

Green Paper 2030: Main outcomes of the public consultation

The adoption of the Green Paper on a 2030 framework for climate and energy policies on 27 March 2013 launched a public consultation that closed on 2 July 2013.

The consultation showed **an almost universal support for the development of a common European framework for climate and energy policies.**

This paper gives an overview on the participation in the consultation and key findings.

Participation

The Commission has received some 550 formal replies from a broad spectrum of stakeholders including the following 14 Member States.¹: Austria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, United Kingdom. Along with Member State contributions, several national parliaments have reacted to the Green Paper.

Targets

With few exceptions, **Member States and stakeholders are expecting the EU to provide a 2030 framework in order to reduce uncertainty among investors, governments and citizens.** Many responses also point out that the EU needs to continue working towards its long term climate objectives, whilst also securing greater commitment from other major economies.

On this basis, there is a broad consensus among Member States and stakeholders on the need for a new Greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction target, whereas there are different views on the appropriate level of ambition. There are also mixed views on the usefulness of renewables' and energy savings' targets.

¹ There was a strong participation from industry associations (41 %), companies (8% with a balanced representation between energy intensive and non-energy intensive firms) and power sector companies (10%) in the consultation. Also civil society, including NGOs (8%), citizens (11%) and trade unions (2%) were well represented. Member States' official replies are considered by the Commission as statements expressed either by central Governments or sent by single national Ministries. Some Member States also underlined that their submission may not fully reflect the final position of their Government.

Main positions on targets among Member States having responded to the consultation²

All Member States that participated in the consultation, except for Poland, are in favour of a *GHG reduction target for 2030*. Some Member States make such support conditional to a thorough analysis of impacts. Denmark, France, the United Kingdom and Spain are favourable to a binding target of 40%; Poland argues that the decision to adopt an objective for 2030 should be taken no earlier than in 2015; the Czech Republic and Romania would accept a more ambitious objective only in the case of a global agreement; Lithuania makes such support conditional to a thorough analysis of impacts and states that such a target should consider efforts by other major economies; Finland and the United Kingdom propose a dual emissions' reduction target for 2030 in the context of global negotiations; Cyprus supports less binding targets.

On Renewables, Denmark is in favour of a 2030 target; Lithuania considers that a RES target should be set following a thorough assessment of impacts on industry sectors and specific Member States; Austria is strongly in favour provided the system security and social dimension is taken into account; Finland calls for an indicative or moderately binding target; France calls for a renewables target to be fixed at a later stage based on a partial harmonisation of support schemes and reflection on how to integrate renewables in the system; Portugal is open to a target, subject to more use of cooperation mechanisms; Estonia is ready to support a renewable target if the EU-level action provides substantial added value, following a cost-benefit analysis; Romania advocates a renewables' target set by the Member States; the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic are explicitly against setting targets for renewables.

On *Energy Efficiency*, Denmark and Portugal are in favour of a 2030 target; Estonia is ready to support energy efficiency targets if the EU-level action provides substantial added value; Lithuania envisages a target for energy efficiency related to energy intensity subject to a thorough impact assessment; France is open to a European target as a complimentary addition and to be fixed at a later stage with a new definition of energy intensity; Finland is favourable to an indicative EU energy efficiency target; Romania would be open to an overall aspirational target; Austria and Cyprus would prefer to postpone discussions on energy efficiency until after 2014; the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic voted against a mandatory energy efficiency target.

Other targets: Portugal advocates an intermediate target as regards the physical implementation of an Internal Energy Market (target for minimum interconnections between Member States) whereas Spain is proposing a binding interconnection target (10%). Romania advocates that targets should pursue also the objectives of security of supply and competitiveness. Lithuania asks for appropriate EU indicators for energy infrastructures' development, research and experimental development.

Objectives - Competitiveness, Security of supply and Sustainability

Member States and stakeholders emphasized the need for climate and energy policy to continue to take into account the three prime objectives of energy policy: *competitiveness, security of supply* and *sustainability*. There is great awareness that the EU climate and energy policy should give greater consideration to the consequences of

² These contributions can be found on http://ec.europa.eu/energy/consultations/20130702_green_paper_2030_en.htm under "public authorities".

the on-going economic crisis, international developments and, in particular, their potential adverse effects on European competitiveness.

A vast majority of stakeholders also point out that the EU should increase efforts to diversify energy supply sources and routes in a 2030 perspective.

Instruments - ETS, Internal Energy Market and Innovation

Stakeholders have underlined the importance of coherence between various instruments to meet new objectives.

There is broad consensus that the **Emission Trading System (ETS)** should remain a central instrument for the transition to a low carbon economy and in particular to reach the GHG emissions' reduction target. Views diverge as to the extent to which a structural ETS reform is needed. A majority of stakeholders recognize that additional policies are necessary.

The benefits of the **Internal Energy Market (IEM)** were well recognized. The *completion of the internal market* for energy is seen as a key means to ensure competitive energy prices and secure supply. A majority of stakeholders also point out that *higher interconnection capacity between Member States* is fundamental to meet energy and climate objectives.

Many Member States and stakeholders express concerns about the *increasing cost of certain climate and energy policies*, and there is a broad consensus that public support for low carbon investment must become more cost-effective through improving policy coherence and harmonization across Europe.

Many replies underline that a greater focus on *innovation* is essential to ensure the flexibility and security of the EU energy system and for the further development of a portfolio of cost-effective and sustainable energy options.

Stakeholders' views by type of organisation

- *Companies and business organisations* are generally arguing that Europe should put cost-competitiveness, security of supply and climate objectives on an even more equal footing. There is general consensus that the EU should set a 2030 emissions' reduction target. Utilities, gas companies and companies providing low carbon equipment mostly support an ambitious GHG target.

There is no agreement within the private sector on the other targets. General industry organisations, the energy sector and energy intensive industries typically are against renewables' and energy savings' targets. Organizations and companies that provide low carbon equipment support renewables' and energy efficiency targets, arguing this contributes to growth and jobs, while improving security of supply within the EU.

- *NGOs and part of the civil society* are generally asking the EU to agree a set of ambitious targets irrespective of action in third countries. It is generally perceived that ambitious, legally binding targets provide investment security for economic actors and promote jobs and growth.

- *Trade Unions* are generally more in favour of an approach including targets for GHG reduction and increase of renewables and energy efficiency although they stress that EU competitiveness should not be undermined and greater priority should be given to the socio-economic dimension of sustainability.

- *Citizens'* views are generally divided: whereas most are favourable to an ambitious climate and energy framework, citizens from Central and Eastern European Countries are generally more concerned about European competitiveness.