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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

This report summarises the presentations and discussions of the Workshop on "Environmental Challenges for EU 2020 Strategy", organised by the ENVI Committee and held at the European Parliament in Brussels on Thursday 10 June 2010. The aim of the workshop was to provide MEPs with a comprehensive overview of the environmental challenges for the 'Europe 2020 strategy' (COM(2010)2020), future issues and interests at stake.

The European Parliament adopted its Resolution on 'EU 2020' (P7 TA-PROV(2010)0223) on 16 June 2010; the European Council adopted the 'Europe 2020' Strategy on 17 June 2010 (EUCO 13/10). The strategy covers 'jobs and smart, sustainable and inclusive growth'. It constitutes a coherent framework for the Union to mobilise all of its instruments and policies and for the Member States to take enhanced coordinated action. The strategy aims to help Europe recover from the crisis and come out stronger, both internally and at international level, by boosting competitiveness, productivity, growth potential, social cohesion and economic convergence. It responds to the challenge of reorienting policies away from crisis management towards the introduction of medium- to longer-term reforms that promote growth and employment and ensure the sustainability of public finances.

Introduction

In welcoming the participants, MEP Jo Leinen, Chairman of the Environment Committee (ENVI), thanked members of the civil society (in particular the speakers from the European Environmental Bureau and the WWF), who had provided the initial impetus for this workshop. He stressed its importance for the work of the ENVI Committee in aiding the MEPs to gain new insights into and a greater understanding of the issues raised within the context of the 'Europe 2020' strategy and the challenges for environmental protection faced.

The 'Europe 2020' strategy had been prepared very quickly: the discussions would now focus on its implementation, addressing the specific problems faced and ensuring the necessary tools were available to achieve those goals. The European Parliament (EP) would actively play its part in the greening of European Union (EU) policies (also known as green growth) to ensure this was anchored in EU policies.

Panel 1: The view of the European Commission

The Commissioner for the Environment, Mr Janez Potočnik, was, unfortunately, unable to participate due to an urgent meeting at the Commission. He was represented by Mr Kurt Vandenbergh, Head of Commissioner Potočnik's Cabinet, who presented the Commission's work with regards to environmental protection and a resource-efficient Europe. He emphasised the holistic nature of the 'Europe 2020' strategy, where environmental considerations formed an integral component and policy driver in its socio-economic agenda. This strategy offered both long-term and short-term perspectives, and the Commission would continue to promote sustainability at both EU and international level.
Whilst not a headline target in the 'Europe 2020' strategy, resource efficiency (or the 'green' economy) was one of its flagship initiatives; ranging from the efficient use of resources ('less in, more out', reducing our ecological footprint), through to the use of efficient resources (preserving ecosystems and increasing their value). A further optimising of the EU environmental *acquis* was needed; with resource efficiency being integrated into other policy areas. One of the priorities lay in developing convincing and more accurate indicators: a task force from the Commission's DG ENV would present a road map for resource efficiency in Europe in 2011.

*In the ensuing discussion, Mr Vandenberghe* answered questions on the importance of profiting from the economic crisis to push forward structural reforms, a more effective management of natural resources and consumption patterns, and improved investment in the green economy, with a better leverage of current funds and green taxation. The inadequacy of GDP-based analysis in measuring resource efficiency and Mr Potočnik's commitment to joined-up thinking on cross-sectorial dossiers were also highlighted.

**Panel 2: The view of Environmental Stakeholders**

*Mr Christophe Bouvier, Director of the Regional Office for Europe of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)* underlined the multiple crises and consequences currently faced on a global scale and the subsequent costs to natural capital, health and human well-being. However, he emphasised that this should be seen as a wake-up call, which should lead to new 'green' opportunities for a collective global 'rethink' of development and business models; the stimulation of economic activity; the creation of jobs; green investment being to be placed at the centre of fiscal stimulus; consistent national fiscal pricing policies and standards; climate, energy and environment-proofing of investments; and for a significant international momentum towards a 'green' or 'new' economy. An important aspect in this would be a clear and sustainable legislative framework, which the legislator could use to stimulate the economy.

*Mr Oliver Blank, Chairman of the Industrial Policy Task Force of BUSINESSEUROPE,* also made reference to the current crises faced by industry and made recommendations, which, he felt, could help to ensure the EU's continued success on the global stage; in particular: longer-term, sustainable commitment by all decision makers to key policy goals at European level; active development of more horizontal EU policies; full consideration of the possible effects on industry's competitiveness when designing EU policies; follow-up of industry-specific analysis from the past couple of years; no artificial separation between “green” industry and others; reduction of administrative burdens; greater emphasis on good legislation rather than its quick implementation; and the avoidance of double regulation.

*Mr John Hontelez, Head of the European Environmental Bureau (EEB),* noted that the European Parliament's difficulties in coping with the speed of 'Europe 2020''s development could affect the strategy's democratic legitimacy. He also expressed his disappointment and concern that the European Council had apparently ignored the strategy's environmental focus. The European Parliament should aim to strengthen the green dimension of 'Europe 2020', as a safe and responsible way to fight the economic crisis and to stimulate employment.
This could be done through: the coherent development of the “Resource-Efficient Europe” flagship initiative (though he expressed deep concern that no deadline had, as yet, been set); development of a domestic greenhouse gas reduction target of 30% (or even 40%) by 2020 and the introduction of biodiversity and ecosystem targets for 2020; major environmental fiscal reform within Europe (shifting the tax burden from labour to energy resource issues); the development of new models for the effective measurement of growth; a global leadership agenda for fair trade; and a level playing field for sustainable production.

*Mr Tony Long, Director of the European Policy Office of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF),* reiterated that the planet is in ecological overshoot, with Europeans consuming about 3 planet lifestyles; this being a really serious indictment. He noted with surprise that the 'Europe 2020' strategy largely ignored the whole natural systems that sustain economies and support the planet (e.g. fresh water resources and clean air for healthy life styles) and failed to deal with the international dimension. Although a good benchmark, it was not challenging. He agreed that a new metrics was also needed to measure well-being, welfare, happiness, satisfaction and quality of life. He also suggested the adoption of a new approach, by investigating issues of prosperity without growth, and qualitative, not quantitative growth, and this together with European citizens.

*In the ensuing discussion,* the following issues were raised: the importance of good legislation; the flagship initiative on resource efficiency; Europe's relevance from a global perspective in furthering environmental issues; the importance of supporting and furthering innovation and innovation policy by creating appropriate framework conditions; the use of green taxation to shift taxation burdens from labour to energy; and further the greening of the economy.
Welcome and Introduction

Welcome and Introduction by MEP Jo Leinen, Chairman (ENVI)

Good morning everybody. I would like to welcome you all to this workshop, which will look at the 'Europe 2020' strategy and the challenges for environmental protection. I am pleased to see that so many people responded to the invitation. Indeed, there are MEPs and also some members of civil society here; the latter having provided the initial impetus for this workshop during a lunch at the 'Green 10' meeting (the 10 largest organisations with regards to environmental protection at EU level).

Mr Potočnik is unfortunately not able to participate due to an emergency meeting at the Commission. However, it gives me great pleasure to welcome his right-hand man to us, his Head of Cabinet, Mr Dirk Vandenberghe (a familiar face to the Environment Committee (ENVI)), who will present Mr Potočnik 's speech in his place.

We will then listen to presentations from the various stakeholders:
- Mr Christophe Bouvier, Director of the Regional Office for Europe of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP);
- Mr Oliver Blank, Chairman of the Industrial Policy Task Force of BUSINESSEUROPE;
- Mr John Hontelez, Head of the European Environmental Bureau (EEB) - an organisation which, some time ago, I helped to found;

The 'Europe 2020' strategy was prepared very quickly. Here in the European Parliament (EP), we were also under great time pressure and, indeed, will be voting on the resolution in Plenary already next week. The initiative for this resolution came largely from the political groups rather than from the EP Committees. This differs from committee to committee, but here in ENVI, we have such a wide range of legislative texts that we are making use of this workshop to gain new insights in this area.
I would just like to add that the Lisbon Strategy from 2000 had the headline goal of 'restoring competitiveness in the world market': many would say it had a rather one-sided focus on economic aspects and did not reach its goals: as we all know, we are not the most competitive knowledge- and research-oriented economic area in the world.

Now we have the 'Europe 2020' strategy and the headline goal this time is 'sustainability'. I think that this represents great progress in terms of the headline goal: we've moved from one-sided economic competitiveness to sustainability, which has three components:
- economic progress;
- social fairness;
- and, of course, the ecological sustainability of everything related to our nature capital.

I have also seen and read articles on this 'Europe 2020' strategy, which suggest that this will be more successful than the first one. This depends largely on the strategy's level of detail, on whether it can really address the specific problems faced and on whether the necessary tools are available to achieve those goals. This is what we will be discussing this morning.
I would just like to thank the NGOs once again for the impulse they gave for this workshop, and, indeed, for taking part this morning.

