

Contribution to the debate on the Green Paper  
Towards a European strategy for the security of energy supply

Name	Alceste RILLI
Organisation	Sogin, AIEE
What are you areas of interest?	nuclear, economy
Contact person	
E-Mail	rilli@sogin.it
Telephone	0039 06 8304 0348
Fax	0039 06 8304 0474
Address	via Torino 6, I-001 84 Rome, Italy

Please add your answers after the question(s) which deal most closely with the subject(s) on which you wish to comment so that the Commission can deal with the remarks efficiently and swiftly.

1.	<p>Can the European Union accept an increase in its dependence on external energy sources 1) without compromising its security of supply 2) and European competitiveness? 3) For which sources of energy would it be appropriate, if this were the case, to foresee a framework policy for imports? 4) In this context, is it appropriate to favour an economic approach: energy cost; or geopolitical approach: risk of disruption?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>1) NO</p> <p>2) The nations that constitute the European Union have very different structures of their economic and judiciary systems (which in my opinion determine the competitiveness of any system). As a consequence the impact would be very different on the different countries. Considering that the most important is the behaviour of the weakest country, the answer is NO.</p> <p>3) Given the problem, the only viable solution is a very rapid deployment of nuclear power plants. As a consequence, there is no need for such a scheme, being strategic stockage of nuclear fuel for as many years as it is seen fit, a possibility with no problems.</p> <p>4) The only thing that will cause disruption is costs. So the approach should be economical. It is important to fast head towards fuels on which is not also present the</p>
----	--

	demand from the developing countries: i.e. nuclear.
2.	<p>Does not Europe's increasingly integrated internal market, where decisions taken in one country have an impact on the others, call for a consistent and co-ordinated policy at Community level?</p> <p>Answer: Any country in Europe is linked to the economy of all other nations on earth. It depends on which political approach prevails at any given time. If there is a pragmatic approach, uniformity will be beneficial; if, like today, an ideological approach furthered by well fed pundits prevails which is devised to increase the consumption of the most expensive and environmentally bogus fuels (gas and oil), then it is much better that everybody is left a degree of freedom.</p>
3.	<p>Are tax and state aid policies in the energy sector an obstacle to competitiveness in the European Union or not? Given the failure of attempts to harmonise indirect taxation, should not the whole issue of energy taxation be re-examined taking account of energy and environmental objectives?</p> <p>Answer: The thing is possible only after the entire system of taxation is taken into account.</p>
4.	<p>In the framework of an ongoing dialogue with producer countries, what should supply and investment promotion agreements contain? Given the importance of a partnership with Russia in particular, how can stable quantities, prices and investments be guaranteed?</p> <p>Answer: The question arises because nuclear, the only source that would not pose any problem, has been ruled out for ideological reasons (at best) by the pundits. In the frame of an energy strategy where all the sources find their role, the agreement with Russia providing gas would be much easier to implement. Today it becomes a death or life decision. With nuclear taken as the energy of choice such an agreement for gas would be one of the normal decisions to be take with no strain.</p>
5.	<p>1) Should more reserves be stockpiled - as already done for oil - and should other energy sources be included, such as gas or coal? 2) Should the Community take on a greater role in stock management and, if so, what should the objectives and modalities be? 3) Does the risk of physical disruption to energy supplies justify more onerous measures for access to resources?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>1) Stockpiling gas will be very harsh for the environment. It takes 20 molecules of CO<sub>2</sub> to make the same effect of a molecule of gas for the greenhouse effect. And the cavities where they intend to pump gas leak a lot. The only energy that can be stockpiled with no impact on safety and the environment is nuclear.</p> <p>2) If the right solution is taken, i.e. nuclear, the stockpiling management will not require any major decision.</p>

