

Dobriansky talking points (obtained by ExxonSecrets.org through FOIA request)

UNCLASSIFIED

200113080



United States Department of State

Washington, D. C. 20520

02

JUN 20 2001

RELEASED IN FULL

BRIEFING MEMORANDUM

UNCLASSIFIED

S/S

TO: G - Under Secretary Dobriansky

FROM: OES - Ken Brill, Acting *Ken*

SUBJECT: Your Meeting with members of the Global Climate Coalition, June 21, 2001, 9:10 - 9:50 a.m.

On Thursday morning you will speak to members of the Global Climate Coalition (GCC), a group formed a number of years ago to coordinate the participation of business and industry in domestic and international climate change policy making. GCC members are completely supportive of the Administration's position on climate change and the rejection of the Kyoto Protocol.

Our objectives are:

- To emphasize the Administration's commitment to develop a realistic and effective response to climate change;
- To brief members on the status of the climate change policy review and principles important to policy development; and
- To solicit GCC ideas on alternative to Kyoto as part of continuing dialogue with friends and allies:

GCC participants, some of whom are scientific experts, will state that they are 100% behind the remarks articulated by the President on climate change policy. They will be greatly interested in further elaboration of the Administration's domestic and international climate change policy. In general, GCC favors voluntary actions, flexible market-based mechanisms and the development of cost-effective technologies. They will want to know our intentions for the resumed session of COP6.

Attachments:

- Tab 1 - Talking points
- Tab 2 - Scenario
- Tab 3 - GCC Action Agenda and members

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE
 REVIEW AUTHORITY: JOHN L. MILLS
 DATE/CASE ID: 03 MAY 2004 200302595

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

O2A

RELEASED IN FULL

Talking Points

Climate Change is a serious problem:

- Administration seeks realistic and effective policies.

Protocol was not appropriate response:

- No signal whatsoever that developing countries would have eventually participated.
- Potentially too costly and would never have been ratified. Better to start over now rather than continue charade.

Future constructs:

- Hold to Principles - response must be global, reasoned and flexible; include market incentives and incentives for technological innovation; sustain economic growth.
- Protect U.S. interests in the international negotiations.
- Guard against trade sanctions as means to force Protocol upon the United States.

Solicit views in developing an effective and market-based response:

- POTUS rejected Kyoto, in part, based on input from you.
- POTUS believes, however, we need to show leadership on this issue to advance U.S. domestic and international policy objectives.
- Interested in hearing from you, what type of international alternatives to Kyoto would you support?

UNCLASSIFIED

Randy Randol's February 6, 2001, fax to the Bush team calling for Watson's dismissal (obtained by Natural Resources Defense Council through FOIA request)

FEB-06-2001 10:12

EXXONMOBIL WASH DC

Facsimile Cover Sheet

TO: **John Howard**
Office: CEQ
FAX: **202.456.2710**
Telephone: 202.456.6540

FROM: **Randy Randol**
Company: ExxonMobil - Washington Office
FAX: **202.862.0267** (Backup: 202.862.0268)
Telephone: 202.862.0220 (Backup: 202.862.0223)
E-Mail: arthur.g.randol@exxon.com

A. G. (Randy) Randol III, Ph.D.
Senior Environmental Advisor

ExxonMobil

Exxon Mobil Corporation
2001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, District of Columbia 20006-1813
202 862 0220 Telephone
202 862 0267 Facsimile
arthur.g.randol@exxon.com

Date/Time: 6 Feb 2001, 10:00 a.m.

Pages including Cover: 18

Regarding: Bush Team for IPCC Negotiations

Attached is a brief memo outlining the issues related to the on-going IPCC negotiations on the Third Assessment Report. I have also attached other material that may be useful to you.

I will call to discuss the recommendations regarding the team that can better represent the Bush Administration interests until key appointments and re-assessments are made.