I will now pass the floor to Kurt Vandenberghe, Head of Cabinet to the EU Commissioner for the Environment, Mr Janez Potočnik, who will tell us more about what the Commission and the Commissioner are planning to do and what they have prepared with regards to environmental protection and a resource-efficient Europe.

Panel 1: The View of the European Commission

In the absence of the Commissioner for the Environment, Mr Janez Potočnik, his Head of Cabinet, Mr Kurt Vandenberghe, presented the Commission's work with regards to environmental protection and a resource-efficient Europe (please see Annex II).

Questions, Answers and Discussion

Mr Vandenberghe agreed with MEP Vittorio Prodi on the importance of profiting from the economic crisis to push forward structural reforms, such as moving from fossil fuels to renewables.

Whilst not wishing to comment on Eurobonds at this time, Mr Vandenberghe agreed on the need for better investment in the green economy and for better leverage of current funds in the context of the budget review and financial perspectives.

He agreed with MEP Prodi’s assessment that a change in civilisation was needed to avoid the scarcity of natural resources and to improve their management; potentially meaning the difference between peace and war. Current consumption patterns would need to be changed, and instruments like taxation should be used to assist this.

With regards to MEP Dan Jørgensen’s question on green taxes, Mr Vandenberghe noted that their implementation should not lead to an increase in the overall tax burden. Commissioners Potočnik and Šemeta were looking into ways to make better use of the existing environmental taxation forum with Member States to allow a better exchange of best practices between the national administrations. The review of the energy taxation directive would be an important moment to put this information exchange to the test.

Regarding MEP Jørgensen's observation with regards to difficulties and the inadequacy of GDP-based measuring tools in the areas of resource efficiency, progress and environmental degradation, Mr Vandenberghe emphasised Mr Potočnik's commitment to taking this work forward. Mr Christophe Bouvier, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Director of the Regional Office for Europe, noted the harmonisation of these methods was also an issue for the legislator, as, seen from a global perspective, many people were thinking on a different path.

With regards to MEP Chris Davies’ comments on political will and joined-up thinking, Mr Vandenberghe emphasised that Mr Potočnik was involved in close dialogue with colleagues, which had already yielded results, also on issues which had previously reached a deadlock.
Panel 2:  The View of Environmental Stakeholders

Mr Christophe Bouvier, Director of the Regional Office for Europe of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Mr Oliver Blank, Chairman of the Industrial Policy Task Force of BUSINESSEUROPE, Mr John Hontelez, Head of the European Environmental Bureau (EEB) and Mr Tony Long, Director of the European Policy Office of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) expressed their views, which are presented in Annex III.

Questions, Answers and Discussion

The Chairman, MEP Jo Leinen noted with regards to Mr Oliver Blank’s comments on the need for good legislation that in the particular case of the Ross and WEE Directives, the European elections had taken place between the first and second readings. The new Parliament was free to rework the legislation and not just recast it: this would probably not have happened otherwise. However, he noted that the process was not yet over, so there would still be many debates to come in this area.

The following issues were debated by Members and the experts

Flagship Initiative on Resource Efficiency

Mr Tony Long, Director of the WWF European Policy Office, expressed his concern at Mr Hontelez’ observations about the possible absence of a real flagship initiative on resource efficiency. He had expected the Parliament to have co-decision powers on the flagship initiative and strongly advised the ENVI Committee to take the initiative and start listing issues it wanted to see in that flagship initiative, instead of simply reacting to the Commission proposal.

Mr Vandenberghe (Head of Cabinet of EU Commissioner on Environment, Mr Janez Potočnik) emphasised that this flagship initiative was at the top of the agenda. By the end of Mr Potočnik’s mandate, they hoped to have changed the trend in such a way that the objectives could be achieved credibly and effectively. First of all, however, as broad a concept as possible would need to be developed: this was currently being discussed in the Commission, and he hoped to already have some proposals by July or September 2010. Next, a roadmap (digital agenda or similar) would need to be developed; showing how the concept of resource efficiency could be pushed in all areas of EU policy. Given the complex and time-consuming nature of this issue, it would not be possible to deliver in the course of 2011.

Europe’s Relevance from a Global Perspective

MEP Theodoros Skylakakis requested more information on the relationship between European environmental strategy and what was happening in the rest of the world. He noted that, with its 500 million people, Europe's resource consumption over the next 40 years would be fairly irrelevant; when compared with the rest of the planet, an additional 2.5 billion people and vast growth in China, India, etc.
Mr Vandenberghe warned of the potential of becoming irrelevant to the international agenda, if appropriate action was not taken. There were many examples, which clearly showed that, when the EU pulled together and spoke with one voice, its voice was clearly heard and it often made a difference. However, if divided, then the rest of the world did not listen. In addition, he noted that the rest of the world was watching the EU; for example, with regard to environmental governance, where the REACH legislation and system had inspired US and Chinese policy makers alike.

Mr Oliver Blank, Chairman of BUSINESSEUROPE Industrial Policy Task Force added that Europe should strive to maintain its global relevance. This being one of its ambitions, in order to create a vision for Europe, it should also be the underlying principle of the 'Europe 2020' strategy. Many businesses worked in global conditions. They looked for incentives and the right framework conditions in Europe; whilst mainly driven by the internal market, they were also heavily dependent on other global markets.

Mr Christophe Bouvier, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Director of the Regional Office for Europe added a few words from a UN perspective. Whilst Copenhagen had not been particularly successful, it should not be perceived as a cause for depression. Instead, it should be a wake-up call; an opportunity for EU Members and many neighbouring countries to get together and ensure they took back the lead. Taking, for example, the recycling industry, he noted that there were 12 million jobs in recycling world-wide: of these 500.000 were in Brazil and over 10 million in China. The European continent, not just the EU, was exporting huge quantities of PEP bottles, etc, to China to get them processed there. This he found to be a strange situation.

He also linked the comparative advantages of the European system to strong demographic systems, which caused problems. Plans had to be made to cover a long period of time, yet, given that our democratic systems were limited to 3, 4 or, sometimes, 5 year cycles, it was actually mostly the private sector (e.g. insurance, re-insurance or energy) which did this. The Chinese decision-makers did not face such issues. Still, this was considered to be a comparative advantage for democratic systems, due to the possibility of a very strong societal consensus around legislation. However, investors needed clear signals, as uncertainty was not conducive to long-term investment.

Mr Tony Long, Director of WWF European Policy Office emphasised the importance of being aware of what other actors on the global market were doing. He had just returned from China, where he had been privileged to learn about the next 5th year plan for China from 2011 to 2015, called 'The Green Plan':

- mandatory targets for environmental protection and energy efficiency;
- incorporate the green economy concept as a means to achieve sustainable development objectives;
- strengthen and improve energy and environmental technical innovation and supporting systems, and increase national investment in R&D;
- include major energy, environment and green economy policies in overall fiscal and economic reform;
- improve statistics on energy and environment.

He pointed out that this basically covered everything that had been discussed during the workshop: however, this was China's actual 5th year plan starting next year.
 MEP Dan Jørgensen, Vice-Chairman also highlighted the positive impression he had received during his recent visit to China. With regards to wind power, none of the top five wind turbine factories and companies in the world had been Chinese at that time, but within 5 to 10 years, they estimated that three out of the top five companies would be Chinese. When asked which ones, they replied that they weren’t sure, ‘because there are so many (companies) that it can potentially be’.

 Mr John Hontelez, Secretary General of the European Environmental Bureau, pointed out that Europe was still the largest consumer market in the world. Consumption patterns, regulation and requirements within the EU had an impact globally, because many other countries were exporting to Europe and learning through this experience. Of course, in international negotiations, attempts had been made to reduce and criticise the EU’s scope and influence, but REACH in the US (Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemical substances) was a good example of how things could be done. During discussions concerning REACH, it had been strongly argued that it went against international legislation and would lead to a trade war with the US. In pushing through such regulation, which was unpopular with parts of industry, other actors had actually adapted, and industry and other countries had become more dynamic and more flexible than they had pretended to be.

 Mr Hontelez also pointed out that 88% of the EU's economy was actually domestic: consequently, enormous investments in energy-efficient housing and buildings could be made without having anything to do with the global market; thereby creating new jobs, reducing citizens' energy bills and reducing energy demands, etc.

 Innovation Policy
 MEP Theodoros Skylakakis mentioned innovation in reducing resource consumption, yet allowing the same, or, at least, a qualitatively equal life style. He asked how resources could be mobilised towards innovation and whether an Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS system) was the right vehicle in this respect.