	<p>3) Much sooner that disruption comes, the most dramatic measures will be taken anyway.</p>
6.	<p>How can we develop and ensure better operation of energy transport networks in the European Union and neighbouring countries so as to enable the internal market to function properly and guarantee security of supply?</p> <p>Answer: Transportation of nuclear fuel should be given the treatment that enjoys the transportation of any other fuel: if some pundits try to fancy interruption of the flow of oil of gas they would be treated unceremoniously.</p>
7.	<p>The development of some renewable energy sources calls for major efforts in terms of research and technological development, investment aid and operational aid. Should co-financing of this aid include a contribution from sectors which received substantial initial development aid and which are now highly profitable (gas, oil, nuclear)?</p> <p>Answer: YES. But the order of profitability is wrong: It is: nuclear, oil, gas.</p>
8.	<p>Seeing that nuclear energy is one of the elements in the debate on tackling climate change and energy autonomy, how can the Community find a solution to the problem of nuclear waste, reinforcing nuclear safety and developing research into reactors of the future, in particular fusion technology ?</p> <p>Answer: If one wants to make a dent on the energy impact on environment, action is as follows: a) increase the penetration of electricity on the total of energy consumed, especially in the areas of transportation and house heating; b) use nuclear to produce electricity.</p> <p>NUCELAR WASTES ARE <u>THE REASON WHY</u> NUCLEAR SHOULD BE THE ENERGY OF CHOICE. Nuclear is the only case where wastes can be managed. They are already today and there is not problem to be solved.</p>
9	<p>1) Which policies should permit the European Union to fulfil its obligations under the Kyoto Protocol? 2) What measures could be taken in order to exploit fully potential energy savings which would help to reduce both our external dependence and CO2 emissions?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>1) a) increase the penetration of electricity on the total of energy consumed, especially in the areas of transportation and house heating; b) use nuclear to produce electricity.</p> <p>2) The idea that energy consumption must be compressed is wrong. It is a necessity today because very polluting fuels are used. Use nuclear and free us people from this asphyxiating issue.</p>

10.	<p>Can an ambitious programme to promote biofuels and other substitute fuels, including hydrogen, geared to 20% of total fuel consumption by 2020, continue to be implemented via national initiatives, or are co-ordinated decisions required on taxation, distribution and prospects for agricultural production ?</p> <p>Answer: While pundits indulge in funny discussions the yearly increase of energy consumption steadily increases since forever at a pace of 4% per year at least. It will be so also for the future. The cheapest kWh will be chosen if left the freedom to do so. Hydrogen shall be pursued if produced by nuclear.</p>
11.	<p>Should energy saving in buildings (40% of energy consumption), whether public or private, new or under renovation, be promoted through incentives such as tax breaks, or are regulatory measures required along the lines of those adopted for major industrial installations?</p> <p>Answer: a) increase the penetration of electricity on the total of energy consumed, especially in the areas of transportation and house heating; b) use nuclear to produce electricity.</p> <p>The idea that energy consumption must be compressed is wrong. It is a necessity today because very polluting fuels are used. Use nuclear and free us people from this asphyxiating issue.</p>
12.	<p>Energy saving in the transport sector (32% of energy consumption) depends on redressing the growing imbalance between road and rail. Is this imbalance inevitable, or could corrective action be taken, however unpopular, notably to encourage lower use of cars in urban areas? How can the aims of opening up the sector to competition, investment in infrastructure to remove bottlenecks and intermodality be reconciled?</p> <p>Answer: Answer: a) increase the penetration of electricity on the total of energy consumed, especially in the areas of transportation and house heating; b) use nuclear to produce electricity.</p> <p>The idea that energy consumption must be compressed is wrong. It is a necessity today because very polluting fuels are used. Use nuclear and free us people from this asphyxiating issue.</p> <p>Use of electric cars could have been done already with the technology of the 1920s. No research is necessary. Today to fill a car up with gasoline you need to wait at least 5 minutes before the tank is filled. Sliding one or more batteries out and in at the gas station where the exhausted batteries are recharged will take only a second.</p>
1.	<p>How can we develop more collaborative visions and integrate the long-term dimension into deliberations and actions undertaken by public authorities and other involved parties in order to evolve a sustainable system of energy supply. How are we to prepare the energy options for the future?</p>

	<p>Answer: Inform people that at Chernobyl 44 people died and that one or two years worth of gas and oil extraction in the world introduces in the atmosphere as much radioactivity as Chernobyl.</p>
2	<p>Any other questions or proposals:</p> <p>It is wrong for Europe from any point of view, ethical, egoistic, economic and common sense to compete for the same fuels as the developing countries. Europe should go nuclear and the developing countries should thus buy gas and oil at cheaper prices. Nuclear, unlike gas, oil and coal, does not need infra-structures, and is the cheapest energy, so it should be promoted in the developing countries. Only in this frame a program of controls against proliferation is possible and would be easier implemented world-wide by those that today would take military action in case of wrongdoings.</p> <p>The issue of energy is urgent. It is necessary today to implement a strong nuclear energy program that includes fast reactors.</p>

Thank you for replying to this questionnaire.