



DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE DE L'ADMINISTRATION
ET DE LA MODERNISATION

DIRECTION DES RESSOURCES HUMAINES

Sous-direction de la Formation et des Concours

Bureau des Concours et Examens professionnels
RH4B

CONCOURS EXTERNE POUR L'ACCÈS À L'EMPLOI DE TRADUCTEUR AU TITRE DE L'ANNÉE 2018

ÉPREUVES ÉCRITES D'ADMISSIBILITÉ

5 février 2018

Combinaison linguistique 2 – A : français B : anglais C : arabe littéral
Combinaison linguistique 4 – A : français B : anglais C : espagnol

NOTE DE SYNTHÈSE

*Rédaction en langue A d'une note de synthèse
à partir d'un dossier constitué de textes à caractère politique ou économique se rapportant à
des faits contemporains, rédigés en langue B.*

(750 mots avec une tolérance de plus ou moins 10%)

Durée : 4 heures

Coefficient : 5

Toute note inférieure à 8 sur 20 est éliminatoire.

SUJET

Ce dossier comporte 19 pages (page de garde et sommaire non compris).

À l'aide du dossier ci-joint, exposez les motivations et les conséquences possibles du retrait
annoncé des États-Unis de l'accord de Paris.

Composition du dossier

- Document 1 :** *Statement by President Trump on the Paris Climate Accord*, The White House - Office of the Press Secretary, June 1, 2017
- Document 2 :** *Trump's pulling the US out of the Paris climate agreement could be disastrous for the economy*, Business Insider, 1 June 2017
- Document 3 :** *How America Stacks Up When It Comes to Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, Smithsonian, June 2, 2017
- Document 4 :** *What to Expect as U.S. Leaves Paris Climate Accord*, New York Times, June 1, 2017
- Document 5 :** *The Paris deal pullout is more damaging to the US than the climate*, The Guardian, 1 June 2017
- Document 6 :** *China and EU strengthen promise to Paris deal with US poised to step away*, The Guardian, 1 June 2017
- Document 7 :** *The Climate Effect of the Trump Administration*, World Resources Institute, December 06, 2017
- Document 8 :** *Trump's Paris Agreement withdrawal: What it means and what comes next*, Brookings, June 1, 2017

SUJET

Ce dossier comporte 19 pages (page de garde et sommaire non compris).

À l'aide du dossier ci-joint, exposez les motivations et les conséquences possibles du retrait annoncé des États-Unis de l'accord de Paris.

Composition du dossier

- Document 1 :** *Statement by President Trump on the Paris Climate Accord, The White House - Office of the Press Secretary, June 1, 2017*
- Document 2 :** *Trump's pulling the US out of the Paris climate agreement could be disastrous for the economy, Business Insider, 1 June 2017*
- Document 3 :** *How America Stacks Up When It Comes to Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Smithsonian, June 2, 2017*
- Document 4 :** *What to Expect as U.S. Leaves Paris Climate Accord, New York Times, June 1, 2017*
- Document 5 :** *The Paris deal pullout is more damaging to the US than the climate, The Guardian, 1 June 2017*
- Document 6 :** *China and EU strengthen promise to Paris deal with US poised to step away, The Guardian, 1 June 2017*
- Document 7 :** *The Climate Effect of the Trump Administration, World Resources Institute, December 06, 2017*
- Document 8 :** *Trump's Paris Agreement withdrawal: What it means and what comes next, Brookings, June 1, 2017*

The White House - Office of the Press Secretary - June 01, 2017

Statement by President Trump on the Paris Climate Accord

THE PRESIDENT: Before we discuss the Paris Accord, I'd like to begin with an update on our tremendous -- absolutely tremendous -- economic progress since Election Day on November 8th. The economy is starting to come back, and very, very rapidly. We've added \$3.3 trillion in stock market value to our economy, and more than a million private sector jobs. [...]

On these issues and so many more, we're following through on our commitments. And I don't want anything to get in our way. I am fighting every day for the great people of this country. Therefore, in order to fulfill my solemn duty to protect America and its citizens, the United States will withdraw from the Paris Climate Accord -- (applause) -- thank you, thank you -- but begin negotiations to reenter either the Paris Accord or a really entirely new transaction on terms that are fair to the United States, its businesses, its workers, its people, its taxpayers. So we're getting out. But we will start to negotiate, and we will see if we can make a deal that's fair. And if we can, that's great. And if we can't, that's fine. (Applause.)