 Kurt Vandenberghe (Head of Cabinet of EU Commissioner on Environment, Mr Janez Potočnik) clarified what innovation policy was about: it was not about increasing public spending but, primarily, about creating or promoting creative destruction in a sustainable way, so that newcomers with new technologies, products and services were able to find their way into the market; possibly at the expense of incumbent players. There was a lot of work to do in Europe in this field, and as the former research Commissioner, Mr Potočnik had already done a great deal of work on the question of getting research to the market. Mr Vandenberghe quoted probably the biggest example of where Europe failed as being the MP3 technology: it had been developed in Europe at the Fraunhofer Institute, yet its commercialisation and the entire socio-economic return had gone to the US. In the same way, we risked losing our lead with regards to green technologies, due to a lack of an European internal market offering the perspective of a possible return on investment. Resources for innovation would then also be needed and there would be plenty of opportunity during discussions on financial perspectives to ensure that a new budget actually reflected this. The first priority, however, lay in creating framework conditions: an internal market that promoted creative destruction in a sustainable way.
Mr John Hontelez, Secretary General of the European Environmental Bureau, noted that, during its Presidency only three years ago, Germany had launched a debate on ecological industrial innovation, where, using its own country as an example, it had shown it to be profitable at a global level to move ahead and have more progressive legislation and policies than the average in Europe or even in the world. They had succeeded in creating a very strong domestic and international environmental industry, which now already employed more people than the car industry.

For any participants interested in how European environmental legislation was being copied in other parts of the world, MEP Dan Jørgensen, Vice-Chairman recommended a book by a journalist called Mark Shapiro on chemical legislation in the United States of America. In it, he documents that the RoHS Directive and the WEEE Directives are being implemented in different American states; the EU ban on phthalates in toys was now also being copied almost word-by-word into the legislation of several different states in the United States of America.

Green Taxation

MEP Dan Jørgensen, Vice-Chairman also shared a small anecdote, about Mrs Margaret Thatcher (former Prime Minister of Great Britain), during her visit to the European Parliament a few years earlier. When asked whether she thought that the UK would be ready to abandon the British pound and join the Euro-zone, Mrs Thatcher answered, 'not in a million years', to which MEP Rocard replied, 'well, Mrs Thatcher, I interpret your answer in the way that we agree on the principles, but we disagree on the timing'. Mr Jørgensen felt this to be similar to when business and green organisations talked about how green an economy we should be. He asked Mr Blank for his opinion on green taxes and their interest to the business community due to both the positive and negative incentives they offered.

Mr Oliver Blank, Chairman of BUSINESSEUROPE Industrial Policy Task Force considered this to be a difficult subject for business and industry. Companies across Europe were not in favour of existing green taxation proposals, as they simply saw them as being an additional burden. Given the current global situation, following a very severe economic and financial recession, and given the stiff competition companies were facing, there was a real fear that the trend towards green taxation could lead to companies in Europe going out of business.

Mr John Hontelez, Secretary General of the European Environmental Bureau, noted differences between the opinions purportedly by BUSINESSEUROPE and those of other industry representatives. Over the past 15 years, contacts with BUSINESSEUROPE had not progressed very much. Yet, although some members would suffer from shifting the taxation burden, a lot of their members would profit from it, Other business representations, such as the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), told a different story. WBCSD had recently produced 'Vision 2050', in which was clearly shown that, not only had industry clearly understood that environmental challenge is decisive for our common future, but also, that incremental change was not going to do the trick. A much more dynamic change was needed, with pricing of natural resources in a market-conform manner.
With regard to green taxes, Mr Hontelez noted difficulties in assessing their effectiveness, as initial proposals had always been very much reduced in ambition through industry opposition. He quoted examples from Denmark and Germany: in Germany, the focus had been placed more on the social agenda, but estimations had shown that hundreds of thousands of extra jobs had been created and that, combined with ongoing taxation reform, it had not had negative effects, only positive ones. in Denmark, emphasis had not been placed on reducing labour costs, but rather on using revenues to help industry become more energy-efficient, returning it back to the sector itself. This worked, because the incentives and support were there to encourage a reduction in energy consumption.
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What Environmental Challenges for the EU 2020 Strategy?

Thursday 10 June 2010, 9:15 - 12:00
European Parliament, József Antall 4Q1, Brussels

In the context of the ongoing discussions on the EU 2020 strategy, the ENVI Committee, in cooperation with the Policy Department A, is organising a workshop aiming at providing MEPs with a comprehensive overview on the environmental challenges for the EU 2020 strategy, future issues and interests at stake. The workshop is hosted by the Chairman of the ENVI Committee, Mr Jo LEINEN. Interpretation will be available in EN, FR and DE.

Agenda

Opening
09.15 Welcome by Mr Jo Leinen, Chairman of the ENVI Committee

The view of the European Commission
09.25 EU Commissioner on Environment, Mr Janez Potočnik

The view of environmental stakeholders
10:00 Mr Christophe Bouvier, UNEP Director of Regional Office for Europe
10:15 Ms Nathalie Girouard, Green Growth Coordinator OECD
10:30 Mr Oliver Blank, Chairman of BUSINESSEUROPE Industrial Policy Task Force
10:45 Mr John Hontelez, Head of the European Environmental Bureau
11:00 Mr Tony Long, Director of WWF European Policy Office
11:15 Q&A, open discussion

Closure
11:55 Closing remarks by Mr Jo Leinen, Chairman of the ENVI Committee

Contacts:

ENVI Secretariat:
Georgios AMANATIDIS, Administrator: georgios.amanatidis@europarl.europa.eu - 02.28.34086

Policy Department A:
Alexandra DETORNACO, Assistant: alexandra.detornaco@europarl.europa.eu - 02.28.32353
ANNEX II: THE VIEW OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Summary of Introductory Comments by Kurt Vandenberghe (Head of Cabinet to the EU Commissioner on the Environment, Mr Janez Potočnik)

The Barroso II Commission was endorsed on the premise of driving a transformational agenda for a sustainable Europe. This includes, inter alia, promoting competitiveness (based on knowledge and innovation); ensuring macroeconomic stability (reducing deficits, improving the quality of public spending); using the potential of the internal market (reward innovation, financial services' regulation); avoiding social dumping (reducing poverty and social inequalities); and reducing our society's carbon and ecological footprint. In other words, the aim is to build a knowledge-based, green or resource-efficient Europe. None of these objectives is new in itself. What is new, is their achievement in an integrated way (i.e. minimising trade-offs between economic, social and environmental objectives) in a Union of 27 countries (i.e. maximising positive spill-over effects between countries).

With 'Europe 2020', we have, maybe for the first time, a socio-economic agenda that includes the environment as an integral component and policy driver; not only with regards to its protection, but also to its valorisation in a structural way. That is why, for example, the strategy tackles issues like shifting the fiscal burden from labour to environmental pollution or eliminating harmful subsidies. These are issues which are not in the hands of the Environment Commissioner or Minister, but which are, nevertheless, very important for the environment.

Discussions on economic governance and on strengthening the coordination of economic policies now present an additional opportunity to incorporate the environment as an integral part of economic policy. Every year, when governments present their stability and national reform programmes, they will be (peer) reviewed and compared against the integrated guidelines. These guidelines include resource efficiency, a low carbon economy and eco-innovation as main orientations. The EU can show a red light to countries going into excessive budgetary deficit or public debt: a red and orange light system should be introduced for those countries, which do not sufficiently respect the guidelines on resource efficiency and a low carbon economy. This gives room to develop a positive agenda with the Environment Minister and, we hope, with the European Parliament, whose support will be important. It will obviously need to include the development of appropriate indicators, as what is not measurable cannot be evaluated.

Resource efficiency is a central concept in all of this and is a synonym for a green economy. It is a very broad concept: ranging from the efficient use of resources ('less in, more out', reducing our ecological footprint) to the use of efficient resources (preserving ecosystems and increasing their value). UNEP has estimated that the annual production of natural services (freshwater, food production, protection against natural catastrophes, etc.) equals or exceeds the world's GDP.

To take this agenda forward, rules and regulations are needed. A strong EU environmental acquis is in place: it should be optimised and further developed. However, resource efficiency should also be integrated into other policies: the common agricultural policy, the common fisheries policy, regional policy, industrial and innovation policy, etc: this is the greening of all policies, which should promote the greening of our economy overall.
Forthcoming discussions on the financial perspectives will be key in this regard, and we count on the EP to ensure that the next EU budget reflects the 'Europe 2020' objectives and priorities.

There is a bit of a paradox within the concept of the green economy. On the one hand, the current times of economic crisis mean that there is not much appetite for environmental ambitions; yet, at the same time, the green economy is seen as being the way out of the economic (and maybe systemic) crisis. Other policies would like to be labelled 'green'. We should be in a position to say what the conditions are for each policy in order for them to be awarded that label. The fact that we have two environment commissioners should strengthen our hand in this regard.