Randy

Global Climate Science-Issues for 2001

A. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)

1. The IPCC is on schedule to issue in late September 2001 its Third Assessment Report (TAR), composed of three Working Group Reports on the science, impacts and mitigation of climate change and a Synthesis Report. The IPCC is headed by Robert Watson, an American who is also the chief science person at the World Bank (Director, Environment Dept.) Watson was hand picked by Al Gore and served in the Clinton/Gore White House Office of Science and Technology policy. His tenure at the IPCC ends with the completion of the TAR. However, he could be extended at an IPCC session this year or next.

During the Hague meeting in November, Watson presented a sneak preview of the Third Assessment Report with the following caveat "None of the conclusions presented in this report are taken from the TAR, but are consistent with the draft conclusions, which are subject to change until final government approval and acceptance early next year." His statement belied his real intent, which was to get media coverage of his views before there was a chance for the process to challenge his personal agenda.

Issue: Can Watson be replaced now at the request of the U.S.?

The Working Group Reports are prepared by scientists, economists, engineers, and others, including some persons from industry and environmental organizations. Each report includes a "Summary for Policy Makers" (SPM) that is approved by IPCC governments by consensus in a line-by-line review at a Working Group session with the underlying report (approx. 1000 pages) accepted by the Group at that session.

In the case of the Working Group I report on science, the Group met in plenary in Shanghai, China on January 17-20, approved the SPM, and accepted the report. The US delegation (Moitke lead) was satisfied to raise no objections on the tone and content of the report. To avoid accountability to the Bush Administration, the meeting actually ran until 1:00 a.m. on January 21 which was exactly January 20, 12:00 noon in the U.S. The U.S. was represented by Clinton/Gore carry-overs with aggressive agendas:

1. State Department: **Jeff Moitke**, Deputy Director, Global Change Office, Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (and Deputy Chief of Mission, Lesotho)
2. White House Office of Science and Technology Policy: **Rosina Bierbaum**, Associate Director, Environment,
3. White House U.S. Global Change Research Program: **Michael MacCracken**, Executive Director, National Assessment Coordination Office.

FEB-06-2001 10:13

EXXONMOBIL WASH DC

2029620269 P.03/16

Global Climate Science-Issues for 2001

Bierbaum and MacCracken were both actively involved in the production of the US National Assessment that has been roundly criticized for its political and scientific bias. The National Assessment was driven by a political schedule to help the Gore campaign. Several controlled leaks were used to get maximum media attention since Congressional oversight forced a delay in the release of the report.

Issue: Have Bierbaum and MacCracken been removed from their positions of influence?

Issue: What was the U.S. position on the WG1 Report? Did it reflect the comments received?

While the SPM was written to highlight the "human fingerprint", it also states that: "Further research is required to improve the ability to detect, attribute and understand climate change, to reduce uncertainties, and to project future climate changes."

According to an AP story, Watson, in commenting on the report, which was released by the Group, but which has not yet been accepted by the full IPCC, said:

"The United States is way off meeting its targets," said Watson. "A country like China has done more, in my opinion, than a country like the United States to move forward in economic development while remaining environmentally sensitive."

China, of course, has no commitments under the Kyoto Protocol and its greenhouse gas emissions are growing and will soon exceed those of the U.S.

2. Working Group II is scheduled to meet on the "Impacts of Climate Change" in plenary in Geneva, Switzerland, from February 12-16. Reportedly, the U.S. has submitted comments on the draft report by January 8, which was the deadline. Those comments have not been made public.

Issue: Who has reviewed those comments?

Issue: What is the U.S. position on the report?

Issue: Who will represent the U.S. at this meeting?

Global Climate Science-Issues for 2001

3. Working Group III is scheduled to meet on "Mitigation of Climate Change" in plenary in Accra, Ghana, from February 28 to March 3. Government comments on that draft report/SPM are due to be submitted by January 29.

Issue: Who has reviewed those comments?

Issue: What is the U.S. position on the report?

Issue: Who will represent the U.S.? What is U.S. position?

4. On April 4-6, 2001, the full IPCC is scheduled to meet in plenary in Nairobi, Kenya, to accept by consensus the results of the three Working Groups.

Issue: Will the U.S. revisit the Working Group I comments of the Clinton/Gore representatives?

Issue: Who will represent the U.S. and what will be the U.S. position?

