



# GLOBAL CLIMATE COALITION

July 19, 1993

Mr. Thomas F. McLarty  
Chief of Staff to the President  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. McLarty:

Over the next several weeks you and other officials of the Administration will be making decisions regarding policies to meet the goals announced April 21 by President Clinton when he said:

"Today, I reaffirm my personal, and announce our nation's commitment, to reducing our emissions of greenhouse gases to their 1990 levels by the year 2000."

"I am instructing my administration to produce a cost-effective plan by August that can continue the trend of reduced emissions. This must be a clarion call, not for more bureaucracy or regulation or unnecessary costs, but instead, for American ingenuity and creativity, to produce the best and most energy-efficient technology."

This is indeed a challenge as the decisions that you will make will effectively drive energy and economic policy in our country for years to come. Members of the Global Climate Coalition have been pleased to participate in the series of workshops which have been held to discuss options available to meet these goals and want very much to continue to work with you as you develop the plan and prepare to implement it.

We urge you to include options in the plan only after a careful analysis of their costs and possible effects on our domestic economy and employment. And, we urge you not to foreclose an option which could, if properly defined without overly restrictive parameters, prove to be the most cost effective and best option available, the option of joint implementation.

This concept — as yet to be precisely defined — was included in the Framework Convention on Climate Change as a means to facilitate economic development in developing countries while containing the growth in global greenhouse emissions by the most cost effective means. The way that joint implementation will work domestically cannot be determined at this point as it will depend in large part on the way that the

Mr. Thomas F. McLarty  
July 19, 1993  
Page 2

international definitions are constructed by parties to the framework convention. This will not be resolved for some time. The drafters of the convention, however, clearly recognized that pursuit of joint implementation programs to achieve net greenhouse gas emissions reductions in developing countries would be regarded as just as significant as domestic reductions of emissions and should be given equal consideration.

Properly defined, joint implementation can meet several goals as it can:

- help address environmental and economic challenges that already exist in developing countries (including countries with economies in transition), where the opportunities for reducing the rate of growth in greenhouse gas emissions far exceed that in the mature, efficient economies of developed countries;
- reduce greenhouse gas emissions globally at a lower cost than domestic controls;
- create new job opportunities for U.S. industry by deploying technological and managerial expertise in countries where it is desperately needed;
- lead to long-term economic development by accelerating the advancement and utilization of more efficient energy technologies with reduced environmental impacts.

We understand that there is a debate within the Administration as to whether joint implementation should be a part of the August National Action Plan and the options put forth at that time. We hope that you do not foreclose this option which could be effective in the short term as well as over a longer term in reducing global emissions.

Because of population growth the legitimate and understandable desire for economic progress in the developing countries will lead to rapid growth in greenhouse gas emissions in these nations, and reductions in greenhouse gas emissions made in the U.S. or other OECD nations will be quickly overwhelmed. This rate of growth could be reduced by a program of technological cooperation between OECD nations and developing countries. Alternatively, if this option is foreclosed the financial capability of OECD nations to assist these countries in their quest for a better economy could be hampered.

The benefits that can accrue to this nation and the world by a well structured policy of joint implementation cannot be underestimated. A national action plan focused solely on domestic programs could threaten the continued economic growth and competitiveness of the U.S. economy. A plan that combines cost effective domestic measures, including voluntary measures, with a properly defined joint implementation program, could foster this nation's economic growth and international competitiveness while providing the

Mr. Thomas F. McLarty  
July 19, 1993  
Page 3

means for the developing countries to enjoy a level of prosperity and environmental protection that has heretofore eluded them.

There is still substantial scientific uncertainty regarding whether global climate change is occurring and if so how fast and what impacts might be. The members of the Global Climate Coalition support actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions or to increase greenhouse gas sinks that are justified for other economic or environmental reasons. If properly defined joint implementation can be one of those actions. We stand ready to assist you in your efforts.

Sincerely,



John Shlaes  
Executive Director

cc: Interagency Climate Change Mitigation Group  
Interagency Analysis Team