

EU-27 WATCH

No. 9
July 2010

ISSN 1610-6458

www.EU-27Watch.org

EU-27 Watch

Contributing partners are

Austrian Institute of International Affairs, Vienna
Bulgarian European Community Studies Association,
Sofia

Center for European Studies / Middle East Technical
University, Ankara

Centre d'études européennes de Sciences Po, Paris
Centre d'étude de la vie politique, Université libre de
Bruxelles

Centre d'études et de recherches européennes Robert
Schuman, Luxembourg

Centre of International Relations, Ljubljana

Cyprus Institute for Mediterranean, European and
International Studies, Nicosia

Danish Institute for International Studies, Copenhagen

Elcano Royal Institute and UNED University, Madrid

European Institute of Romania, Bucharest

Federal Trust for Education and Research, London

Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Helsinki

Foundation for European Studies - European Institute,
Łódź

Greek Centre of European Studies and Research,
Athens

Institute of International Affairs and Centre for Small
State Studies at the University of Iceland, Reykjavik

Institute for International Relations, Zagreb

Institute for World Economics of the Hungarian
Academy of Sciences, Budapest

Institute for Strategic and International Studies, Lisbon

Institute of International and European Affairs, Dublin

Institute of International Relations, Prague

Institute of International Relations and Political
Science, Vilnius University

Istituto Affari Internazionali, Rome

Latvian Institute of International Affairs, Riga

Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies,
University of Malta

Netherlands Institute of International Relations
'Clingendael', The Hague

Ohrid Institute for Economic Strategies and

International Affairs, Skopje

Slovak Foreign Policy Association, Bratislava

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
(SIPRI)

University of Tartu

On the project

Due to the new treaty provisions of the Lisbon Treaty and the economic crises the enlarged EU of 27 member states is on the search for a new modus operandi while also continuing membership talks with candidate countries. The EU-27 Watch project is mapping out discourses on these and more issues in European policies all over Europe. Research institutes from all 27 member states and the four candidate countries give overviews on the discourses in their respective countries.

The reports focus on a **reporting period from December 2009 until May 2010**. This survey was conducted on the basis of a questionnaire that has been elaborated in March and April 2010. Most of the 31 reports were delivered in May 2010. This issue and all previous issues are available on the EU-27 Watch website: www.EU-27Watch.org.

The EU-27 Watch No. 9 receives significant funding from the **Otto Wolff-Foundation, Cologne**, in the framework of the *"Dialog Europa der Otto Wolff-Stiftung"*, and financial support from the **European Commission**. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Dialog Europa Otto Wolff - Stiftung

cfce Centre international
de formation européenne



Disclaimer

Institutes/authors are responsible for the content of their country reports. The publisher and editorial team cannot be held responsible for any errors, consequences arising from the use of information contained in the EU-27 Watch or its predecessors, or the content of external links on www.EU-27watch.org or in the EU-27 Watch. The content of the EU-27 Watch is protected under German copyright law. The articles of the EU-27 Watch can be printed, copied, and stored for personal, scientific, and educational use for free. Articles of the EU-27 Watch may not be used for commercial purposes. Any other reprint in other contexts is not allowed without prior permission from the publisher. For permission or any other question concerning the use of the EU-27 Watch please contact: info@EU-27watch.org.

Editorial Team

Publisher: Prof. Dr. Mathias Jopp
Executive Editor: Dr. Katrin Böttger
Managing Editor: Julian Plottka
Editorial Staff: Daniela Caterina, Gregory Kohler,
Christoph Kornes
Layout: Matthias Jäger

Contact: info@EU-27watch.org
www.EU-27watch.org

iep Institut für
Europäische Politik

Bundesallee 23
D-10717 Berlin
Tel.: +49/30/88.91.34-0
Fax: +49/30/88.91.34-99
E-mail: info@iep-berlin.de
Internet: www.iep-berlin.de

Slovenia**Wrong EU tactics: Copenhagen only the beginning of a long process****Andreja Jerončič and Danijel Crnčec**