Issue: Can this report be deferred until the US has provided updated input(30-45 days)?

5. The last element of the TAR is the Synthesis Report (SR) that is still being drafted under Robert Watson's control. A draft of the SR, including its SPM, is to be sent out for simultaneous expert and Government review and comment with a deadline of May 29. A second draft is scheduled to be given to Governments only for their review and comment on July 6 with a deadline of August 31. The IPCC plenary will meet in London from September 24-29 to adopt/approve the Synthesis Report by consensus.

Issue: Can this report be deferred at least 45 days?

Thereafter the entire TAR will be released(in time for political use at COP-7).

COP-6, held in The Hague last November, ended without finishing its work on implementation of the Kyoto Protocol and with an understanding that it would meet again in 2001, but with no date established. The SBI and SBSTA are scheduled to meet in Bonn, Germany, from May 21-June 1. Some Parties want COP-6 to reconvene during that time. COP-7 is scheduled to meet October 29-November 9 in Marrakech, Morocco, together with the subsidiary bodies.

FEB-06-2001 10:14

EXXONMOBIL WASH DC

Global Climate Science-Issues for 2001

Recommendations:

1. Restructure the U.S. attendance at upcoming IPCC meetings to assure none of the Clinton/Gore proponents are involved in any decisional activities.

a. Appoint **Dr. John Christy**, University of Alabama-Huntsville(Lead Author-Working Group I) as science lead for the balance of the IPCC process. Phone: 256.961.7763
This replaces Bierbaum and MacCracken.

b. Appoint **Dr. Richard Lindzen**, MIT,(Lead Author-Working Group I) as a co-lead to conduct an immediate review of the comments on the Working Group reports(I, II and III) and to review the US comments to be submitted(II, III). Phone: 617.253.2432

c. Detail **Dr. Joe Friday**, National Research Council-Board on Atmospheric Sciences and Climate(Coordinated the "Research Pathways for the Next Decade" report that the Clinton Admin tried to bury), to work with Christy/Lindzen. Phone: 202.334.3512

d. Detail someone from the State Dept to work under the direction of Christy/Lindzen for the "consensus negotiations". This replaces Mottke.

2. Request that the April 4-6 full IPCC meeting be deferred at least 30 days until a re-assessment of US input can be made.

3. Request that all action related to the Third Assessment Report is deferred until the IPCC process is complete (30-45 days). This must include the Watson release of the draft Synthesis Report.

4. Explore the possibility of asking Speaker Hastert to make Dr. Harlan Watson, Hse Science Committee, available to work with the team. Dr. Watson has been recommended for the Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans position.

Sample mark up of Draft Strategic Plan for the Climate Change Science Program, p. 20,
by Philip Cooney, Chief of Staff, White House Council of Environmental Quality, October 2002.
(provided by Rick Piltz, Climate Science Watch)

DRAFT FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

1 Representation of polar climate in climate models is not as advanced as that of the lower
2 latitudes. This arises in part because of the limited data available for model development,
3 refinement, and validation, and a limited understanding of the processes at work. An
4 enhanced observation system and the use of existing and future satellite data sets should
5 improve the representation of these areas in climate models, which is necessary to accurately
6 predict future climate changes and assess the potential for these changes to be abrupt.

7
8 Warming temperatures ^{will} also affect Arctic land areas. As continuous permafrost areas
9 become discontinuous and discontinuous areas experience complete summer thawing, the
10 hydrology of northern land areas will be substantially altered. Many of the wetlands,
11 marshes, and perched lakes in the Arctic are underlain by permanent ice. The reduction
12 of this ice ~~will~~ ^{would} lead to the infiltration of the water into the soil and widespread changes in
13 vegetation patterns. The release of greenhouse gases such as CH₄ associated with
14 wetlands will expand in areas where meltwater resulting from deeper and longer thaw
15 periods does not have a natural drainage path to the ocean.