As President, I can put no other consideration before the wellbeing of American citizens. The Paris Climate Accord is simply the latest example of Washington entering into an agreement that disadvantages the United States to the exclusive benefit of other countries, leaving American workers -- who I love -- and taxpayers to absorb the cost in terms of lost jobs, lower wages, shuttered factories, and vastly diminished economic production.

Thus, as of today, the United States will cease all implementation of the non-binding Paris Accord and the draconian financial and economic burdens the agreement imposes on our country. This includes ending the implementation of the nationally determined contribution and, very importantly, the Green Climate Fund which is costing the United States a vast fortune.

Compliance with the terms of the Paris Accord and the onerous energy restrictions it has placed on the United States could cost America as much as 2.7 million lost jobs by 2025 according to the National Economic Research Associates. This includes 440,000 fewer manufacturing jobs -- not what we need -- believe me, this is not what we need -- including automobile jobs, and the further decimation of vital American industries on which countless communities rely. They rely for so much, and we would be giving them so little.

According to this same study, by 2040, compliance with the commitments put into place by the previous administration would cut production for the following sectors: paper down 12 percent; cement down 23 percent; iron and steel down 38 percent; coal -- and I happen to love the coal miners -- down 86 percent; natural gas down 31 percent. The cost to the economy at this time would be close to \$3 trillion in lost GDP and 6.5 million industrial jobs, while households would have \$7,000 less income and, in many cases, much worse than that.

Not only does this deal subject our citizens to harsh economic restrictions, it fails to live up to our environmental ideals. As someone who cares deeply about the environment, which I do, I

cannot in good conscience support a deal that punishes the United States -- which is what it does -- the world's leader in environmental protection, while imposing no meaningful obligations on the world's leading polluters.

For example, under the agreement, China will be able to increase these emissions by a staggering number of years -- 13. They can do whatever they want for 13 years. Not us. India makes its participation contingent on receiving billions and billions and billions of dollars in foreign aid from developed countries. There are many other examples. But the bottom line is that the Paris Accord is very unfair, at the highest level, to the United States.

Further, while the current agreement effectively blocks the development of clean coal in America -- which it does, and the mines are starting to open up. We're having a big opening in two weeks. Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, so many places. A big opening of a brand-new mine. It's unheard of. For many, many years, that hasn't happened. They asked me if I'd go. I'm going to try.

China will be allowed to build hundreds of additional coal plants. So we can't build the plants, but they can, according to this agreement. India will be allowed to double its coal production by 2020. Think of it: India can double their coal production. We're supposed to get rid of ours. Even Europe is allowed to continue construction of coal plants.

In short, the agreement doesn't eliminate coal jobs, it just transfers those jobs out of America and the United States, and ships them to foreign countries.

This agreement is less about the climate and more about other countries gaining a financial advantage over the United States. The rest of the world applauded when we signed the Paris Agreement -- they went wild; they were so happy -- for the simple reason that it put our country, the United States of America, which we all love, at a very, very big economic disadvantage. A cynic would say the obvious reason for economic competitors and their wish to see us remain in the agreement is so that we continue to suffer this self-inflicted major economic wound. We would find it very hard to compete with other countries from other parts of the world.

We have among the most abundant energy reserves on the planet, sufficient to lift millions of America's poorest workers out of poverty. Yet, under this agreement, we are effectively putting these reserves under lock and key, taking away the great wealth of our nation -- it's great wealth, it's phenomenal wealth; not so long ago, we had no idea we had such wealth -- and leaving millions and millions of families trapped in poverty and joblessness.

The agreement is a massive redistribution of United States wealth to other countries. At 1 percent growth, renewable sources of energy can meet some of our domestic demand, but at 3 or 4 percent growth, which I expect, we need all forms of available American energy, or our country -- (applause) -- will be at grave risk of brownouts and blackouts, our businesses will come to a halt in many cases, and the American family will suffer the consequences in the form of lost jobs and a very diminished quality of life.

Even if the Paris Agreement were implemented in full, with total compliance from all nations, it is estimated it would only produce a two-tenths of one degree -- think of that; this much -- Celsius reduction in global temperature by the year 2100. Tiny, tiny amount. In fact, 14 days of carbon emissions from China alone would wipe out the gains from America -- and this is

an incredible statistic -- would totally wipe out the gains from America's expected reductions in the year 2030, after we have had to spend billions and billions of dollars, lost jobs, closed factories, and suffered much higher energy costs for our businesses and for our homes. [...]

Trump's pulling the US out of the Paris climate agreement could be disastrous for the economy - Bob Bryan, 1 June 2017

President Trump announced on Thursday that he would withdraw the US from the Paris climate accord.

The agreement, which 195 nations signed in December 2015, set a global goal to keep the planet from warming to a level that scientists say could keep the planet from launching into a tailspin of irreversible consequences.