Copenhagen conference failed to reach expectations

While looking forward to the next conference on climate change (the sixteenth Conference of the Parties (COP) and the sixth Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP)) at the end of November 2010, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia assessed the conference in Copenhagen as the beginning of a long process. Even though the conference ended without a legally binding agreement on joint action on climate change and therefore failed to reach global and also Slovenia's expectations, it can lay the foundation for a comprehensive agreement. Therefore, it is even more important that, in the future, member states announce their commitments and show their political will and maturity in order to create an efficient global environmental management plan: "We can no longer afford to hesitate. The consequences of climate change will have devastating effects on development, the elimination of poverty, health care and security, and the political stability of countries and regions. Without timely and joint action, the costs of the consequences of climate change will greatly exceed the costs related to greenhouse gas emissions."¹

The Former Minister for Environment and Spatial Planning, Karl Erjavec, was disappointed with the agreement reached in Copenhagen, since it lacks legally binding targets, is not ambitious enough and is too general. Regarding the EU's negotiation strategy, he believed that the EU adopted the wrong tactics for negotiations in Copenhagen. Although the EU was supposed to be the most important actor in the conference; it was basically invisible.² According to Karl Erjavec, the EU's negotiation and communication strategy has to change, especially regarding the USA and China. In order for the EU to maintain its credibility, more bilateral meetings have to be conducted with both the most and the least developed countries since the multilateral summits will not be efficient otherwise due to divergent interests. However, some improvement is seen and the agreement can serve as a good basis for future negotiations.³

The Slovenian Foundation for Sustainable Development, Umanotera,⁴ sees the Copenhagen Accord as empty and lacking substance. Moreover, not only are the goals not ambitious enough, but neither global nor national targets for reducing emissions of greenhouse gases are determined. According to Umanotera, the agreement does not meet global expectations and world leaders did not justify the public's trust. It has shown that the common goal of preventing dangerous climate change does not suffice against the power of individual national interests and the degree of distrust between states; meanwhile, the time for action is expiring. According to Greenpeace Slovenia, one of the reasons for a weak agreement is the unwillingness of the EU to use its political power to lead countries into accepting legally binding targets.⁵

The Slovenian public is also sceptical about the Copenhagen Accord; 85 percent of people participating in the survey made on Slovenian national television believe that it will not help to reduce pollution due to the fact that it is not legally binding. This demonstrates that the public in Slovenia expects legal obligations and not only promises.⁶

EU energy and climate policy

According to the Government Office of the Republic of Slovenia of Climate Changes,⁷ the EU energy and climate policy is among the most advanced in the world; therefore, its change by itself will not provide a major boost to international negotiations. The main reasons for the current impasse in negotiations lie outside the EU. The USA does not yet have a domestic legal base enabling for a comprehensive global and legally binding agreement. In addition to this, the level of trust between the developing and developed countries is very low. One of the reasons is that not all developed countries acknowledge their historic responsibility for greenhouse gas emissions and their consequences. Within the current policy, the EU still has the possibility to increase its 2020 emission reduction target from 20 to 30 percent in order to motivate other countries to set comparable targets. What the EU may

want to change is the position of the second commitment period of the Kyoto protocol. Since a globally comprehensive legally binding agreement is not very likely in the next few years, the possibility of extending the Kyoto Protocol beyond 2012 should be kept open. This would improve the level of trust in relation to the developing countries and put pressure on the USA.⁸

The global agreement within UNFCCC assessed as the best strategy

“Global agreement within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is the best option to securing global combat against climate change based on the principle of shared but differentiated responsibility.”⁹ However, the Copenhagen Summit has shown that such an agreement may take more time and may not reach the level of effort required to stabilise climate change at the temperature increase of 2°C. Therefore, in order to improve international and bilateral cooperation, speed up the implementation of climate mitigation and adaptation measures, and in turn facilitate the achievement of a global agreement, alternative strategies need to be pursued. One such strategy is to perform well on the fast start financing agreed on in Copenhagen and to develop cooperation on measures with interested countries. A good example of this is the Slovenian participation in the Paris-Oslo process on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) and the Western Balkans Forum on Climate Change.¹⁰

