FOIA Number: 2017-1093-F

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Office of Environmental Initiatives

Series/Staff Member: Roger Ballentine

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 19510

FolderID:

Folder Title:
Climate Change International National Security

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	62	1	1	1

Climate Treaty and National Security
FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY -- November 1998

- **Where do DoD's GHG emissions come from?**
  - 58% of emissions are from operations & training, 42% are from facilities and commercial-type vehicles. Jet fuel is about 45% of DoD's total energy use.
  - DoD uses HFCs in aircraft and weapons air conditioning systems, PFCs in certain aircraft radar systems and SF6 in ground control radar.
  - DoD's total energy use is about 72% of US federal agency total. Federal agency energy use is almost 2% of US total.

- **Why did Administration want national security protections?**
  - Ensure no nation would hesitate to join multilateral humanitarian, peacekeeping or other operations due to potential of exceeding emissions budget.
  - Ensure no disincentives to allies making fuel available overseas (for unilateral or multilateral needs).
  - Ensure readiness of forces.

- **What protects national security?**
  - Internationally
    - Kyoto Protocol Decision 2.4/CP3: Bunker fuels (sold to ships or aircraft engaged in international transport) do not count in a Party's national totals but are reported separately.
    - Kyoto Protocol Decision 2.5/CP3: Emissions from multilateral operations pursuant to UN Charter are not included in national totals but reported separately. Other overseas emissions can be divided among countries involved by agreement. Absent an agreement, these emissions would be reported by the nation in which they occur.
    - Results of these Kyoto decisions are not limited to the Protocol as they are decisions of the Parties to the Convention.
  - Domestically
    - The Administration has determined that domestic measures to promote reductions in emissions of GHGs shall not impair or adversely affect military operations and training."

- **How do relevant DoD emissions count toward the national GHG allowance?**
  - International bunker fuels – (Addressed in Kyoto Protocol, per above.) These are reported separately from national totals and do not count toward compliance. Parties are to work through ICAO and IMO to limit or reduce them (Kyoto Protocol Article 2.2).
  - Domestic operations and training – (Addressed in Administration policy.) These would be included in national totals.
  - Domestic buildings and commercial-type vehicles (42% of DoD emissions) – Same as private sector.

- **What GHG reductions has DoD achieved since the 1990 baseline year?**
  - 25% energy use reduction through improved energy management and base closure. Includes over 17% reduction in facility energy consumption per square foot.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 3, 1998

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JIM STEINBERG DBS for
TODD STERN
KATHLEEN McGINTY
GENE SPERLING

SUBJECT: Climate Change/Military

Republican critics continue to charge that the Kyoto agreement will hurt the U.S. military. In recent weeks, Senators Hagel and Inhofe have used Congressional hearings and other fora to push this line of attack. A group of prominent Reagan/Bush appointees -- including Richard Cheney and Jeanne Kirkpatrick -- make this argument in paid advertising running frequently in Roll Call and the Washington Times.

In fact, the Pentagon is reasonably satisfied with the results at Kyoto. The agreement reached there exempts emissions from most multilateral military operations (such as Desert Storm, Bosnia and Grenada) and from military (and civilian) international air and marine transport. Pentagon officials participated prominently in the U.S. delegation at Kyoto.

The Pentagon remains concerned, however, about domestic implementation of our climate change obligations. It accepts that any domestic emissions trading program should cover Defense Department facilities (i.e., buildings and non-tactical vehicles, similar to those used by other government agencies or the private sector). It argues, however, that any domestic emissions trading program should exempt military operations and training (including tactical aircraft, weapons systems, combat training and border security). Noting the unique and often unpredictable nature of its mission, the Pentagon argues that subjecting military operations and training to greenhouse gas emissions limits could compromise military readiness.

