



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 12 November 2013**

**16143/13**

**PE 511  
ENER 521  
ENV 1064  
IND 327**

**NOTE**

---

from: General Secretariat of the Council  
to: Delegations

---

Subject: Summary record of the joint meeting of the **Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE)** and the **Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI)** of the European Parliament, held in Brussels on 7 November 2013

---

The meeting was co-chaired by Ms Sartori (EPP, IT) and Mr Groote (S&D, DE).

**A 2030 framework for climate and energy policies**

CJ10/7/13218, 2013/2135(INI), COM(2013)0169

Rapporteurs: Anne Delvaux (EPP, BE) and Konrad Szymański (ECR, PL)

Opinions: DEVE, INTA, EMPL, IMCO, TRAN, REGI

Ms Delvaux, ENVI rapporteur, supported the 2030 framework and its three main objectives of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, promoting renewable energies and improving energy efficiency to achieve a low-carbon economy in an economically efficient way, with a view to jobs creation, energy security, independence from energy imports and affordable energy prices. She pinpointed the pitfalls of the current regulatory framework that should be addressed. In the context of the climate package, she considered that policies based on national subsidies for renewables were not cost-efficient and there was a market distortion of conventional sources. She said that these policies

should be clarified, more coherent and should be phased out. She also advocated a return to technological neutrality. Other issues identified were the counterproductive overlapping and duplication in the context of renewables, the underestimated potential of energy efficiency, and the neglect of competitiveness and energy security. Ms Delvaux stressed that the 2030 framework was crucially important for companies, as they needed long-term planning for investment certainty. She also raised the issue of the emissions trading scheme (ETS), which should be more strategic and have an automatic correction mechanism for dealing with fluctuations.

Mr Szymański, ITRE rapporteur, agreed with all the objectives, but voiced concerns that the transition to a cost-effective, low-carbon economy would not be possible without a proper analysis. He was convinced that the climate change policy did not meet expectations and considered that the EU should renounce the dream that unilateral EU action would change the world. He favoured the use of political potential to set the example. Consequently, he called for a change in climate change policy and questioned funding renewables with public money. Mr Szymański also saw a need for stable rules for investors (also discouraged by climate policies such as the ETS). With regard to the high energy prices, (again citing climate policies as a contributing factor), he called for a restoration of the balance between the objectives of sustainability, competitiveness and security of supply. The completion of the internal energy market was necessary to boost the potential for competition and the focus should be the development of infrastructure for all sources. As regards the goals, he called for coherence of policy instruments, while taking into account the differing capacity of Member States.

During the discussion, Mr Vidal-Quadras (EPP, ES) reiterated that the 2030 framework (including targets) had to draw lessons from the current framework which focused too much on climate change to the detriment of energy policy. Together with Ms Kolarska-Bobińska (EPP, PL), he called for an a balance between environmental sustainability and competitiveness. Mr Rübzig (EPP, AT) advocated a balance between competitiveness and renewable energy sources. Mr Gierek (S&D, PL) agreed that the climate package should be modified, as a low-carbon economy assumption was not very valid in terms of competitiveness.

Ms Ulvskog (S&D, SE), on the other hand, did not agree that the climate policy was threatening competitiveness. For her, competitiveness had to be climate and environmentally sustainable. She thought that current climate policies were successful and should be pursued. Mr Gerbrandy (ALDE, NL) underlined the urgency of the climate objective. Ms Thomsen (S&D, DK) considered that the EU could be competitive only if it was leading the green economy. To achieve that, the EU needed investments primarily from private sources. Together with Mr Leinen (S&D, DE) and Mr Correia de Campos (S&D, PT), Ms Thomsen called for a clear and predictable framework for investors. Mr Leinen underlined that the EU could not "miss the boat" in breaking technologies. Ms Eickhout (Greens/EFA, NL) echoed the need for investment security. In this context, several Members underlined the importance of innovation. Others pointed to the need to take account of the different capacities of Member States to achieve the objectives.

Members had diverging views whether and/or which targets should be binding. The EPP Group Members were, in particular, less devoted to a (binding) renewables target. Mr Vidal-Quadras (EPP, ES) preferred a more general CO<sub>2</sub> target, with a sub-target for energy efficiency. Ms Carvalho (EPP, PT) suggested combining targets for energy efficiency and renewables instead of having a separate one for each of them, including a sub-target for heating and transport systems (non-ETS sectors). Mr Liese also thought that one of the weak points of the current legislation was a voluntary energy efficiency target, which, in his view, had the biggest potential. Only Mr Liese (EPP, DE) voiced his support for three binding targets.

Ms Ulvskog (S&D, SE) saw a need to clearly set three binding targets (supported by Mr Gerbrandy (ALDE, NL), Mr Eickhout (Greens/EFA, NL) and Ms Lepage (ALDE, FR)), with flexibility for Member States in how to achieve them. Ms Thomsen (S&D, DK) supported binding renewables and energy efficiency targets. Ms Hall (ALDE, UK) linked the energy efficiency target to non-ETS sectors mentioned previously. Ms Van Brempt (S&D, BE) also supported binding targets and an ambitious ETS. Ms Herczog (S&D, HU) supported combined binding targets.

