



## Press Statement

# ”Fukuda Vision is Insufficient for a positive progress at Toyako G8 Summit or at Copenhagen

June 9, 2008

2008 G8 Summit NGO Forum, Environmental Unit

The “Fukuda Vision” announced today was disappointing in that it was totally insufficient to make progress at the Toyako G8 Summit and contribute to an agreement on the post 2012 international framework to prevent global warming at Copenhagen.

### 1. Having indicated Japan’s 2050 long-term target could be highly evaluated

It is a great step forward that Japan finally indicated its own 2050 long-term target in the range of 60-80% from current level. It will also be a step forward to an agreement on a global “shared vision” to “halve the global emissions by 2050”.

### 2. However, the lack of a mid-term goal was crucial

However, the mid-term goal was not presented and is totally deficient. In order to minimize the impacts of global warming, a mid-term goal is essential. What we need now is an indicator of what we do now, and the mid-term goal is what we exactly need now. Global warming is accelerating in an unprecedented speed, and to slow the speed and stabilize the GHG emission to a safe level all depends on what we do in the next 5-10 years.

Further, if Japan presents its mid-term goal as a developed nation, it would indicate how Japan is taking climate change seriously, and would send signals to the new emerging developing countries to take their part just as what Japan is seeking for: a framework where everyone participates.

But Fukuda’s speech was on the contrary. It even compared to EU’s commitment to a 20% reduction by 2020 by saying, if the baseline is 2005, EU’s 20% target would be around 14%, which is similar to that of Japan. EU has made its reduction of about 6% by 2005, and that is why the target for 2020 may be 14% if compared to 2005. But Japan has increased its emissions since 1990, and the recent findings by METI had indicated that Japan could reduce about 14% including sinks from 2005 base year. This is totally different if compared from 1990, and the figure had been only 4% without sinks. So, Fukuda was playing number tricks to mislead the public by changing the baselines.

### 3. Bottom Up Approach would not be enough for a Mid-term Goal

If the mid-term goal will be set by a bottom up approach by sectors, there will be a gap between the top down approach from what the science has indicated as necessary reduction amount for the earth. This was acknowledged at the Environment Ministers’ Meeting held in the end of May in Kobe, and written in the Chair’s Summary that this gap “must be bridged to ensure environmental integrity”. Consequently, the mid-term goal should be decided based on the recommendation by IPCC to be in the range of “25-40% reduction from 1990 levels for industrialized countries” which Japan agreed to at Bali last December.

### 4. Enhancing Domestic Actions

The long-term target which Fukuda announced has sent a signal to the Japanese domestic policies. Especially that he referred to “emissions trading scheme” and that the government would start an experimental phase in autumn is a step forward. If the scheme is really to be introduced, it would be a strong signal to Toyako G8 Summit that Japan is serious in making Japan a Low Carbon Society. However, if the scheme is to be a “Japanese type” scheme which he mentioned, it may be an extension of the current Voluntary Action of the Nippon Keidanren, and would only be a trade of voluntary actions, or intensity targets and not a trade of reduction amounts or emission allowances. In such a case, the scheme would again be entirely different to the global standard and would be completely insufficient as a climate policy.

### 5. What we really need is a Mid-Term Target

In order to transform the Japanese industries whose intention is only to avoid absolute reduction amounts, we really need a mid-term goal. Without such a goal, there would be no signal on what we need to do today, and tomorrow. Japan cannot change into a low carbon society. If Japan would announce its mid-term goal at the

Toyako G8 Summit, it would accelerate Japan's domestic climate policy and would enable the Japanese government officials at climate negotiations to be positive to numerical targets and advance the negotiation to a post 2012 international framework to be agreed at Copenhagen in 2009. That is exactly what is required of Japan as the host country for the G8 Summit.

#### 6. Conclusion

If the Japanese government continues to talk politics based on the industry sectors' intentions, based only on voluntary actions, we cannot expect for a progress at Toyako G8 Summit, and Japan to contribute to the UNFCCC international negotiations in a positive manner for a meaningful agreement for a post-2012 framework at Copenhagen.

Yurika Ayukawa  
Vice Chair of "2008 G8 Summit NGO Forum"  
Mika Ohbayashi  
Environment Unit Leader of the "2008 G8 Summit NGO Forum"