It is true, that we do not have a headline target for resource efficiency in 'Europe 2020': we did not have a convincing indicator or benchmark for this. Developing the indicator and target will be one of our priorities. DG ENV has set up a task force on resource efficiency and, in 2011 we will present a road map for a resource-efficient Europe. The fact that resource efficiency is a flagship initiative should help us in better structuring the Commission's actions toward this goal.

'Europe 2020' is not the answer to everything, but it is a framework for action that should enable us to integrate our objectives and make solutions more coherent. It certainly helps us in the sense that we can point to (politically possibly painful) contradictions whenever EU action is not in line with the sustainability agenda. 'Europe 2020' takes a holistic position, so that we can better see how the environment fits into the bigger picture of multilevel governance, global competition, environmental degradation and resource scarcity.

However, having the right objectives and framework obviously does not mean that all this will happen automatically. Two remarks in closing. The first is that the measure of success will lie in the strategy's implementation. It is absolutely vital to have a decent long-term perspective, but this should not be an excuse to do nothing in the short term. And the second is that realising our sustainability agenda will be easier the more the world at large is going in the same direction. There we can take some confidence from work ongoing at UNEP, OECD and elsewhere. A recent OECD report said that "Improving resource efficiency is among the top priorities in today's world, as governments, business and civil society are increasingly concerned about natural resource use, environmental impact, material prices and supply security."
ANNEX III: THE VIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL STAKEHOLDERS

Mr Christophe Bouvier, UNEP Director of Regional Office for Europe

Mr Oliver Blank, Chairman of BUSINESSEUROPE Industrial Policy Task Force

Mr John Hontelez, Head of the European Environmental Bureau

Mr Tony Long, Director of WWF European Policy Office
Investing in the New Economy

Multiple crises
We are confronted with a multiple crises on a global level, including:
- food: there are about 1 billion people that we currently cannot feed. By 2050, the world population will, according to the United Nations Population Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), probably level off;
- agriculture: by 2030, we will have to feed 3 billion extra people; meaning 50% more people than we are able to feed right now;
- a financial and economic crisis: which is affecting Official Development Assistance (ODA) and developing countries very strongly;
- employment levels: according to the International Labour Organisation (ILO), 200 million jobs were lost between 2007 and 2009. Although the financial dimension of the crisis shows signs of subsiding, the employment crisis does not;
- climate and energy crisis: is contributing to the exacerbation of all of the other crises.

Emerging opportunities
This is the moment to rethink both development and business models; especially how we measure progress in society. Indeed, many governments are looking for ways to stimulate economic activity and create jobs through so-called green stimulus. This is, of course, not just a European phenomenon. There’s a significant international momentum towards a transition to the 'green' or 'new' economy.

If we follow the same path
This should be seen worldwide as a bit of a wake-up call, because if we follow the same path, then by 2030:
- our energy demand will have grown by about 45%;
- greenhouse gas emissions are also set to have risen by roughly the same amount;
- the average global temperature will, most likely, be within the range of 5°C higher than now; with possible consequences for sea water levels and on the capacity of the earth to produce food and other services, amongst other phenomena;
- this is, of course, measurable in terms of GDP; whilst not a good method, it is nevertheless the one that we have. UNEP, together with many other partners, has been trying to measure the impact of all of these environmental crises in GDP terms, but also to measure the price of what's going on with regards to natural capital, which, of course, is not measured very precisely in our current indicators.

The Cost to Natural Capital
At the turn of the century, we basically went beyond what could be considered as the average citizen's sustainability level. Of course, this concerns an average of over 6 billion people, but we have now exceeded the earth's carrying capacity; this also being the case for land and CO₂ emissions. These statistics are taken from an ecological footprint indicator (Humanity's Ecological Footprint) set up by a Swiss/American foundation, which offers credible indications, as it captures various dimensions of earth’s carrying capacity.
The Cost to Health and Human Well-Being
It is now possible to measure the price and benefits to health and well-being fairly accurately. We are working on how to do this: not only in terms of costs (if nothing is done), but also in terms of benefits (if these are measurable economically). This concerns, amongst others, clean water, clean air, soil and agricultural production and productivity, carbon capture (at a time when many countries are trying to invest in carbon capture systems, which are probably more expensive and less efficient than the natural ones, such as forests in particular) and, of course, medicines (which are largely dependent on biodiversity).

The Contribution of Natural Capital
Although GDP is not a very good indicator of progress, we can still use it to measure how the level of a given population's income varies with the importance of an ecosystem's value (and the service it provides to society). For example in India, taking the population as a whole, nature's contribution would be approximately 7% of national GDP; however, if we take the poorest level of the population (those living on less than $2 a day), then 57% of natural capital represents what is called by some 'the GDP of the poor'. So, the relationship between sound ecosystem, nature and poverty management is very obvious. Worldwide, the ecological crisis hits the poor far more than any other section of the population.

Opportunities Amid Crisis
Against this background, we are launching a number of initiatives (together with a number of partners in the United Nations and in the European system) which are linked to the 'green' or 'new' economy.

The New Economy - What?
Our working definition of what the new or the green economy would be is:

« A system of economic activities related to the production, distribution and consumption of goods and services that result in improved human well-being over the long term, while not exposing future generations to significant environmental risks and ecological scarcities »

This tries to be consistent with the definition of the Brundland Commission on sustainable development; namely, it should contribute to the wellbeing of current generations, whilst not jeopardising that of future generations.

Green Stimulus Ranking
In this context, we've looked at very concrete examples of how green stimulus has worked in a number of countries. There is a huge variation in terms of how many stimulus packages have actually been dedicated to these sectors of the economy; with North Korea and China topping the chart. Although some European countries are doing relatively well; however, there is a very broad variation in how this investment is actually channelled towards a greener form of economy.

G20 Green Stimulus Spending
Rail, the energy grid and water management are the most important sectors.

Global New Deal - How?
There are a number of new instruments in which, of course, the legislator has a particular, strong role to play. Perverse subsidies were at the heart of many discussions in this house and also appear (in part) in the discussion on 'Europe 2020'.

Proceedings of the workshop 'What environmental challenges for the Europe 2020 Strategy'
We estimate that roughly $1 trillion worth of subsidies are granted worldwide; of which, roughly 1/3 is dedicated to stimulating fossil fuel consumption. Therefore, this is not necessarily about new taxes; it's about a different use of stimulus packages and of other subsidies.

The Green Economy Initiative
There are basically three main elements to what we're trying to do together with the World Bank, UNEP, ILO and private partners, such as Deutsche Bank:
- the Green Economy Report, which is going to come out this year and which tries to give an economist/banker's view;
- a very strong programme with the ILO on the potential of Green Jobs;
- working in Europe and elsewhere on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) study; where we are trying to precisely measure the value of the services provided to society by nature with some very concrete measurements.

Green Economy Report - Making the Economic Case for Reform
There are basically two main parts: the 11 sectorial studies (only 8 of which are shown here) and what we call enabling conditions: the financial, fiscal and legal instruments already existing in various countries to be able to contribute to a greener or more sustainable form of economy. From this basis, we shall work on policy briefs for decision-makers and on specific regional country reports.

New Economy applications: Agriculture, Energy and Green Buildings
We could also have taken recycling or transport, however, I have chosen agriculture, energy and green buildings: three examples of how on a worldwide basis we see these sectors as having potential for the transformation of economic growth.

Agriculture, challenges and opportunities for a sustainable path
By 2050, we must produce 50% more food than we are doing now; it is very unlikely that current methodologies will lead to that. We have, a water shortage issue, an issue with climate change and declining productivity, and we have competing production methods; in particular with regard to bio fuels. So, this contributes to a rather extreme combination of factors, which could lead to worsening the food crisis rather than improving it, if we continue on the current path.

New Economy Opportunities
However, there are also opportunities here; in particular, in organic and near-organic production in some of the most problematic parts of the world and in Africa in particular, where we can see rather spectacular increases in productivity. And it is a market which is growing: 97% of the revenues of this particular market are, of course, generated in Europe and in North America, but 80% of the producers are in developing countries, so there is a new equilibrium that may be set up here, both in terms of employment and of capacity to produce more food for 9 billion people in a few decades.

Energy today: challenges and opportunities for the Green Economy path
If we look at energy, we have similar types of challenges: and since the previous speaker spoke about efficiency, I don't think we need to go into more detail. I just want, again, to emphasise the aspect of subsidies, because, in many parts of the world (including Europe in some instances), the subsidies are going the wrong way in terms of greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuel consumption.
New Economy Opportunities
There are, of course, opportunities in the renewable energy sector, and some countries, in particular China, are investing very heavily in this area. We all know that China is investing strongly in non-clean energy production (particularly in coal-fired plants), but behind that you have huge investments and job creation in China in particular (but also in other developing countries) in the new energy sectors (in particular wind and solar).