16
17 Warming ~~will~~ ^{would} also cause reductions in mountain glaciers and advance the timing of the melt
18 of mountain snow packs in polar regions. In turn, runoff rates will change and flood
19 potential ~~will~~ ^{would} be altered in ways that are currently not well understood. There will be
20 significant shifts in the seasonality of runoff that will have serious impacts on native
21 populations that rely on fishing and hunting for their livelihood. These changes will be
22 further complicated by shifts in precipitation regimes and a possible intensification and
23 increased frequency of extreme hydrologic events. Reducing the uncertainties in current
24 understanding of the relationships between climate change and Arctic hydrology is critical
25 for evaluating the potential impacts of climate change on Arctic communities and their
26 infrastructure. Further, a better understanding of these relationships may allow the
27 development of monitoring procedures that use changes in the Arctic as a signal of the
28 progress of global climate warming.

29
30 **RESEARCH NEEDS**

- 31 • Determination of basin-wide Arctic sea ice thickness, particularly in the marginal seas for
- 32 a period sufficient to determine if observed historic changes are present across the basin.
- 33 • Modeling of observed sea ice changes to determine the relative role of transport versus
- 34 net loss.
- 35 • Establishing the mass balance and ice dynamic regime of the Thwaites/Pine Island
- 36 drainage system of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and assessing its stability through
- 37 observationally-constrained models.
- 38 • Assessment of the mass balance of the Greenland ice sheet, its variability, and its
- 39 potential contributions to near-term sea level rise.
- 40 • Measurement of permafrost temperatures and thaw patterns in sufficient detail for five
- 41 years to establish regional thaw patterns.

42
43 **PRODUCTS AND PAYOFFS**

- 44 • Reduced uncertainty in estimates of the future state of the Arctic Ocean, its impact on
- 45 global climate, and its navigability for strategic and commercial purposes.

*straying from
research
strategy into
speculative
findings findings
here.*

Draft Date: October 21, 2002 20

Email from Myron Ebell, Competitive Enterprise Institute, to Phil Cooney
(obtained by ExxonSecrets.org through FOIA request)



Myron Ebell <mebell@cei.org>
06/03/2002 05:08:05 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Phil Cooney/CEQ/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Phil, thanks for calling and

Dear Phil,

Thanks for calling and asking for our help. I know you're in crisis mode, but from our end it is a most welcome change from the Administration's SOP, which is to tell conservatives to stop bothering them and to shut up. So it's nice to know we're needed once in a while. I want to help you cool things down, but after consulting with the team, I think that what we can do is limited until there is an official statement from the Administration repudiating the report to the UNFCCC and disavowing large parts of it.

As I said, we made the decision this morning to do as much as we could to deflect criticism by blaming EPA for freelancing. It seems to me that the folks at EPA are the obvious fall guys, and we would only hope that the fall guy (or gal) should be as high up as possible. I have done several interviews and have stressed that the president needs to get everyone rowing in the same direction. Perhaps tomorrow we will call for Whitman to be fired. I know that that doesn't sound like much help, but it seems to me that our only leverage to push you in the right direction is to drive a wedge between the President and those in the Administration who think that they are serving the president's best interests by pushing this rubbish.

The references to the National Assessment in the report are most hurtful to us because we dropped our lawsuit last September 6th after receiving a written assurance that the National Assessment did not represent "policy positions or official statements of the U. S. government." The previous communication from the U. S. government to the UNFCCC was a detailed criticism of the IPCC's Third Assessment Report that reflected that agreement and also implied a disavowal of the National Assessment. So the new transmittal to the UNCCC looks to us much like it looks to the New York Times.

So I'm willing and ready to help, but it won't be possible to do much without some sort of backtracking from the Administration. Unless that occurs, then you have handed an awful lot of ammunition to Jim Jeffords, and the only way we will be able to fight him and all his allies in the Congress is to get much more strident and noisy. Even if the Administration does move quickly to get back on the right side of the issue, it may be too late to save our side in the Senate from being squashed. If it were only this one little disaster we could all lock arms and weather the assault, but this Administration has managed, whether through incompetence or intention, to create one disaster after another and then to expect its allies to clean up the mess. I don't know whether we have the resources to clean up this one.

Best,
Myron.