Trump said that he planned to renegotiate the US's position in the agreement, but the exact terms are unclear.

In explaining his decision, Trump said it was in part to save US jobs, saying that the accord "handicaps the US economy."

Economists say that while there may be some positive short-term economic effects, Trump's decision to pull out of the Paris agreement and not fight to address climate change would most likely have devastating long-term economic consequences for the US and the world.

In a paper published in Nature attempting to bring together previous findings of climate change for the economy, researchers from the University of California at Berkeley and Stanford estimated that there would be serious consequences for the global economy if climate change continues at its current pace.

"If future adaptation mimics past adaptation, unmitigated warming is expected to reshape the global economy by reducing average global incomes roughly 23% by 2100 and widening global income inequality, relative to scenarios without climate change," said the paper from Marshall Burke, Solomon M. Hsiang, and Edward Miguel.

While these effects would be different in different countries around the world, the researchers estimated that US GDP between 2016 and 2099 would be 36% lower if climate trends continue, compared to a world with more stable temperatures.

This isn't to say that the other nations in the Paris accord couldn't mitigate these effects, or that Trump couldn't undertake other measures to decrease carbon emissions.

In addition to the macroeconomic effects, Trump said that the move would help to preserve jobs at power plants, coal mines, and other fossil-fuel-generating industries.

While there are still a large number of workers in the traditional fossil-fuel industries according to the Department of Energy, the number of Americans employed in energy-efficient and renewable-energy jobs is also huge.

For instance, 1.1 million Americans work in electric-power generation through traditional fossil fuels, but renewables follow closely with 880,000 employees.

Additionally, from a long-term economic perspective, shifting toward renewable energy would likely be more beneficial for job growth.

The Department of Energy said the renewable sector is booming with solar employment growing by 25% and wind-generation employment growing by 32% in 2016.

Add on the fact that 2.2 million people are employed in the "the design, installation, and manufacture of Energy Efficiency products and services," and it's clear that combatting climate change is a big employment driver for the US.

Morgan Stanley equity strategist Eva Zlotnicka said the job losses in fossil fuels would likely accelerate regardless of Trump's policies.

"As we've noted, economics are still driving, not regulation," said Zlotnicka in a note to clients after Trump's announcement. "Our energy commodities team's fundamental analysis of power generation economics shows that longer term coal cannot compete with natural gas or renewables (even on an unsubsidized basis)."

Given much of this research, a large number of business leaders spoke out against Trump's rumored decision before his announcement.

Twenty-eight major US companies — including Apple, Gap, Facebook, Google, Microsoft, and Morgan Stanley — took out a full-page ad in The New York Times asking Trump to stay in the Paris agreement.

Both ExxonMobil and ConocoPhillips, two of the largest energy companies in the world, have also expressed support for the Paris accord.

General Electric CEO Jeff Immelt tweeted his disappointment after Trump's announcement on Thursday.

"Disappointed with today's decision on the Paris Agreement," Immelt said. "Climate change is real. Industry must now lead and not depend on government."

How America Stacks Up When It Comes to Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Maya Wei-Haas, June 2, 2017

The 2015 Paris climate agreement represents one of the first attempts at a truly global response to the threat of climate change. For nearly two years, the pact has linked almost every country in the joint effort to cut back greenhouse gas emissions and stave off human-influenced climate change. As of yesterday, that effort does not include the United States.

President Donald Trump announced on Thursday that the U.S.—a major player on the climate scene and one of the treaty’s de facto leaders—would be pulling out of the historic pact. “In order to fulfill my solemn duty to protect America and its citizens, the United States will withdraw from the Paris Climate Accord,” he announced at a press conference at the White House Rose Garden.

The controversial decision makes the U.S. one of just three countries that are not part of the voluntary agreement, the other two being Syria and Nicaragua. It also reverses the past administration’s efforts on climate change, following recent actions to begin dismantling Obama-era climate protection policies.

But it doesn’t take America out of the climate equation. No matter how you crunch the numbers, the U.S. still ranks among the top greenhouse gas emitters in the world. Based on data from the European Commission, Joint Research Center/Netherlands Environmental Agency and Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research, the top five emitters in what’s known as “carbon dioxide equivalents” (CO₂ eq) released in 2012 are as follows:

1. China (12.45 million kilotons CO₂ eq)
2. United States (6.34 million kilotons CO₂ eq)
3. India (3.00 million kilotons CO₂ eq)
4. Brazil (2.99 million kilotons CO₂ eq)
5. Russian Federation (2.80 million kilotons CO₂ eq)

Importantly, these numbers are based on CO₂ *equivalents*. That means they include all the greenhouse gases a country emits—including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide and fluorinated compounds—to reflect the fact that warming results from a combination of gases released from both natural and human activities. By measuring emissions in equivalents, scientists can take into account the differing impacts of each of these gases on the atmosphere. [...]

