Stakeholder Seminar: "Engaging Civil Society in the EU Roadmap Process'
Brussels, October 25, 2011

Comments on the Roadmaps of the European Commission by *Frauke Thies, Greenpeace*

Notes by Meike Fink, Climate Action Network-France, ENCI LowCarb Coordinator.

- 3 documents that are part of the roadmap strategy:
  - General comments on the economy
  - Transport: white paper
  - Upcoming energy roadmap

- It makes sense to develop long term visions in order to avoid lock in effects, which is why it is necessary to choose the right pathway.
  - The Roadmap would be a good tool if it would have the good milestones and objectives
  - The Commission decided that off-setting won't be an option in 2020
  - Suppose the EU only reduced by 80% the emissions in 2050; that means that EU would use 1% of the carbon budget having only 6% of the world population
  - In the roadmap we are starting slowly- climate perspective- the more we emit every year the more we get away from our global mitigation perspectives due to path dependencies
  - A slow start means that people change from coal to gas; this reduces emissions in the short term but creates lock-ins for ambitious emission reductions
  - We have to set the right pathway - now
  - This is even true for CCS – even with CCS coal power plants would still emit 100g/CO2/KWh; this is too much
  - Also important concerning the signal you are sending to the global level
  - The objective (2t/CO2 capita) cannot be extended to everybody

- But the Commission analysis shows that taking short term actions brings benefits because it is reducing our energy bill
  - In the case that the EU is acting alone without any global deal – the EU is investing in low carbon technologies
  -Even if it is from a climate perspective not desirable, the relative cost savings could even be more important if EU acts alone as fossil fuel prices will continue to increase (but even if our economy benefits won't solve climate change if the EU acts alone)

- It is ridiculous that in the reference scenario of the energy roadmap RES (Renewable Energies) only reach 50% in 2050 because RES are only reaching cost effectiveness in 2020
  - Biofuel conflicts have to be sorted out [ie sustainability issues and labelling]
  - Good step to clear where we are going to avoid lock-ins but for this the objective and the pathway have to be right= 2020 -30% GHG as -95% in 2050; 40% in 2030 is clearly not sufficient

- Energy:
  - 7 scenarios – reference, current policy scenario, high-energy efficiency, Diversified supply technologies, high RES, low nuclear (high CCS), low CCS (high nuclear)
  - Why there is no scenario combining RES ad EE?
  - Financial times article: concerning the overall system costs all scenarios analyzed come to the same system case- an interesting conclusion; that means we can have a safe clean energy scenario based on RES

- But if you only look at electricity prices / the RES is the those with the highest prices up from 2030 (even if the overall costs are the same in all scenarios)
  - Cost input assumptions: not always renewable energy learning curves are taken into account
  - Until 2030 the RES are not more expensive – up from 2030 costs shoot down for all options but the high RES is due to high balancing needs
  - One reason for the spike of prices can also be the mix that the Commission puts behind it; if you have a high share of flexible renewable energies than there is a conflict between flexible production and base load – which is probably the case
  - Why not going to 100% RES (and not combining RES with nuclear but with gas)
  - But even with the assumptions the Commission has chosen the system costs are the same for high RES

- Message:

1. The EU can have a high RES scenario and does not need nuclear and CCS
2. Some elements are needed in all scenarios; RES, a flexible system and energy efficiency

- These are no regret options
- Everything else we will not find an agreement

Question: Who pays for the electricity distribution?
Answer: The overall system costs are the same in all scenarios; the difference is who pays for it.
Q: Do the citizens have to do it like in the high RES scenario via high electricity prices?

The event was organized as part of the EU FP7 Project: ENCI-LowCarb, European Network engaging CIvil Society in Low Carbon Scenarios. Partners are: RAC-France, Germanwatch, INFORSE-Europe, PIK, CIRED. Event's web site, where the presentations can be downloaded: http://www.lowcarbon-societies.eu/index.php?id=50