

June 14, 2018 | Rome, Italy

The role and the relevance of EU long-term climate strategy

Key choices to be tackled and main stakeholders to be reached

Andrei Marcu, Director, ERCST & Senior Fellow, ICTSD

Georg Zachmann, Senior Fellow, Bruegel

Timeframe options

- Timeframe beyond 2050 can have advantages and disadvantages
 - + includes negative emissions
 - - increase in uncertainties
- Option 1: 2050
 - Corresponds with 2050 Roadmap and mid-century aspiration of the PA
 - Lock-in of decarbonisation pathways until 2050
- Option 2: 2060/2070
 - Carbon budgets might be overshoot in the future, which implies negative emissions after 2050 to compensate
 - However, perception that climate action could be postponed to post-2050 needs to be avoided
- Option 3: 2100
 - Climate change will not stop after the mid-century
 - Even more uncertainties

Granularity of analysis – sectoral focus



- How much do we focus on specific sectors?
 - Any specific focus cannot be detrimental to other sectors and to a systemic approach
- 2050 Roadmap focused mainly on energy (power) sector, but specifically stated that all sectors must decarbonize
 - However, it was further broken down for industry, transport, residential and services, agriculture, and other non-CO2 emissions
- New EU long-term climate strategy could potentially include the following sectors:
 - Electricity
 - Transportation
 - Residential heating
 - Industry
 - LULUCF/Agriculture
 - Carbon capture and Negative emissions

Policy drivers – Driver for decarbonisation

- 2050 Roadmap saw climate as a main driver while recognising co-benefits
- Option 1: Climate as a stand-alone driver
 - Can mainstream climate as a legitimate and self-standing societal objective
- Option 2: Climate change and co-benefits jointly presented as drivers
 - Allows for full cost-benefit analysis and is vital for accuracy of modelling of impacts
- Option 3: Co-benefits as a stand-alone driver
 - Easier to sell (especially in developing countries)?