Green Buildings
‘Green buildings’ is another issue in which Europe does play a leading role. In North America, Australia and Germany in particular, we have interesting examples of new legislation and investments in energy efficiency. One of the important facts here (from a legislative viewpoint) is that sometimes much of the discussion concerns only 10% of this issue, namely new buildings, whereas 90% actually concerns the retrofitting of existing buildings; in this respect, the German example is quite interesting.

Enabling conditions
For UNEP, the best enabling conditions would be:
- place green investment at the core of fiscal stimulus;
- look at the budgetary aspects of initiatives such as 'Europe 2020';
- ensure that national fiscal pricing policy and standards are actually consistent;
- ensure investments in sectors other than those mentioned here (infrastructure in particular; also within the European system, the structural investments in particular) are also climate, energy and environment-proofed, as much of the investment is, at times, done on a parallel path to what some call the green economy.

In conclusion, probably the most important aspect is a clear and sustainable legislative framework. Investors need a clear and long-term indication of what the legal framework is going to be. And, therefore, these choices are the responsibility of society as a whole: of course, at the root of this lies a clear and sustainable legislative framework, which the legislator can use to stimulate the economy in one way or another.
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Multiple Crises

- Food crisis: 1 billion people worldwide at risk of hunger and malnutrition by 2050 (FAO),
- Need to increase agriculture production by 50% to feed a population 27% larger than now (OECD outlook to 2030)
- Financial and economic crisis - threatening jobs worldwide & poverty reduction gains
- Decline in trade, investment, ODA and foreign remittances
- 200 million jobs lost between 2007 and 2009 (ILO)
- Climate crisis – exacerbating all the others
Collective global “rethink” of development and business models

Governments looking for ways to stimulate economic activity and create jobs (cf EU 2020 Plan)

Significant international momentum for transition to a green economy, for developed as well as developing countries

Emerging opportunities

Global energy demand up by 45%
GHG emissions up 45%
Global average temperature up 5.2°C, with possible sea level rise between 26-59 cm (IPCC)
Sustained losses equivalent to 5-10% of global GDP as compared to the 3% of GDP loss from the current financial crisis (IMF)

If we follow the same path:

By 2030…

Global energy demand up by 45%
GHG emissions up 45%
Global average temperature up 5.2°C, with possible sea level rise between 26-59 cm (IPCC)
Sustained losses equivalent to 5-10% of global GDP as compared to the 3% of GDP loss from the current financial crisis (IMF)
The price to Natural Capital

- 1981 – 2005: global GDP more than doubled, but 60% of world’s ecosystems degraded/exploited unsustainably (MEA, 2005)

- Global GHG emissions at 42 GtCO2 per annum are 5 times higher than the Earth can absorb ...

- ‘Ecological Footprint’ exceeds Earth’s regenerative capacity…

The price to Health and Human well being

- Clean water
- Clean air
- Soil productivity
- Carbon capture
- Medicines, ex: 42% anti-cancer drugs are natural, 50% synthetic drugs have a natural origin

Among many others …. 

TEEB Interim report 2010
The price of Natural Capital

**India Example:** 480 Million people earn their livelihood mainly in small farming, animal husbandry, informal forestry, fisheries …

![Diagram showing economic values of ecosystem services and GDP]

- **Ecosystem services / classical GDP**
  - 7.3%

- **Ecosystem services / “GDP of the Poor”**
  - 57%

Source: GIST’s Green Accounting for Indian States Project, 2002-03 data

Opportunities Amid Crisis
The New Economy
What?

• « A system of economic activities related to the production, distribution and consumption of goods and services that result in improved human well-being over the long term, while not exposing future generations to significant environmental risks and ecological scarcities »

UNEP’s working definition

---

Green Stimulus Ranking as % of Total Stimulus of August 2009
(UNEP GGND Update to the G20 - September 2009)

- South Korea: 79%
- China: 34%
- France: 18%
- Germany: 13%
- US: 12%
- South Africa: 11%
- Mexico: 3%

Source: IISD Global Research
Global New Deal
How?

International Policy Architecture
• International Trade
• International Aid
• Global Carbon Market
• Global Markets for Ecosystems Services
• Development and Transfer of Technology

Domestic Policy Initiatives
• Perverse Subsidies
• Incentives & Taxes
• Land Use and Urban Policy
• Integrated Management of Freshwater
• Environmental Legislation
• Monitoring and Accountability

Source: HSBC Global Research, UNEP
Demonstrating that Greening is a new engine for growth, sizing sectoral opportunities, addressing hurdles & enabling conditions.

Demonstrating the value of ecosystems & biodiversity, capturing these values, and reversing the vicious cycle of environmental losses and persistent poverty.

Sizing and incentivizing growth in green & decent jobs.

The Green Economy Initiative

- Evaluating Ecological Infrastructure
- Evaluating Biodiversity

TEEB

Green Economy Report

Demonstrating that Greening is a new engine for growth, sizing sectoral opportunities, addressing hurdles & enabling conditions.

Green Jobs

Sizing and incentivizing growth in green & decent jobs

Decent jobs from Community-based Conservation, PES/PIES implementation.

Making the Economic Case for Reform

Green Economy Report

Sector Focus

Enabling Conditions

- Finance
- Subsidies
- Laws & Taxes
- Markets

- Energy
- Transport
- Industry
- Buildings
- Cities
- Agriculture
- Forestry
- Fisheries
New Economy applications: Agriculture, Energy and Green buildings

Agriculture, challenges and opportunities for a sustainable path

- Declining productivity: Globally, the growth rate of agricultural productivity is declining, and climate change will exacerbate this trend (OECD).
- Water: Agriculture accounts for 70 per cent of global freshwater use and is also responsible for most surface water pollution (UNEP).
- Climate change: About 13% of global greenhouse gas emissions come from agriculture, mainly due to its heavy reliance on nitrogen fertilizers (UNEP).
- Subsidies: Agricultural production is dependent on subsidies, particularly in developed economies. In 2008, agricultural subsidies in OECD countries amounted to US$265 Bn (OECD).
- Prices: Food prices have been instable, driven in hikes by fuels prices
- Land: Land scarcity and land degradation, declining soil fertility and increasing erosion are leading to desertification.
New Economy Opportunities

- **Productivity**: 114 cases of conversion to organic/near organic in Africa showed 116% increase in productivity.

- **Market**: Global trade of organic reached US$50 billion.

- **Economic gains**: 97% of revenues generated in Europe/North America; But 80% of producers are in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

- **Initiative launched in Eastern Europe and Central Asia**

- **Employment**: 30% more jobs per ha than non-organic in East Africa; 178,000 new jobs in Mexico.

- **Environment**: CO2 emissions per ha 48% to 68% lower. High potential for sectoral CDMs and other carbon finance

---

Energy today: challenges and opportunities for Green Economy path

- **Energy security**: Current patterns of energy production and distribution still leaving billions without access to modern forms of energy; global stress about future energy supply.

- **Climate change**: About 25% of global greenhouse gas emissions come from the power sector, all energy-related emissions would account for half of GHG emissions.

- **Health**: Energy related pollution is responsible for more death than malaria and tuberculosis combined.

- **Subsidies**: Global energy subsidies range from US$240 to US$310 billion/year or around 0.7% of global GDP, but there is inadequate support for renewable energy development.

- **Prices**: Unstable prices affecting food prices and government revenue.
New Economy Opportunities

- About 2,3 million jobs in renewable energy sector
- Globally, investing US$630 billion in the renewable energy sector would create 20 million additional jobs
- China is now leading on manufacturing wind turbines and solar panels and renewable energy industries are adding jobs, reaching 1.12 million in 2008 and climbing by 100,000 a year, according to the Chinese Renewable Energy Industries Association.