Under the Obama administration, the U.S. had committed to a 26 to 29 percent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions below its 2005 level by 2025. However, as an analysis from four European research organizations known as the Climate Action Tracker points out, without any further action, the country will miss its commitment “by a large margin.” One of the most significant steps in U.S. climate actions was the Clean Power Plan, announced in August 2015. But the EPA has been ordered to review and possibly revise this plan, which mean significant challenges lay ahead in meeting emissions targets.

Overall, global CO₂ emissions have slowed since 2012, which could reflect changes in the world's economy and investments in energy efficiency. Both China and India—the two other leading greenhouse gas emitters—are well on track to meeting their emission goals, according to the Climate Action Tracker. China in particular has taken significant steps toward shuttering coal-fired power plants and increasing its reliance on renewable energy. Experts predict that America's withdrawal from the Paris agreement gives the Chinese government the opportunity to take the lead in the fight against climate change.

What will the actual effects of America's withdrawal look like? For starters, nothing will happen immediately. The accord stipulates a four-year legal process for a country to pull out, meaning the soonest the U.S. could officially withdraw is 2020 (as news outlets have pointed out, this also means that a future U.S. president could potentially opt to stay in).

Even then, many argue that the move won't necessarily change U.S. progress toward reducing its emissions. From falling renewable energy prices to state-level commitments to continue efforts to staunch emissions, America is already working toward lowering greenhouse gasses. Others have argued that the Paris Agreement could even be stronger without U.S. participation, which—with President Trump's stated commitment to bringing back coal and reduce regulations on industry's emissions—could “water down” the treaty's goals, writes Robinson Meyer for *The Atlantic*.

Moreover, as a recent Gallup poll suggests, the American public strongly supports a continued shift away from environmentally harmful forms of energy like oil, gas and coal, with 71 percent favoring an emphasis on alternative energy sources like solar and wind. “Given the choice, the majority of Americans think protecting the environment should take precedence over developing more energy supplies, even at the risk of limiting the amount of traditional supplies the U.S. produces,” according to Gallup's website.

It is now up to the American public—as individuals, companies and communities—to take the lead in reducing their impact on the environment in whatever way they can. As David Moore, ecosystems scientist at the University of Arizona wrote on Twitter after the announcement: “Walk it off ... walk it off ... then get to work with your local school, city, or state to make the world more sustainable.”

What to Expect as U.S. Leaves Paris Climate Accord - Brad Plumer June 1, 2017

President Trump said on Thursday that the United States was officially withdrawing from the Paris climate agreement, following through on a campaign promise and defying fellow world leaders who had pleaded with him to remain a party to the pact.

The move was sure to provoke a sharp backlash from the rest of the world, and it could prove to be a major setback for international efforts to avert drastic global warming.

The world's nations had already been struggling to reduce emissions deeply enough to prevent global average temperatures from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) above preindustrial levels, the threshold deemed unacceptably risky. The Paris climate deal was meant to provide a structure to ratchet up those efforts over time. Now, the world's largest economy has clearly stated that it wants no part of that process.

The big question now is how other countries will respond to Mr. Trump's withdrawal: Do they keep pressing ahead with climate action anyway, or does the accord start to unravel without the United States? Here's a look at what happens next.

What does this mean for the United States?

The Paris climate deal, which 195 countries agreed to in 2015, was designed to work through voluntary action and peer pressure. Because it was never ratified by the Senate, the United States will face few barriers to leaving.

The Trump administration plans to invoke the accord's formal withdrawal mechanism, a winding legal process that will take four years to complete and would lead to an official exit on Nov. 4, 2020, the day after the next presidential election. A future administration could, if it chose, rejoin.

The United States would remain a party to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and could still participate in future U.N.-sponsored climate discussions. But Mr. Trump said he would not abide by any of the United States' previous commitments under the Paris agreement and would rejoin only if the accord were drastically renegotiated, an unlikely prospect.

In the meantime, the Trump administration will keep pushing to dismantle domestic climate policies, including the Clean Power Plan to curtail emissions from power plants, and various regulations on methane leaks from oil and gas operations. Those rollbacks are still far from assured, however, and environmentalists plan to challenge them in court.