According to Lučka Kajfež Bogataj,¹¹ a renowned Slovenian climatologist, one of the reasons for the failure of the conference in Copenhagen is that the Kyoto idea itself has died. The concept of binding reduction goals that are supervised by the UN is outdated because the global economy is so intertwined. “Today, almost half of the emissions that are caused by China go at the expense of manufacturing products for the Western world. How can we then prescribe China to cut its emissions, if we are causing them with our demand?”¹² However, she believes that it is better to fight climate change in a global context, i.e., in the context of the UN, than to let countries set their own targets.

Financial assistance has to be available to the developing countries

The summit confirmed the substantial differences in the views and negotiating positions between the developed and the developing countries. Some of the fast-growing economies lacked the necessary understanding for the less-developed countries, where the consequences of climate change mean no less than the difference between their existence and disappearance.¹³ The position of the Ministry for Environment and Spatial Planning on financing mitigation and adaptation efforts in developing countries is that the measures for reducing emissions in the framework of the global climate agreement have to be based on the historical responsibility for the emissions of greenhouse gases and the financial capability of individual states. For the reduction of global emissions to be successful, it is necessary that the developing countries also limit and later on reduce their emissions. However, it needs to be taken into account that the developed states are the ones most responsible for the current situation and, therefore, have to bear the greatest burden. The financial and technological assistance along with the assistance for building capacities has to be assured to the developing countries and this help has to be sufficient and predictable. The EU as an entity has to contribute its fair share to this assistance according to two criteria: the capability of payment and the share of emissions. Slovenia is also supportive for the earlier financing, i.e., before the beginning of the second commitment period (2010-2012).¹⁴

¹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Press statement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Samuel Žbogar, on the Copenhagen Summit, 22 December 2010, available at: <http://www.mzz.gov.si/nc/en/tools/cns/news/article/6/%2026391/36746f22d9/> (last access: 15 May 2010).

² STA: Erjavec: Kobenhavn demokratična anarhija; taktika EU napačna (Erjavec: Copenhagen is democratic anarchy: the EU tactic is misguided), 22 December 2010, available at: <http://www.sta.si/vest.php?s=s&id=1462739&q=ERJAV+RAZO%C4%8CAR> (last access: 16 May 2010).

³ STA: Erjavec: EU mora spremeniti podnebno taktiko glede ZDA in Kitajske (Erjavec: EU must change climate tactic concerning USA and China), 16 January 2010, available at: <http://www.sta.si/vest.php?s=s&id=1469925> (last access: 15 May 2010).

⁴ The Slovenian Foundation for Sustainable Development – Umanotera: Sporočilo za javnost ob zaključku podnebnih pogajanj v Kopenhavnu (Press release at the end of the climate negotiations in Copenhagen), 19 December 2009, available at: <http://www.umanotera.org/index.php?node=178> (last access: 15 May 2010).

⁵ STA: Nad dogovorom v Kopenhavnu razočarane tudi nevladne organizacije. (NGOs also disappointed with the agreement in Copenhagen), 19 December 2010, available at: <http://www.sta.si/vest.php?s=r&id=1461744&pr=1> (last access: 18 May 2010).

⁶ Mmc.rtvsl.si: Anketa (Survey), 26. December 2010, available at: http://www.rtvsl.si/modload.php&c_mod=poll&op=polls&func=list&c_menu=23&c_parent=23&page=4 (last access: 15 May 2010).

⁷ Jernej Stritih, Director of the Government Office of the Republic of Slovenia of Climate Changes: Written comments to the EU-27 Watch Questionnaire 2010.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Mladina: Intervju: Lučka Kajfež Bogataj, klimatologinja (Interview: Lučka Kajfež Bogataj, climatologist), 7 May 2010, available at: http://www.mladina.si/tehdnik/200901/dr_lucka_kajfez_bogataj_klimatologinja (last access: 18 May 2010).