Green Buildings

- Investments in improved energy efficient buildings = 2-3.5m jobs in Europe & USA
- New buildings: only 10% of market
- Germany retrofitting existing housing stocks to improve energy efficiency. So far, over 200,000 apartments retrofitted, 25,000 new jobs created and 116,000 existing jobs sustained.
- In Australia a proposed US$ 3b green housing over 4 years is expected to reduce GHG emissions by 3.8mtons/year = 160,000 jobs
Enabling conditions

- Place green investment at core of fiscal stimulus
- Include green investment in regular budget
- Create public-private funding mechanisms
- Create domestic conditions (fiscal/pricing policy, standards, education & training)
- Climate and environment proofing of investments in other sectors
- Create enabling international conditions (trade, ODA, technolog transfer, climate agreement)

A clear and sustainable legislative framework:
- To give clear and longer term signal to investors and private sector actors
- Responsibility of legislators, including at EU level, to make sustainable choices when deciding on budget (Agriculture, Fisheries, Social Fund, Structural Funds, etc)
UNEP currently entering into discussions with a wide range of possible partners, other than at government level:

- Trade unions
- Agriculture and Fisheries federations
- European Social Fund
- Cities
- European Economic and Social Committee
- European Parliament?
Green Economy Advisory Services

Advisory Services - Countries

- UNEP currently initiating partnerships in Green Economy in over twenty countries around the globe, e.g.:
  - Republic of Korea: review of National Strategy for Green Growth
  - China: UNEP Policy research (feeding into five-year plan) (on-going)
  - Indonesia
  - Kenya, South Africa
  - Moldova, Ukraine, Armenia
  - Barbados, Brazil
  - Jordan
Regional Green Economy Initiatives

- East Asia Low carbon Green Growth Initiative
- Caribbean Regional Initiative
- Green Economy Initiative in Eastern and Central European countries (sustainable agriculture)
- Regional consultations for the Arab Region
- Series of Green Economy national workshops in the Arab Region in partnership with AFED
- African Green Economy Initiative

More Information

UNEP Green Economy Website

http://www.unep.org/greeneconomy/
Presentation by Mr Oliver Blank,
Chairman of the BUSINESSEUROPE Industrial Policy Task Force

Environmental aspects of the Europe 2020 strategy

Introduction
After a very severe financial and economic crisis over the last twelve months, we are now seeing positive signs of recovery. However, there are question marks as to Member States' financial stability, the Euro and the entire economic situation in Europe with regard to wealth, jobs, growth, innovation and what is coming up next. Whilst efforts are being made at national level to consolidate national budgets and cut public spending, it is high time to invest in the future of Europe. It is necessary to assess the big picture and what effects different policies will have on the future of Europe (also in the global context): e.g. on growth, the creation of new jobs or the retention of existing ones, innovation and on Europe's global competitiveness.

Industry is vital for Europe
BUSINESSEUROPE has some 40 member associations in 34 different countries in Europe. According to the Alliance for Competitive European Industry, we provide some 23 million jobs in 6000 large companies and 1.7 million SMEs across Europe. Our members create a € 1.3 trillion yearly added value, a € 5 trillion yearly turnover, with the manufacturing side alone making around 17% of EU GDP for the moment.

Industry is a solution provider
Industry has an important role to play, seeing itself as a solution provider, rather than a problem creator. Working together to find favourable solutions provides a win-win situation for all sides.
- Demographic change and an ageing population: industry is providing solutions through, for example, E-Health technologies and ambient assisted living technologies, which are available on the market, but just need to be implemented.;
- Climate protection and the sustainable use of energy and resources: many technologies are available for the better use of energy and for greater energy efficiency in buildings, transportation, lighting and also during the production process;
- Access to energy at affordable prices: technologies exist to build a smart grid across Europe: equally important, is the issue of measuring energy consumption (smart metering);
- Mobility and better transport: work is ongoing on intelligent transportation systems and telematic solutions, and on introducing electric vehicles throughout Europe; indeed, the car, electrical engineering and infrastructure industry are working together on these issues. Whilst this is already bearing fruit, it will take some time, with further technological developments needed: e.g. battery technologies. At the moment, they cannot be used for very wide markets. Industry will continue to invest in this area, but suitable framework conditions are needed from the political side.
- participation in knowledge or digital society: digital content, infrastructure (mainly broadband technologies), the layout and the spread, which has now also become part of the digital agenda of the European Commission.

Industry is good in energy efficiency
In recent years, industry has not only provided solutions, but has also improved its energy efficiency and performance.
Environmental aspects of Europe 2020 strategy

As a stakeholder, it's always easy to provide long lists of recommendations and thoughts on what all the others should do. It should rather be seen as a commitment from the political side and from industry – a win-win situation to ensure that the future of Europe will be bright and that, together, we can solve the problems we are facing.

I believe the 'Europe 2020' strategy to be both a very good and much needed exercise for Europe, but would just like to underline some thoughts of a more general nature:

- Invest in Europe's future: through commitment to certain policy goals over the next 10 years. Key projects should be defined at European level: such as energy infrastructure, energy-efficient buildings, creating a standard for electric vehicles. All decision makers should then commit themselves to their realisation (European Commission, European Parliament, European Council and Member States);

- Integrate European policies: actively develop more horizontal EU policies which take into account those different aspects;

- Integrate the competitiveness dimension into all EU policies: by assessing, measuring or benchmarking in some way how a political dossier, decision, legislation, regulation, etc. would affect Europe's competitiveness in the world - I think this can be done;

- Follow-up some of the more industry-specific analysis, reports and roadmaps that have been done over the last couple of years to identify areas where horizontal and/or more specific measures and recommendations could be implemented;

- Do what you say: when talking about sustainability, this should also include sustainability in policies. There are a lot of new policies coming up all of the time; some of which tend to ignore decisions that have been taken already (for instance in industrial policy over the last 12 months). They simply need to be implemented, not followed up. There is the very good tool of impact assessments across Europe to measure the impact of certain policies; as industry, we also believe this is the right tool. We stand ready to be consulted on these matters.

No artificial separation between “green” industry and others: in some of the environmental aspects of the ‘Europe 2020’ strategy, we should be careful not to make artificial distinctions between green and not so green industries following recent trends.

Reduce administrative burdens: in particular for SMEs. Indeed, in order to gain a better understanding of how companies work, the different pillars in our society (companies, industry and political decision-makers) should be brought closer together. Parliament officials could, for example, be seconded to work in the private sector over short periods; thereby gaining invaluable first-hand, practical experience of the issues faced, whilst, at the same time, aiding companies to better understand political decision-making in Brussels.

Legislative issues and stakeholder involvement

A calmer approach is needed in some of the political dossiers (including comitology or impact assessment); getting things right rather than getting things done quickly.

The Eco-Design Directive is, overall, very good. It has embedded the environmental aspects of resource efficiency and products into a full life-cycle perspective, and also requires economic and social parameters to be taken into account.
However with regards to the Emissions Trading Scheme for NOX and SO\textsuperscript{2}, we clearly believe this is double regulation, as there are already many regulations in place on air quality standards. The various actors need to work together via more consultation and, probably, also another study to get it right; smart regulation being the goal.

The WEEE (Waste of Electrical and Electronic Equipment) Directive and the RoHS (Regulation on Hazardous Substances) Directive were meant to be recasts of recent directives. Companies had worked together to set up national take-back systems; the recast was supposed to take care of some of the deficiencies of the previous or existing legislation. Instead, however, both directives are being completely reworked without taking into account a proper impact assessment of the areas affected; again it is hoped that this model of smart regulation is followed by concrete steps and not only by words.

Conclusion
In spite of these negative points, I would like to conclude by hoping that we continue to enjoy good cooperation with the European Commission and the European Parliament, but also at the level of the Council on these subjects. Industry across Europe, with all its diversity and colourfulness is ready to participate in these discussions. Europe needs the right vision for the next 10 or 20 years; one which will make it a very attractive place: a place where people want to live, work and invest, and where, together, we can ensure that Europe has a very strong position in the world.
"Environmental aspects of the EU 2020 strategy"

European Parliament, 10 June 2010

Oliver Blank
Chairman, BUSINESSEUROPE
Industrial Policy Task Force.

BUSINESSEUROPE: 40 members in 34 countries
Industry is vital for Europe

23 million jobs
6,000 large companies
1.7 million SMEs
EUR 1.3 trillion yearly added value
EUR 5 trillion yearly turnover
Manufacturing makes 17% of EU GDP

Industry is a solution provider

Demographic change and ageing population
Climate protection
Sustainable use of energy and resources
Access to energy at affordable prices
Mobility and better transport
Participation to knowledge / digital society
Industry is good in energy efficiency

EU 27 - Developments in Energy Efficiency
1990 - 2007
2000=100

Source: European Commission

Environmental aspects of EU 2020 strategy

- Invest in Europe’s future: prioritise growth, jobs, innovation, global competitiveness
- Integrate European policies
- Do what you say
Environmental aspects of EU 2020 strategy

Better environmental policy is key:

• No artificial separation between “green” industry and others
• Improve existing legislation
• Reduce administrative burden
• Improve quality of new legislative initiatives
• Avoid “double regulation”
• Stakeholder involvement (e.g. in comitology)

Thank you for your attention!

blank@zvei.org

http://www.businesseurope.eu
Presentation by Mr John Hontelez, Secretary General of the European Environmental Bureau

Workshop on the environmental aspects of the Europe 2020 Strategy

Thank you for this initiative, and thank you for inviting me.

The work on Europe2020 is moving fast between Commission and Council, and I appreciate the EP has difficulties to cope with this speed, which affects the democratic legitimacy of this Strategy.

This is important because the pretension of both Presidents Barroso and Van Rompuy is that Europe2020 is the key Strategy for the EU for the coming years, and as such it should influence all relevant individual policies as well as the Financial Perspective beyond 2013.

In order to increase this pretension even more, the Commission and Council are rushing through Integrated Guidelines that should assist the Member States to develop national Europe2020 implementation plans by the end of this year.