Overall, the Defense Department accounts for 1.4% of total U.S. carbon emissions, a 22% decrease from its share in 1990. *Carbon emissions from military operations and training are 0.8% of the U.S. total.*

In your October, 1997 climate change policy announcement, you said that full implementation of a domestic emissions trading program for greenhouse gases should wait until at least 2008. In that sense, consideration of the Pentagon's unique needs in designing such a program may be premature. However, there is a possibility that the spiraling political charges on this issue could be defused by an early administration statement. *Specifically, we could preempt the critics by announcing that we would oppose emissions limits on military operations and training.* For the reasons stated below, your advisors recommend this approach.

OPTIONS

The options are as follows. In both cases, we would continue to emphasize our considerable success on this issue at Kyoto.

1. Have an administration spokesman state our opposition to emissions limits on military operations and training. *Stu Eizenstat's testimony before several Congressional committees tomorrow and Thursday (March 3 and 4) would be a good opportunity.*

We have been assured that, with such a statement, the uniformed services will publicly express confidence that military readiness can and will be protected in the design of our climate change policies. This would significantly if not entirely neutralize political attacks on this issue. Furthermore, an exemption for military operations and training would respond to the Pentagon's concerns on readiness with only the most marginal impact on the United States' ability to meet national emissions targets. The share of emissions at stake is small, and downsizing together with fuel efficiency improvements may lead to reduced emissions from these sources in any event. Such an exemption would carry forward the spirit of the Kyoto agreement with respect to military emissions.

The biggest downside is the risk of starting a round of special pleading and complaints from industrial emitters. Industries may grouse that they will be asked to absorb emissions reductions properly attributable to the Pentagon. More broadly, opening the door to discussions on the structure of an emissions trading program could raise a series of awkward questions about our positions on other aspects of the eventual carbon emissions reduction regime. However, given the small share of emissions at issue, the unique circumstances of the military and the number of years before these industries might be subject to limits, these appear to be manageable problems.

The environmental community would not support this approach, but we do not anticipate significant criticism.

Jim Steinberg, Todd Stern, Gene Sperling and Stu Eizenstat support this option. Katie McGinty supports this option, emphasizing that the Defense Department should be asked to come forward with an aggressive plan for reducing emissions from its non-exempt facilities.

2. Continue to emphasize diplomatic success on this issue at Kyoto, and state that consideration of domestic implementation issues is premature.

The other option is to continue emphasizing and explaining our success on this issue at Kyoto (where few observers expected us to obtain exemptions for our military), while deferring questions on domestic implementation to a later time. This would avoid charges of special treatment and allow a more thorough consideration of the role of the military in any emissions trading program, against the backdrop of other domestic implementation issues. However, it would also entail a level of

concern about this issue among the uniformed military that would be damaging, in the short- and long-run. It would provide opponents of our global warming agenda an argument that resonates strongly with many on the Hill. None of your advisors support this option.

_____ Option 1 _____ Option 2 _____ Let's discuss

Clinton Presidential Records
Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a publication.

Publications have not been scanned in their entirety for the purpose of digitization. To see the full publication please search online or visit the Clinton Presidential Library's Research Room.

policy

Developing **countries** & Global **climate change**

Electric Power Options in India

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT, AHMEDABAD

BATTELLE, ADVANCED INTERNATIONAL STUDIES UNIT

PEW CENTER ON Global CLIMATE CHANGE

PEW CENTER ON Global CLIMATE CHANGE

For Immediate Release:
Thursday October 21, 1999

Contact: Kelly Sullivan/Heather Fass
202-289-5900

New Analysis Outlines Opportunities for Korea and India to Reduce Emissions and Maintain Economic Growth

Studies Important As COP 5 Begins in Bonn

WASHINGTON, D.C. – Two case studies released today outline realistic opportunities for Korea and India to address the challenge of climate change. The studies commissioned by the Pew Center on Global Climate Change examine ways to reduce emissions without comprising economic growth.

The release coincides with the start of the Fifth Conference of the Parties (COP5) in Bonn, Germany. Talks there will depend on a clear understanding of actions taken by developing countries to address local environmental and economic concerns, and how these actions might impact greenhouse gas emissions.