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Press statement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Samuel Žbogar, on the Copenhagen Summit, 22 December 2010, available at: <http://www.mzz.gov.si/nc/en/tools/cns/news/article/6/%2026391/36746f22d9/> (last access: 15 May 2010).

¹⁴ Ministry for Environment and Spatial Planning: Stališča Republike Slovenije za konferenco o podnebni spremembi v Kopenhavnu od 7. do 18. decembra 2009 (Position of the Republic of Slovenia on the conference on climate change in Copenhagen from 7 to 18 December), available at: http://www.vlada.si/fileadmin/dokumenti/si/projekti/2009/podnebne/konferenca_kopenhagen_stalisca_Slovenije.pdf (last access: 15 May 2010).

Questionnaire for EU-27 Watch, No. 9

Reporting period December 2009 until May 2010 – Deadline for country reports 21 May

All questions refer to the position/assessment of your country's government, opposition, political parties, civil society organisations, pressure groups, press/media, and public opinion. Please name sources wherever possible!

1. Implementation of the Lisbon Treaty

On the 1 December 2009 the EU-reform ended with the entering into force of the Lisbon Treaty. However, the new treaty provisions still have to be implemented. Some procedures and conditions have to be determined. In other cases, procedures, power relations, and decision-making mechanisms will change due to the new provisions.

- How is the work of the new President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, assessed in your country? Which changes to the role of the rotating council presidency are expected?
- How is the work of the new High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Catherine Ashton, assessed in your country? Please take into particular consideration both her role within the European Commission and her relationship to the Council of the European Union.
- On 25 March 2010 a "Proposal for a Council Decision establishing the organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service" was presented. How is this concept perceived in your country? Which alternatives are discussed?
- On 31 March 2010 the European Commission presented a proposal defining the rules and procedures for the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI). What are the expectations for the ECI in your country? What are the various positions concerning the rules and procedures?

2. Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy

The European Commission has given its opinion on Iceland's application for EU-membership and a decision from the Council is expected before the end of June. Croatia seems to have settled its border dispute with Slovenia. Against this background:

- Which countries does your country expect to become members of the European Union in the next enlargement round? What are the opinions in your country on the membership of these countries?
- How are the membership perspectives of those countries discussed, which are not expected to become a member in the next enlargement round?

The Eastern Partnership and the Union for the Mediterranean were the last major projects dealing with the European neighbourhood:

- How are these projects assessed in your country?

3. European economic policy and the financial and economic crisis

The European Council agreed on 25/26 March on the key elements of the Europe 2020 strategy, the successor of the Lisbon strategy. While not being on the formal agenda the economic and financial situation in Greece was discussed. The European Council agreed on a finance package combining bilateral loans from the eurozone and financing through the International Monetary Fund.

- How is the finance package for Greece assessed in your country? Are there any opinions on the process, how the agreement on the package was reached?
- Which lessons should be drawn from the Greek case for a reform of the Stability and Growth Pact?
- How is the idea of "a strong coordination of economic policies in Europe" perceived in your country? What concepts of an European economic governance are discussed in your country and which role do they assign to the Euro group?
- How is the Europe 2020 strategy discussed in your country? What are the priorities for the Europe 2020 strategy from your country's perspective?

4. Climate and energy policy

The climate conference in Copenhagen took note of the Copenhagen Accord but did not reach a binding agreement. The next conference of the parties (COP 16 & CMP 6) will take place at the end of November 2010.

- How is the Copenhagen conference assessed in your country? Please take into consideration the negotiation strategy of European Union and the results of the conference.
- Does the European Union need to change its own energy and climate policy in order to give a new impulse to the international negotiations?
- Is a global agreement within the UNFCCC the best strategy to fight climate change? If not, which alternative strategy should the European Union follow?
- What is your country's position on financing mitigation and adaptation efforts in developing countries?

5. Current issues and discourses in your country

Which other topics and discourses are highly salient in your country but not covered by this questionnaire?