Looking at the fate of the Lisbon Strategy, the predecessor of Europe2020, one might get less concerned about this rushing. Did the Lisbon Strategy really make a difference at the national level? Did the Lisbon Strategy really force national governments to go into different directions than they were planning for? I guess at the national level, “Lisbon” was more an alibi than a real pressure tool.

At the EU level though, the Lisbon Strategy has been time and again the reference for political initiatives, which has put environmental policy making under pressure. I refer to converting “sustainability impact assessments” of new EU policy proposals into “competitiveness proofing”, and on pressures to reduce administrative burdens for business, even if in the end the environmental acquis forms less than 1% of that burden. The Lisbon Strategy has indeed been used to insist that environmental policies always have to respect EU’s objective to keep and even increase its global competitiveness position. The biggest victim of this was REACH, where the original environmental and health objectives came under strong pressure from the competitiveness angle. Also airpollution legislation has been suffering from this. Yet, the Lisbon Strategy was not strong enough to block everything.

Will Europe2020 be different? Unlike the Lisbon Strategy it starts in the middle of the worst economic crisis the EU has experienced in its existence, with currently the main focus being on reducing public deficits. Europe2020 therefore has a complicated message for national governments: reduce your deficits as soon as possible, but also invest in activities that create long term growth.
What is in it for the environment? At first glance, Europe2020 is good news. It’s motto: “for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth”, points at knowledge, education and training, climate action and resource efficiency, and reducing poverty as key drivers for the economy of the next decade. That sounds almost like a sustainable development agenda! Besides integrating the Energy/Climate package of 2008 into Europe2020, it mentions “climate change, energy and resource efficiency” amongst the key areas on which the research&development and innovation policy should concentrate (Flagship initiative: “Innovation Union”) and it announces an Industry policy Flagship initiative aiming for a green economy, in particular to “support the transition of service and manufacturing sectors to greater resource efficiency, including more effective recycling”.

Moreover, when it comes to the most immediate challenge, budgetary consolidation, Europe2020 clearly advises, in case increased tax income is necessary, “to shift the tax burden from labour to energy and environmental taxes as part of a “greening” of taxation systems.”, calling this a “growth friendly” strategy.

First signals from the European Council are not encouraging. Its March conclusions did not even accept the new motto, and changed it back into “jobs and growth”. The environmental dimension of the Commission’s proposal was entirely ignored. The watering down process has started.

But Europe2020 does not need watering down, it needs considerable improvement! We should not get it wrong! The coming decade can be decisive for a sustainable future of Europe, of the planet. We urgently need the transformation stated in the EU 2020 three priorities:
- Smart growth: an economy based on knowledge and innovation.
- Sustainable growth: a more resource efficient, greener and more competitive economy.
- Inclusive growth: a high-employment economy delivering social and territorial cohesion.

Why is this urgent for the environment AND for the economy?
Climate change, biodiversity degradation risk to hit harder and harder. We might see the beginning of reduced oil production (peak-oil) and increasing scarcity of other resources such as water and clean fertile soils. Resource scarcity will result in high prices and thus damage our resource dependent economies. And this can even threaten world peace. Unsustainable use of natural resources is a cause of many environmental and biodiversity problems, and resource scarcity will even increase these pressures, inside and outside the EU. So we must turn the curve and start reducing our energy and resource dependency and reduce our use in absolute terms now!

Europe2020 as the Commission proposed has the potential to kick start the necessary transition if it is beefed up with the following 6 points:
- ambitious, binding energy and resource use reduction targets
- a better climate target
- an explicit link to the EU’s new biodiversity and ecosystem target for 2020 and a recognition that biodiversity and ecosystems are our ultimate resource base, our natural capital, as is already concluded in the TEEB study.
- tax and subsidy reform, to make the market work for the environment
- Coherence between key policy objectives and budgetary allocations, especially in agriculture, cohesion, and research policies
- Global leadership for fair trade and a level playing field for sustainable production

More specifically: what needs to be improved?

In its Communication “Analysis of options to move beyond 20% greenhouse gas emission reductions and assessing the risk of carbon leakage” of the 26th May, the Commission
Proceedings of the workshop ‘What environmental challenges for the Europe 2020 Strategy’

shows clearly that sticking with a 20% target greenhouse gas reduction target for 2020, risks to undermine an innovation agenda, risks the EU to lag behind other large nations rather than leading globally. The Commission is very right here. We are in the EU already on -14% greenhouse gas emissions compared to 1990, and the abundant opportunities to choose for CDM-projects combined with banking emission rights for later, might mean that hardly any further domestic reductions are realised in the coming decade. This means a low carbon price and little market pressure for renewables and in particular for energy efficiency. Indeed, sticking with the 20% target now is undermining rather than stimulating innovation and economic recovery. The Commission states that the extra costs of an unconditional greenhouse gas reduction target of 30% are easily compensated with important co-benefits such as green jobs creation, reduction of airpollution and industrial innovation. Even more, it warns that not increasing ambitions to 30% by 2020 would make it difficult to reach the 80-95% reduction goal for 2050. It is therefore extremely worrying that the Commission has refused to show leadership and determination, and refused to propose the move to 30%, irrespective of what the rest of the world would do. If one is convinced that a strong climate policy triggers innovation and a strong export sector, one should see moving ahead of others as strength, not risk.

To be clear, for the environmental movement, even a 30% scenario is not enough. We promote a 40% reduction scenario, combined with a legally binding 20% target for reduction of energy use. This is the only scenario that, provided it is mirrored in the end with comparable policies in the rest of the world, can prevent disastrous climate change impacts – and has many other advantages such as reducing energy dependency and air pollution.

Resource efficiency appeared in the Europe2020 Strategy at the last moment, thanks to the intervention of Commissioner Potocnik. It is now mentioned in combination with energy efficiency and security. However, Europe2020 does not get into details of which resources need to be looked at specifically and what level of ambition is needed. The EEB has called for a clear longer term target in which Europe2020 plays a role: halving EU’s ecological footprint with 50% by 2030. From such a target one can come to specific targets for the next decade, which sharpen the picture of what the flagship initiatives and the national reform programmes should do. These targets should be specific to different resources covering more than just energy and include for example water, land-use and soil. For the time being a minimum annual increase of resource efficiency of 3% is necessary. 2% has been business as usual in the last three decades, so the increase is not beyond reach.

Rather than improving it, will the environmental dimension really survive in Europe2020?

The five overarching targets as proposed by the Commission are coming together with seven flagship initiatives, aimed “to catalyse progress under each priority theme”. In the Work programme 2010 of the Commission we can read when and how the Commission intends to produce these flagship. It appears that the flagship “Resource efficient Europe” is the only one that will not be produced as such. Instead the Commission re-announces bits and pieces of an existing agenda (implementation of the Energy/Climate package, revision of the Energy Efficiency Action Plan and the Energy Taxation Directive), and from Commissioner Potocnik we heard he plans to develop a Roadmap for Resource Efficiency, to be published sometime in 2011. Given that work has not even started in the Commission, and given our experiences with the Thematic Strategy on Sustainable Resource Use, I fear that this Roadmap can take long to develop and will face many hurdles preventing it to be clear on targets and timetables.

The absence of a flagship in the sense of the other six, questions the real position of the energy and resource agenda in Europe2020. While Europe2020 will remain “Chefsache”, followed up by the European Council, the environmental dimension might disappear in the
margins. Absence of such a flagship will also undermine the green dimension of the flagships on innovation and industrial policy.

As said, it is important that the Commission calls for environmental fiscal reform as part of a healthier taxation system. But it leaves the implementation entirely to the individual member states. This is understandable because of the stiff resistance of in particular the UK against EU interference in taxation matters and the unanimity requirement for EU taxation legislation, but it is irresponsible in a time when resistance from vested interests in each country, pointing at the need for a coordinated EU approach, frustrates any national initiative (see CO2-tax proposal in France). The Commission’s role in such a setting needs to be to strengthen a “coalition of the willing”, to build support among a wider range of national governments, and to push forward on development of such an economic reform agenda. Where legislation is complicated we call for an Open Method of Coordination Initiative for environmental tax reform, setting an ambition level of 10% shift of taxation income away from labour related taxes to energy and resource use, in a period of 10 years. The ambition should be shared by all member states and the Commission must get the right to monitor and comment. Those countries that want to have details of the reform agreed, can do this in an enhanced cooperation framework. While we always insisted on revenue neutrality of such a reform, in the current circumstances this might not be desirable anymore. But even if the tax-income would increase on a net level, it should be ensured that part of the revenues are spent in avoiding negative social impacts of the reform.

Is there public support for a green Europe2020?