Similar to other developing countries, power demand in both India and Korea is outpacing economic growth. Electricity consumption in India and Korea has more than doubled in the last decade, and both countries expect to at least double their power supply again over the next 15 years. The energy choices these countries make today will affect the local and global environment for years to come.

"This analysis shows that there are reasonable and realistic opportunities developing countries can and are taking today to begin responding to the challenge of climate change," said Eileen Claussen, President of the Pew Center on Global Climate Change. "The recommendations offer a clear roadmap for progress, moving the debate from the theoretical to the practical."

The Korea Energy Economics Institute and the Advanced International Studies Unit at Battelle completed the case study on Korea's electric power choices. The Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, also worked with Battelle to conduct the analysis on India's electric power choices.

The studies are part of a series that began with an overview report, *Developing Countries and Climate Change: Electric Power Options for Growth*, which was released earlier this year. In addition to the case studies on India and Korea, the series also will include reports on Argentina, Brazil, and China. All the case studies are being conducted and completed by in-country authors to ensure a balanced and informed assessment.

2111 Wilson Blvd.
Suite 350
Arlington, VA 22201
ph (703) 516-4146
fax (703) 841-1422
www.pewclimate.org

The Pew Center On Global Climate Change brings a new cooperative approach and critical scientific, economic and technological expertise to the global debate on climate change.

The studies use a least-cost model to test the effect of various scenarios on the mix of power generation technologies. The impact of these technology choices on costs and emissions are estimated through 2015.

The Korean analysis yielded several interesting insights:

- Additional restructuring of the power sector and reform of industrial policy can reduce emissions of carbon dioxide by 9 percent relative to the "business-as-usual" path, with slightly lower costs per unit of electricity generated. Increasing the supply of natural gas and reducing import tariffs on that fuel have similar results.

- Korea could boost economic performance, improve environmental quality, and ensure greater energy security by accelerating energy efficiency efforts. By reducing demand for power by 15 percent, these efforts could also reduce carbon and sulfur dioxide emissions by almost 25 percent.

- Further tightening of local environmental requirements might shift technology choices toward natural gas and nuclear, and achieve reductions in the emissions of sulfur dioxide (59 percent) and carbon dioxide (28 percent), with only a small increase in costs.

- Korea's economy and environment could benefit from advanced technologies such as fuel cells and wind power if research and development is accelerated and capital costs decline as a result.

The Indian case study also identified several key opportunities:

- Strict control of local pollutants may not necessarily lead to reduced coal consumption, because of limited supplies of low-cost natural gas. On the other hand, striving to attain sustainable development goals can reduce costs and capacity needs, and achieve the most dramatic reductions in carbon dioxide emissions (60 percent over 1995 levels, but 35 percent below business-as-usual).

- High economic growth does not have to lead to excessive coal emissions; instead, stricter emissions control and greater financial resources might cause a shift to cleaner fuels and more energy-efficient coal technologies.

- Natural gas use increases in all scenarios, indicating that enhancing the gas supply is a vital energy policy measure. For those cases where gas use increases the most, the analysis shows that carbon emissions can be reduced from 11 percent (by accelerating market reforms) to 23 percent (by more widespread adoption of cost-effective energy efficiency measures).

The findings from all of the case studies will be presented as part of a roundtable discussion on October 27th in Bonn, Germany during COP 5.

The Pew Center was established in May 1998 by the Pew Charitable Trusts, one of the nation's largest philanthropies and an influential voice in efforts to improve the quality of America's environment. The Pew Center supports businesses in developing marketplace solutions to reduce greenhouse gases, produces analytical reports on the science, economics and policies related to climate change, launches public education efforts, and promotes better understanding of market mechanisms globally. Eileen Claussen, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, is the President of the Pew Center.

The Pew Center includes the Business Environmental Leadership Council, which is composed of 21 major, largely Fortune 500 corporations all working with the Pew Center to address issues related to climate change. The companies do not contribute financially to the Pew Center – it is solely supported by contributions from charitable foundations.

# # #