Pulling out of Paris won't mean the end of all domestic efforts to address climate change. States like California and New York will keep pursuing their own programs to reduce emissions from power plants and vehicles. And the private sector is shifting toward cleaner energy regardless: Cheap natural gas and renewables will continue to drive the retirement of coal plants.

But the United States will be doing far less about global warming than it otherwise might have done. In 2015, the Obama administration vowed to cut greenhouse gas emissions 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025 as part of the Paris deal. A recent analysis by the Rhodium Group estimated that, under Mr. Trump's policies, United States emissions will now most likely fall just 15 to 19 percent below 2005 levels by 2025.

How might other countries respond to the U.S. pulling out?

Leaders in Europe, China and India have insisted that they will carry on tackling global warming without the United States. But the precise shape of future climate talks remains an open question.

One possibility is that, with the world's second-largest emitter pulling out, other countries may feel less pressure to step up their own plans to curb greenhouse gases. "Other governments and industries could say, if the United States is being less ambitious, why should we take on these extra costs?" said Elliot Diringer, executive vice president of the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions.

Meanwhile, a core part of the Paris deal involved the United States promising \$3 billion in aid to poorer countries to help them expand clean energy and adapt to droughts, sea-level rise, and other global warming calamities. The Obama administration already chipped in \$1 billion, as have other wealthy nations. But Mr. Trump has vowed to cancel all future payments, and developing nations in Africa and Asia may now prove less eager to tackle their emissions as a result.

Not everyone is so pessimistic, however. Luke Kemp, a climate policy expert at Australian National University, suggests that the shock of the United States withdrawing could spur other countries to redouble their climate efforts. "In the short term you could see a galvanizing effect," he said.

The United States could also face serious diplomatic repercussions for leaving. Europe, China and other countries may decide to withhold cooperation on issues the Trump administration cares about, like trade. In a more extreme case, other countries could threaten to impose carbon tariffs on the United States.

What does this all mean for climate change?

The 2015 Paris agreement was meant to be a first step in the long, grinding process of slowing climate change. Countries put forward individual pledges for curbing emissions and agreed to meet regularly to review and strengthen those pledges in the hopes of avoiding catastrophic warming.

Even before the Trump administration's retreat, those efforts were falling far short. Current pledges, when added up, put the planet on pace to warm 3 degrees Celsius or more above preindustrial levels, an outcome with a far greater risk of destabilizing ice sheets in Greenland and Antarctica, higher levels of sea-level rise, more destructive heat waves and droughts, and the loss of vital ecosystems like coral reefs.

Whether the world can avoid that fate may now depend on countries like China, the world's largest emitter, which is poised to assume a dominant role in future talks. China is investing

heavily in wind, solar and nuclear power in an attempt to level off its once-insatiable coal consumption. But it is unclear how far China's leaders will go in pressuring other countries to raise their ambitions. In the past, China has argued against rigorous transparency standards to review nations' progress.

And, so far, no country has said it will cut emissions by an additional amount in order to offset weaker action by the United States. "Everyone's just saying that they will stay the course," said Oliver Geden, a climate policy expert at the University of Oxford. But that course, he notes, is now even further from the goal of avoiding 2 degrees of warming.

A future American administration could always change direction on climate policy — and even try to rejoin the agreement once Mr. Trump is out of office. "Other countries are constantly judging each other's positions in the world," said David G. Victor, a professor of international relations at the University of California, San Diego. "If it looks like this administration is only going to last for four years, you might see other countries continue to push along on climate and not give up on the U.S. just yet."

The Paris deal pullout is more damaging to the US than the climate - 1 June 2017

The US abandoning the global climate deal brings risks, but the unity of the rest of the world and plummeting green energy costs are reasons for hope

Will Donald Trump's decision to pull the US out of the Paris climate change agreement tip the world into fiery catastrophe? The extraordinary unity of the rest of the world's nations in tackling global warming, allied with the booming green economy, driven by plummeting renewable energy costs, are strong reasons to think not.

A much more likely casualty of Trump's choice is the US economy he claims to be protecting: America's brilliance at innovation, investment and building businesses will no longer have its government's support. The prize of leadership in the 21st-century economy could be sacrificed in a doomed attempt to revive the fossil-fuelled economy of the 20th century.

However much Trump "digs coal", he cannot force companies to build coal-fired power stations if wind and solar are cheaper and executives are smart enough to realise that a billion-dollar bet on a new plant – likely to be closed by Trump's successor – is not a winner.

Instead, US states and cities will continue to pursue the green future that secures clean air, water and the promise of climate stability for their citizens. That is no small deal: combined together, California and New York City would be the fourth biggest economy in the world.

