

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



Notes of the Discussions: Morning Session

Discussion after the Presentation: "Roadmap for a Low Carbon Economy" by Damyana Stoynova, DG Climate Action. All answers are by Damyana Stoynova.

Question: What did the Commission expect from the stakeholder consultation?

Answer:

- We had no specific expectations from the stakeholder consultation; our aim was to receive as broad feedback as possible (in terms of country of origin and affiliation of the respondents).
- We were glad that it was not only the "usual suspects" that answered the online consultation.
- Only a few of the respondents wanted to remain anonymous.

Question: As not many research institutes answered to the online consultation: Could you say that there was lack of academic feedback in the consultation process?

Answer:

- I would not agree that this represents a lack of feedback. The online questionnaire gives a podium for discussion during the creation process of the Communication.
- Companies and NGOs are perhaps following more closely opportunities to present their position, since their work could be directly affected by initiatives of the Commission.
- For its analysis the Commission has consulted existing scientific studies.

Question: Shouldn't scientific aspects been more considered in the roadmap construction? What kind of sensitive analysis (fuel prices) has been done?

Answer:

- Yes. We did sensitivity analysis (including using high oil prices). This information can be found in the impact assessment that accompanies the roadmap.

Question: What information was given during the consultation process?

Answer:

- We gave orientation on key questions to be addressed but did not publish data in advance of the launch of the Roadmap (i.e. no data published at the time of the consultation process).

Question about cost for the transition of the power sector?

Answer:

- At the beginning the required investments will be higher than the savings resulting from the associated benefits (e.g. smaller oil and gas import bill), but later this will turn around.
- For the electricity sector many cost-effective solutions for reducing emissions are already available now.

Question: Regarding energy efficiency – we are not on track (to meet the 2020 target), should the roadmap be better explained to the member states?

Answer:

- For 2020 the EU member states have agreed the climate & energy package.
- Improving energy efficiency is very cost-effective measure for reducing emissions, and everybody could gain from applying it due to reduced energy bills. There is a huge potential for improving energy efficiency in both the ETS and the non-ETS sectors.

Question: Next steps on the Roadmap - what does the Commission plan? Do we have enough legislation, policy measures to achieve these objectives?

Answer:

- The Environmental Council has failed to adopt Council Conclusions on the Roadmap in June; Hence the Council and the Parliament still need to discuss the Communication.
- We have to fulfil existing targets before we create new measures.
- The EU ETS is the key instrument that will continue also after 2020. It gives an orientation to business to choose the most cost-effective way of reductions.

Question: 80-95% emission reductions should be obtained in 2050 (following to the IPPC) – do you have a scenario with higher objectives than the 80% in the Roadmap?

Answer:

- The roadmap is about 80% domestic greenhouse gas reduction by 2050, not about an 80% target. The EU target remains 80-95%.
- In case we have to achieve a higher target we can do it through flexible mechanisms.

Question: Could we have more openness of the assumptions of the Primes models? - for example prices for batteries and electric cars?

Answer:

- The different assumptions on electrification and its sources in the scenarios are described in the Impact Assessment.
- Future work of the Commission envisages to provide more transparency on the Primes model.

Question: What is the link between the two roadmaps? (low -carbon/climate and energy)

Answer:

- The coming energy roadmap is a sectoral concretisation of the Low-Carbon Roadmap. - Both roadmaps have the same long-term emission reduction objectives.
- For the part of the analysis on the European energy system, they are also based on the same modelling tool.

Question: What about Durban – will COP17 in Durban put the roadmap under pressure or is the action at the international level not important?

Answer:

- The international level is a key driver for low carbon strategies. The EU is trying to advance even if there is no global agreement yet.
- There will be further work on the 2050 Low-carbon Roadmap independently from an international agreement. However, its scope will be influenced by progress on the international level. The roadmap scenarios address both global action and fragmented action.

Question: When we will have 100% RES production, we need storage solutions. Do you take that into account storage in the scenarios?

Answer:

- The 2050 Low-carbon Roadmap requires full decarbonisation of the power sector, but does not prescribe 100% RES in the EU energy mix for 2050. Energy choices are national competence and decarbonisation can be achieved in a variety of ways – RES, nuclear, coal and gas with CCS.
- It is good to have a diverse energy mix in 2050.

Question: In transport: perhaps we do not need only electrical vehicles?

Answer:

- We do not say that we need “only” electric vehicles.
- Different solutions could be exploited in the transport sector: biofuels are also a solution (especially for aviation).
- There is more information in the White Paper on transport (published in 2011).

Question: Renewable energy needs space – how do you include issues like landscape protection and local acceptance in the Roadmap? How do you engage local authorities?

Answer:

- It is a priority of the future cohesion policy to support low carbon solutions on local and regional level.
- A minimum share of financing shall be spent on renewable energy and energy efficiency. The proposal for the ERDF (European Regional Development Fund) in the new MFF (2014-2020) envisages that 20% of the funds for more developed and transition regions and 6% of the funds for the less developed regions should be spent on energy efficiency and RES .

Comment and question: There is an urgency to increase energy efficiency and energy savings - this is recognized but not happening. Obviously ETS is not suited to trigger investments. ETS is not the best option and it is not sufficient to tap into the energy efficiency resources. In addition the EE target is not binding for the time being. There is (a negative) interaction between high energy efficiency and the ETS – carbon price: if we realise high-energy efficiency – we need to set aside allowances to avoid that both ETS and energy efficiency actions are jeopardized.

Answer:

- We have ETS for power stations and industrial plants and effort sharing decision for the non-ETS sectors
- The proposed energy efficiency directive aims at filling the gap and putting the EU back on track for reaching its energy efficiency target.
- The Commission will have to monitor the impact of new measures on the ETS in order to maintain the incentives in the ETS.

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>