

Hartmann, Lorraine

RELEASE IN PART B5, B6

From: Talley, Trigg
Sent: Friday, November 21, 2014 5:46 PM
To: Stern, Todd D (S/SECC); Sierawski, Clare S
Cc: Wagner, David Vance
Subject: Re: Congratulations and thank you

[Redacted]

B5

From: Stern, Todd D (S/SECC)
Sent: Friday, November 21, 2014 05:37 PM
To: Sierawski, Clare S; Talley, Trigg
Cc: Wagner, David Vance
Subject: RE: Congratulations and thank you

Trigg - [Redacted]

B5

This email is UNCLASSIFIED.

REVIEW AUTHORITY: David Van Valkenburg, Senior Reviewer

DECONTROLLED

From: Sierawski, Clare S
Sent: Friday, November 21, 2014 5:35 PM
To: Stern, Todd D (S/SECC); Talley, Trigg
Subject: RE: Congratulations and thank you

[Redacted]

B5

US-China: Going in the right direction, but far and fast enough?

November 13, 2014 | [E2C2](#), [Mitigation action](#), [Uncategorized](#) | Tagged: [China](#), [INDC](#), [US](#) | Posted by: [Harald](#) | [no comments](#)

The US and Chinese Presidents announced on 11 Nov 2014 that

- the US is to cut net greenhouse gas emissions 26-28% below 2005 levels by 2025
- China is to peak CO2 emissions around 2030, with the intention to peak earlier, and to increase the non-fossil fuel share of all energy to around 20% by 2030.

The announcements were a concerted move by the two largest economies in the world, and so has undoubted political significance. They have potential to create momentum and promote collective action, rather than a tenor of 'I will if you will'. But what do these announcements add up to, assessed against science and equity?

The question is whether we should pop the champagne corks, hailing this as a game-changing announcement. When assessing the contributions more closely, including the numbers, it does not look at good. Particularly when assessed against the requirements of science and equity. That is a very different metric to assessing this