Climate change is, of course, a global issue but, around the globe, leaders from China to India to Russia to the European Union have lined up to reassert their commitment to confronting the greatest challenge faced by civilisation. Most remarkable is China, the world's biggest polluter, which has transitioned from climate laggard to climate leader in recent years.

Can China be relied upon to match its words with action? The answer is yes, because its determination is not founded on lofty altruism but the hard-headed need to protect its vast population from the air pollution and looming water and food problems that stem from carbon emissions. Furthermore, China is coming to dominate the supply of renewable energy technology.

But the US pullout still undoubtedly brings risks for the rest of the world. There are lots of possible pathways to the zero-emission global economy needed in the second half of this century to avoid the "severe, widespread and irreversible impacts" warned of by the world's scientists. But the best is to start early, with global carbon emissions starting to fall by 2020.

Even a flattening of the decline in US carbon emissions – if not compensated for by other nations – will slow progress and might bump up global warming by a tenth of a degree or two. That could be enough to push the most vulnerable nations under the waves of a rising ocean.

A rogue US, exporting goods manufactured with dirty energy, might tempt other nations to weaken their climate commitments in order to compete, although there is no sign of this at

present. Alternatively, other countries could punish the US with heavy carbon taxes on its exports. But that would prompt retaliation, with unpredictable consequences.

The US has also been a major funder of climate aid programmes, which have been vital in winning over developing nations that view global warming as a crisis inflicted on them by industrialised nations. Billions more will have to be contributed by the richest nations.

But the breakthrough in Paris – getting the unanimous agreement of 196 nations to tackle climate change together – remains a deceptively solid foundation for beating global warming, a task that will take decades not years.

German environment minister Barbara Hendricks said on Thursday: “The world’s climate will survive for eight years without the US.” But, despite the good reasons for optimism, a one-term Trump presidency would be even safer.

China and EU strengthen promise to Paris deal with US poised to step away – 1 June 2017

Beijing and Brussels to set up new alliance to reduce global carbon emissions as Donald Trump says he will announce decision later on Thursday

China and the EU will forge an alliance to take a leading role in tackling climate change in response to Donald Trump's expected decision to pull the US out of the historic Paris agreement. [...]

Beijing and Brussels have been preparing to announce their intention to accelerate joint efforts to reduce global carbon emissions.

According to a statement being prepared before an EU-China summit in Brussels on Thursday and Friday, the new alliance will say they are determined to "lead the energy transition" toward a low-carbon economy.

The EU's climate commissioner, Miguel Arias Cañete, told the Guardian: "The EU and China are joining forces to forge ahead on the implementation of the Paris agreement and accelerate the global transition to clean energy."

Cañete continued: "No one should be left behind, but the EU and China have decided to move forward. Our successful cooperation on issues like emissions trading and clean technologies are bearing fruit. Now is the time to further strengthen these ties to keep the wheels turning for ambitious global climate action."

In their declaration, Brussels and Beijing will also call on all parties "to uphold the Paris agreement" and signal their "highest political commitment" to doing so themselves.

The document describes climate change as a "national security issue" and "multiplying factor of social and political fragility". The Paris pact is a "historic achievement" and "irreversible", the document says.

In a bid to calm jangling nerves in the developing world, the document reaffirms funding commitments and promises to bring forward new mid-century greenhouse gas reduction targets. The two blocs will also launch their first ever clean-energy cooperation, as well as measures on energy efficiency, low-emissions transport and low-carbon cooperation between cities.

"The EU-China agreement on the full implementation on international commitments under the Paris agreement becomes even more important," one EU source said.

A senior EU official said there was a steely determination that the Paris agreement would not be allowed to unravel, having formally come into force last November. "This is not the end of the world," she said.

It is hoped that the opposition for action on climate change in the White House will not be matched at the state level, where programmes are already in place and where there is a political will to defy the Washington line.

The expected announcement in Brussels illustrates China's determination to take a leadership role in the world as Trump turns the US inwards and prepares to shun its commitments under an international agreement Barack Obama had described as a "turning point for our planet" and a "major leap for mankind".

The joint EU-China statement will offer a high level of detail on how they intend to make real the promises they made when they agreed to limit global warming to well below 2C (3.6F).

The EU, which has pioneered an emissions trading system, has agreed to provide China with €10m (\$11.2m) to support its plan to roll out its own programme this year.

Both sides will also promise to help developing countries reduce their carbon footprint, and the EU will increasingly share its technological knowhow. "Tackling climate change and reforming our energy systems are significant drivers of job creation, investment opportunities and economic growth," the joint statement is expected to say.