Last year, the EEB got together with the European Trade Unions Confederation, the Platform of European Social NGOs and Concord, the European umbrella of development and relief organizations. We launched the Spring Alliance, and agreed on, with numerous other civil society organizations involved, the Spring Alliance Manifesto. We discussed the Manifesto with, amongst others, President Barroso during his preparations for his Policy Guidelines and Europe2020. So he knows that a green economy is not just an issue for environmentalists, but that it is widely shared, that also social activists are convinced that a green and social economy is possible that creates decent jobs, guarantees social fairness and determines international relations by cooperation rather than competition.

This public support can be mobilized, if Europe2020 becomes an inclusive project whereby civil society organisations are involved in the agenda setting and implementation. That means a different way of working from now, where everything, at the EU and the national levels, has to be pushed through in a couple of months.

What the European Parliament should do?

In general: Insist on the green dimension of Europe2020 to be strengthened, as a safe and responsible way of fighting the economic crisis and creating new, decent employment.
In particular, insist on:

- the “resource efficient Europe” flagship be developed in a coherent way, and with priority, so that it can influence first of all the other relevant flagships, in particular on the “innovation union” and “an industrial policy for the globalization era”: with as one of it objectives to lead to a more energy and resource efficient economy that will support achieving climate and biodiversity targets. Include ambitious, binding energy and resource use reduction targets including water, and link it to the new 2020 biodiversity target.

Set an immediate domestic, unconditional greenhouse gas reduction target to 30% for 2020, compared to 1990, which means in fact 16% for the next ten years. This as a major stimulus for an innovative low-carbon economy, the first in the world, with strong export potential. Open a debate on even moving to 40%.

Call for a major environmental fiscal reform project for Europe, using the Open Method of Coordination, combining the pressure of the Europe2020 Strategy and regular reporting by the Commission, with the freedom of member states to sort out the details themselves.

Insist that the EU finally goes “beyond GDP”, meaning that we stop calculating progress just in GDP-growth terms and start counting what really matters for people and the future.

Demand a global leadership agenda for fair trade and a level playing field for sustainable production.

Insist that the Member States take their time to translate Europe2020 into national action, on the basis of real civil and political dialogue. Otherwise we will see the repeat of the paper exercise that Lisbon Strategy was at the national level.
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What Europe 2020 is expected to be

• A key strategy for the EU for the coming years.
• A point of reference for all relevant individual policies and for the financial perspective.
The precedent of the Lisbon Strategy

- At a national level, the Lisbon Strategy was not a real pressure tool.
- At the EU level, it was a political framework that affected policy making on environment.
- It was used to link environmental policies with the EU objective of competitiveness.

Will Europe 2020 be different?

- It starts in the middle of the worst economic crisis that the EU has experienced and sends a complicated message to the Member States: reduce your deficits as soon as possible, but also invest in long term growth!
EU 2020 and environment

- Its motto as proposed by the Commission: “For smart, sustainable and inclusive growth”, includes Energy/Climate Package, and resource efficiency.
- It includes “climate change, energy and resource efficiency” as key areas on which R&D and innovation should focus.
- It announces an industry policy flagship initiative for a green economy.

« Growth Friendly » Tax policy

Also:
Commission advises: When increased public income is needed, take “growth friendly” taxes: “shift tax burden from labour to energy and environmental taxes as part of a “greening” of taxation systems.”
A disappointing European Council response

- Changed the motto into “jobs and growth”
- Ignored the environmental focus that was evident in the Commission’s proposal
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No watering down please!

We need urgently the transformation stated in the three priorities:

• Smart growth: an economy based on knowledge and innovation.
• Sustainable growth: a more resource efficient, greener and competitive economy.
• Inclusive growth: a high-employment economy delivering social and territorial cohesion
What should be done?

- Include binding targets in the new strategy with regard to: energy and resource use reduction; climate; biodiversity protection.
- Need to make the market work for the environment
- Reform EU agriculture, cohesion, research policies and budget.
- Global leadership on fair trade and sustainable production

Climate policy triggering innovation?

- The Commission: 20% target on greenhouse gas reduction for 2020 risks to undermine innovation and competitiveness agenda.
- Shows extra-costs of 30% greenhouse reduction targets are easily compensated (i.e. with green jobs,...).
- The Commission is right! But fails to show leadership for the next step: setting a new target.
- The environment movement aims at a 40% reduction target.
Resource efficiency?

• Appeared at the very last moment in the Strategy thanks to the Commission’s proposal, but without going into details.
• The EEB calls for halving the EU’s ecological footprint by 2030.
• A minimum annual increase of resource efficiency by 3% is necessary.
• Roadmap instead of Flagship???

Fiscal Reform

• An environmental fiscal reform is needed (also according to the Commission), but its implementation is left to the member states.
• The EEB calls for an open method of coordination for environmental tax reform.
• This would imply a 10% shift of taxation income from labour-related taxes to energy and resource use in 10 years.
Is there public support for a green Europe 2020?

- Spring Alliance: EEB, European Trade Unions Confederation, Social Platform and Concord.

- Its Manifesto: www.springalliance.eu

Green economy is a widely shared issue and can mobilise public support.

What the European Parliament should do?

- Call for
  - “Resource Efficient Europe” Flagship without delay, with
  - Ambitious, binding energy and resource use reduction targets.
  - A better climate target
  - tax and subsidy reform, to make the market work for the environment
  - The EU finally to move “beyond GDP” in its assessments of progress
  - Global leadership for fair trade and a level playing field for sustainable production
  - Real civil and political dialogue at the national level.
Thank you for your attention
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I would also like to thank the Committee for holding this important hearing today on this subject. As we have had a long morning, I will throw away my notes and am just going to talk to you a little bit frankly and ask the rhetorical questions: Does the 'Europe 2020' strategy add up to state-of-the-art public policy in the second decade of this century? Does it add up to informed, sharp, public policy leading this continent into the future?

Going back to Mr Bouvier's slides, I would just like to reiterate that the planet is in ecological overshoot at the moment. The ecological footprint shows that we are living at around 1.4 planets per year. So, whether in terms of resource extraction or in terms of pollution, we are straining this planet's limits to the very edge. If that is bad enough, then calculations made by the WWF show that the Europeans are consuming at about 3 planet lifestyles: that is a really serious indictment.

Is the 'Europe 2020' strategy in its current form actually in any way near enough an adequate response to that challenge?

I found 'Europe 2020' to be quite curious, in that it largely ignored the whole natural systems that sustain economies and support the planet (e.g. fresh water resources and clean air for healthy life-styles). In fact, if it had not been for the Parliament's resolution in March and one or two Member States, 'Europe 2020' strategy would have been completely silent on the whole agriculture, forest and marine dimension. Huge sectors of European economy were actually absent from 'Europe 2020'. Quite curious, in a way, given Mr Bouvier's emphasis in one of his 3 case studies on the whole question of agriculture, food, food security and, in fact, the whole economy of rural areas. Curious!

Although it's a good benchmark and is obviously going in the same direction as others, the 'Europe 2020' strategy, as a state-of-the-art public policy, is not at all challenging in the second decade of the 21st century. The failure of conventional macro-economics to deal with market failures and the whole question of externalities have left us limping along with a macro-economic system which is clearly broken. The 'Europe 2020' strategy, which is a ten year strategy, does not fix the very things that are broken and that are leading to some of the environmental issues that this Committee has to deal with.

Another omission is the failure to deal with the international dimension. The 'Europe 2020' strategy, was blind to the fact that the three-planet life style that we lead, is largely due to imports. The consequent huge footprint on the rest of the world was largely absent.

The WWF joined with the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Club of Rome to have the landmark 'Beyond GDP' conference here in the European Parliament in 2007. This is well before President Sarkozy started getting interested in 'Beyond GDP' and at least 2 years before the Stiglitz 7 report. European Union institutions were way ahead of the mark - in fact the Parliament was discussing this in 1995: 'Reform of GDP'.
Whilst it is, of course, important to change the metrics or measurement, what is important is how we measure well-being, the whole welfare, human happiness, human satisfaction and human quality of life. This is crucial at the moment when looking at the European economy and European countries, and seeing massive centres of unemployment, particularly amongst young people.

How do we have that discussion in a way that doesn't simply keep reverting to sustainable growth, green growth? Why don't we have a discussion about something other than growth? Why don't we have a discussion about (as started in the UK) prosperity without growth? Why don't we have a discussion about, as we were having last night in the EP, about qualitative, not quantitative growth? These are the discussions that I think the 'Europe 2020' strategy should be bringing forward. I am hoping that they still might.

If we did have that discussion about qualitative growth and prosperity beyond growth, I am sure that would be a way of honestly discussing with the European citizen which predicament this continent now faces; given where growth centres in the rest of the world. I think the European public wants to have an honest discussion, an honest opinion about what is the future of this continent. They don't want to have the wool pulled over their eyes that somehow everything will be alright with a little bit more green growth. I think there's a mature discussion to be had about different futures.
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