutions, found that by 2070, the Sierra snowpack is likely to be reduced by 29 to 89 pct, causing a reduction in the state's water supply by as much as 30 pct, having a severe impact on the state's farms and ski areas and worsening urban smog.

Former Vice President Al Gore, who played a key role in negotiating the Kyoto Protocol, said California's steps on climate change set an "extremely important" national precedent. For his part, Governor Schwarzenegger has spurned the national Republican Party's stand on global warming and has named Democrats to key environmental policy position.

Alan Lloyd, a Democrat, said "Fortunately, we have a governor and a populace who understand that global warming is an issue in which protecting the environment is married to economic development and

public health.”

Why not the State of California ratifies Kyoto Protocol by itself? The Constitution of the United States stipulates several roles and functions between federal and state governments. It is clear that ratification of treaty is a nation’s right and responsibility, but also the Constitution has given strong autonomy to state. Sole ratification by California is in a sort of gray area in law, and of course it will develop a lawsuit.

The 36,800,000 people in California are an enormously important number in view of democracy because that they represent the 16 pct of the U.S. The July 2004 Special Survey conducted by the Public Policy Institute of California, found that eight in ten California support the state law that requires automakers to further reduce the emission of greenhouse gases from new cars in California by 2009.

Beside the federal government reluctance, several other concerns against Californian sole ratification exist there.

Non Profit Organization (NPO) and Non Government Organization (NGO) in California are inactive now in air pollution. I got the list of NPO/NGOs, pick up several big and early-established NPO/NGOs, and sent mails for proposing exchange views, or a meeting there. All of them returned to me that currently they are out of air pollution issue, or they have no time to talk this issue. They are California Institute of Public Affairs, Planning and Conservation League, and so on. One of the results causes that some NPO/NGOs are sponsored by auto manufacturers.

The book, “State of Fear” written by Michael Crichton, was No. 5 on the New York Times bestseller list in February, 2005. It describes a nefarious plot by a mainstream environmentalist group to try to trigger a tsunami and other disasters to convince the world of the dangers of climate change and to boost the group’s fund raising. The Conservative pundit in the U.S. such as Rush Limbaugh and Senator James Inhofe (Republic-Oklahoma), called Crichton’s novel “the real story” of climate change and called environmentalists’ warnings about global warming “the greatest hoax ever perpetuated on the American people.”

Ethics of NPO/NGO people including lobbyists and pundits play an important role in California sole ratification for Kyoto Protocol. What is wrong in scientific-proven issue is wrong. The group called Program on International Policy Attitudes, found that 94 pct of the 812 survey participants said the United States should limit greenhouse gas emissions, while 73 pct said the should participate in the Kyoto Protocol. The margin of error on the poll was 3.5 pct. (Morello, 2005) On the other hand, almost as distressing is the state of U.S. public opinion on climate change. Gallup reported in 2004 that the public is “practically dozing” on the subject of global warming. The percentage of Americans who worry “a great deal” or a “fair amount” about the “greenhouse effect” or global warming slipped seven points between 2003 and 2004, from 58 pct to 51 pct. Nearly as many as Americans (47 pct) now say they worry “only a little” or “not at all” about the issue. As a result, global warming ranks near the bottom of the list of specific environmental issues for which Gallup measured public opinion. (Speth, 2005)

What can PEKEA make the U.S. ratify Kyoto Protocol?

There are several ways for PEKEA; (1) to support pro-Kyoto Protocol scientists and pundits, (2) to support NPO/NGOs aided by not GM and Ford, (3) to support and encourage Governor Schwarzenegger to fight and negotiate on Californian sole ratification against Bush administration. It seems to me, when President Bush completes the term in 2008, next President might be elected from the Democratic. That President is supposed to ratify Kyoto Protocol. Is “Let’s keep fingers cross” only a way for PEKEA?

### **References:**

Air Resource Board, “Climate Change-Report to the Legislature and the Governor on Regulations to Control Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Motor Vehicles,” California Environmental Protection Agency,

December 2004.

Bratt, D., "Implementing Kyoto in Canada: The Role of Nuclear Power," *The Energy Journal*, Cleveland: 2005, Vol. 26, Iss. 1; pg.107.

Eizenstat, S., and Kraiem, R., "In Green Company," *Foreign Policy*, Washington:Sept/Oct2005., Iss. 150; PP92-93.

Morello, L., "Bush Acknowledges Human Effect on Global Warming," *Light & Medium Truck*, Alexandria: Aug. 2005. Vol.18, Iss. 7; pg 42.

Speth, J. G., "The Single Greatest Threat," *Harvard International Review*, Cambridge: Summer 2005, Vol. 27, Iss. 2; Pg 19.