On Wednesday, reports emerged from Washington that Trump had, after months of prevarication, decided to remove the US from the agreement. [...] The expected decision from Trump – who once described climate change as a Chinese hoax – has appalled leaders in the EU and China, but there is a resolve to maintain the momentum behind the Paris agreement. EU sources said there was no evidence that any other countries would follow Washington's lead. [...]

Wendel Trio, the Director of Climate Action Network Europe said: "The summit shows that climate protection is and will remain top priority in the international cooperation, no matter what the US administration does.

"The strengthened climate alliance between the EU and China should trigger more climate action. This will smooth the way for the two powers to ramp up their Paris climate pledges by 2020, when they are due to be resubmitted. Both are set to overachieve their targets and can afford to make an even bigger contribution."

Li Shuo, the climate policy adviser of Greenpeace East Asia, said it was crucial for the largest emitters of carbon to fill the vacuum left by the US's likely decision.

He said: "The rapid backlash of US climate action requires enhanced leadership from all other countries. At the upcoming EU-China summit, Beijing and Brussels need to demonstrate they are putting new and collective leadership into concrete terms. If US-China climate cooperation gave birth to the Paris agreement, now it is up to EU and China to defend and enhance it."

The Climate Effect of the Trump Administration – by Taryn Fransen and Kelly Levin - December 06, 2017

Over its first year, the Trump administration has taken extreme steps to unravel progress on U.S. climate action domestically. Last month, President Trump's administration reiterated its intention to abandon the Paris Agreement, isolating the United States internationally. Now that Syria has formally joined the Paris Agreement, the United States is the only country not on board with the global accord. And in July at the G20 Summit President Trump indicated the United States would "immediately cease implementation of its current nationally-determined contribution."

The administration has followed through by holding a hearing on its proposal to repeal the Clean Power Plan – former President Barack Obama's signature plan to curb climate-warming emissions in the electric sector. The administration has also taken steps to revisit rules that would limit emissions from new fossil fuel plants, light-, medium-, and heavy-duty-) vehicles, and methane sources like new oil and natural gas equipment. At the same time, the administration has also moved forward with rules to support baseload coal generation and orders to increase oil and gas production on public and tribal lands. If the administration continues with these plans, it could significantly compromise the United States' ability to deliver on its Paris Agreement pledge (known as a nationally determined contribution, or NDC) to reduce emissions by 26 to 28 percent from 2005 levels by 2025.

Much of the trajectory for U.S. emissions depends on how quickly policies are reversed or revised, and what will replace them. In addition, many states, cities and companies have stepped up in response to Trump's announcement on the Paris Agreement with their own statements of "We Are Still In," pledging to support the agreement and to take action on climate change. A recent report from America's Pledge has documented the scope and scale of non-federal action, showing that more than 2,500 non-federal actors, representing more than half of the U.S. economy, have pledged support for the Paris Agreement goals. The report was released by Gov. Jerry Brown of California and UN Special Envoy on Climate and Cities Mike Bloomberg, with analysis by our colleagues at WRI, the Rocky Mountain Institute and CDP.

The U.S. emissions trajectory of the next several years will depend in part on what impact these subnational and corporate actions will have and how much market forces will continue to drive decarbonization. At the global level, it is also too early to tell whether other countries will step up and make up for the lack of U.S. climate action. [...]

Maintaining International Momentum

The Trump administration's actions to reverse actions to reduce GHG emissions isolates the United States and will likely slow this country's progress on tackling climate change and advancing clean energy. How much emissions and global temperatures will rise as a result has yet to be fully determined, and will depend in large measure how subnational action in the United States, such as the We Are Still In campaign, market forces and international efforts can sustain momentum in the coming years.

The recommitment to the Paris Agreement by world leaders other than Trump at the G20 summit, and progress at COP23, shows their intent to demonstrate the opportunities offered in working toward a low-carbon future. Many U.S. cities, states, regions and companies are already joining other countries in taking the helm on climate and clean energy action and pointing the way toward a low-carbon future.

Trump's Paris Agreement withdrawal: What it means and what comes next

Today, President Donald Trump announced that he will withdraw the United States from the landmark Paris Agreement on climate change. It was adopted in 2015 by 195 nations, with 147 ratifying it—including the United States, which is the world's second largest greenhouse gas emitter. Experts offer their analyses on what the decision could mean and what comes next.

William Galston: President Trump's advisers may have suggested that withdrawing from the Paris climate accord would be a popular move. This is what they told him about the firing of FBI Director James Comey, and he seems to have believed it. This could become yet another self-inflicted wound, because vast majorities of Americans want to remain in the Paris accord, including many of Trump's own supporters.

In a survey of registered voters taken just weeks after the 2016 election, 69 percent said that the United States should participate in the agreement. This figure included 86 percent of Democrats, 61 percent of Independents, and 51 percent of Republicans. By a margin of 40 to 34 percent, even a plurality of self-described conservative Republicans backed the agreement.

The administration has argued that the Paris Agreement is “unfair” because large polluting countries such as India and China are not required to do anything until 2030. The voters don't buy this argument. Two-thirds of them—79 percent of Democrats, 56 percent of Independents, and 51 percent of Republicans—say that the United States should reduce its greenhouse gas emissions regardless of what other countries do.

Samantha Gross: The Trump administration's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement is a huge foreign policy blunder that will reverberate through our relationships with our allies. During the negotiation process, the United States pushed to make the agreement flexible to bring all countries on board and to keep them in the fold even if their situations and priorities changed. This flexibility means that our withdrawal would be completely unnecessary—the administration could have remained party to the agreement while still pursuing its policy goals.

Abdicating U.S. responsibility in climate change mitigation and the coming clean energy transition is likely to make other international negotiations more challenging, particularly with respect to trade. Our withdrawal also opens up a geopolitical space in climate leadership that may or may not be filled. The United States was a crucial force in bringing the Paris Agreement to fruition, especially in bringing China into the fold. Chinese President Xi Jinping expressed strong support for the Paris Agreement, and globalization in general, in his keynote address in Davos this January. Might China be looking to fill the leadership role that the United States is vacating?

Finally, the United States has been the major voice pushing for transparency and verification of compliance with nations' stated goals, or Nationally Determined Contributions, throughout the process that led to the Paris Agreement. The measurement and reporting portions of the agreement are to be negotiated and put into place from now through 2020. U.S. leadership in

this process will be sorely missed and implementation of the agreement may suffer in our absence. [...]

Mark Muro: My take is at once crestfallen and cautiously optimistic.

Without doubt Trump's withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement represents a tragic, rash error in judgment. In diplomatic and moral terms, the withdrawal represents a willful abdication of America's leadership role in the world. And as a business mistake, the decision means the U.S. will miss out on some the \$1.4 trillion global business opportunity that the global low-carbon economy represents. That the limited binding force of the agreement is nil makes the whole drama unnecessary and therefore even more distressing.

With that said, I believe that progress will continue. Internationally, other leaders—maybe India, maybe China—will assert themselves to fill the vacuum created by U.S. retreat.

Domestically, the problem isn't so much the withdrawal from Paris as the more general problem of Trump's efforts to actively dismantle U.S. climate policy at the federal level. And here, while there is much to worry about, including draconian cuts to the entire suite of clean energy innovation and deployment programs, there are real grounds for compensatory optimism. Ambitious state-level policies will continue to support the transition to a cleaner energy system. And for that matter, so will the increasingly impressive efforts of municipalities and businesses. Beyond that, there are signs that state and local actions may ratchet up as federalism allows states and cities to push back against federal irresponsibility and fill some gaps, even if their efforts are no substitute for a cohesive national stance.

To that extent, at least for the near term, the largest problem isn't the withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. It's President Trump and continued climate denialism in Washington.

[...]

David Victor: Now that the United States is leaving the Paris Agreement, what's next for international cooperation on climate change?

Some foreign policy analysts suggest that other countries will also head for the exit. I suspect the opposite will happen. For most countries, Paris does not require that they do much beyond what they were planning anyway. Despite the bold goal of stopping warming well below 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels—a goal that never could be met—Paris has always been about process. Countries make pledges for the efforts they will undertake and then periodic reviews check to see what is working and not. Over time, this process would make deeper cooperation easier. Chuck Sabel, a law professor at Columbia, and I have been calling this experimentalist governance of climate change. Countries, firms, and NGOs are committed to do something about global warming, but nobody really knows what will work and scale—policy experiments and learning are essential. And Paris was designed to achieve just that.

America's exit isn't good news for Paris, despite what some people have argued. America almost always plays a key role in building effective international institutions. Without America, leadership is diffused and harder to muster. The list of things left undone in Paris remains very long, and leadership is essential to turning the Paris framework into something truly effective. But the American exit is not fatal to the process. Indeed, the U.S., China, France, and others designed Paris so that it would be highly flexible—able to change in

response to new realities, even the exit of the world's most powerful nation. Even if the U.S. formally stayed inside the Paris agreement the lack of support for the process from the president on down has severely undermined the country's ability to lead. Events like the recent G-7 meeting—which on climate and much else has now become the G6+1—will become more common.