Regarding renewables in general, Mr Vidal-Quadras (EPP) referred to the rapid effect subsidies had on energy prices. He said that blind support of uncompetitive energy sources could not continue and that technology should reach a mature stage. Mr Rübzig (EPP) suggested calculating technology life cycle and recycle costs to determine what was affordable and what was expensive. He considered that the new generation of renewables should get as much support as was necessary. Ms Korhola (EPP, FI) thought that subsidies should be phased out for major renewables and fossil fuels.

On the other hand, Mr Gerbrandy (ALDE, NL) thought that renewables were specifically needed to secure energy supply at affordable costs. Ms Thomsen (S&D) argued that high energy prices had nothing to do with renewables (with Mr Leinen), but were influenced by energy imports. Ms Hall (ALDE, UK) referred to the rise in fossil fuel prices. She also said that the subsidies were working, but acknowledged the need for their reformulation and retargeting. Mr Eickhout (Greens/EFA) also did not agree that renewables were distorting the market. As regards subsidies, he pointed to much higher subsidies for fossil fuels that should, in his view, be addressed in the first place. He was echoed by Mr Seeber (EPP, AT). Ms Estrela (S&D, PT) also saw no logic in supporting fossil fuels. She considered that the diversification of sources should be done via renewables and that investment in these should be promoted.

As regards energy efficiency, Ms Ulvskog welcomed the focus on this objective, but thought that a clear proposal on the issue was lacking. She would prefer clear suggestions instead of general statements. Mr Gierek, Mr Correia de Campos and Mr Prodi (S&D, IT) also supported high energy efficiency policies. Ms Herczog reiterated that energy efficiency had to be a major driver for all material science.

Other issues mentioned by Members were indigenous energy sources in general (including nuclear, shale gas, renewables, etc.), cumulative emissions counts, a functioning internal energy market, CO<sup>2</sup> footprint and related VAT reductions for products with a low-energy content, common energy policy, investments in storage, demand management and networks for renewables.

The DG CLIMA representative informed Members that the framework proposal would be available by the end of the year/beginning of next year. He assured them that the balance between competitiveness, energy security and climate change sustainability was at the heart of the Commission's thinking. He agreed that prices of imported gas and oil were crucial for EU competitiveness, as these imports were on the rise. Concerning global action, he considered it crucial to solve the problem of climate change. In this context, he found it encouraging that both China and the US were planning to come forward with their post-2020 plans before the 2015 COP in Paris. With regard to the ETS, he noted that stakeholders' consultation confirmed its importance as the main instrument to incentivise cost-effective emissions' reduction in the EU (a common action instead of a fragmentation of approaches to address the climate change).

As regards the non-ETS sectors (i.e. buildings and transport), he underlined their importance in the effort-sharing and welcomed their emphasis in the report.

The DG ENER representative welcomed the focus on energy efficiency. She informed Members that the report on the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive would be published in 2014. She highlighted the role of renewables in the context of 2030, as they were an own energy resource. In this context, she pointed to the different national measures to cut their renewables' subsidies retroactively, which would be examined. Regarding the internal energy market and infrastructure, she underlined that Member States needed to cooperate further to achieve it by 2014. She also informed Members that energy prices would be analysed in the context of the climate and energy package. The Commission was currently drafting an impact assessment. Nevertheless, she already identified the rise in fossil fuel prices as the main reason for the increase. She repeated that the proposal would be published by the end of the year/beginning of next year. Replying to the question as to why the Commission was not waiting for the Parliament's report, she said that the European Council had called on the Commission to issue a follow-up in 2013. Against this background, she thought that it would be difficult to wait any longer than January 2014. But she assured Members that the Commission was ready to listen to the Parliament's views and thought it probable that their report would be taken into account if ready by January 2014.

Mr Szymański reiterated the need for various instruments and policies that would complement each other. Regarding resources, he was in favour of a balanced mix of all resources, including conventional sources, renewables and nuclear energy. He acknowledged that shale gas and conventional sources would not change the overall landscape, but rejected the idea that fossil fuels were the past, as they could still be used by some Member States to increase their competitiveness. He repeated his call for a multi-faceted approach that would meet objectives, be economically viable and convince investment partners. A balance between climate change and energy policies should be sought in the meantime.

Ms Delvaux supported three binding targets, but insisted that the current framework should be refocused and more realistic. She reiterated the importance of energy efficiency and renewables for competitiveness, but said that these should be addressed in a cost-efficient way. In terms of

profitability, she identified energy efficiency as a cornerstone of the regulatory framework. In this context, she stressed the role of non-ETS sectors, in particular construction and transport.

Regarding renewables in particular, she acknowledged the problem of coordination. The subsidies ought to be more targeted and their maturity taken into account. The subsidies for fossil fuels should also be addressed. In the context of energy prices, she was satisfied that the Commission understood the problem of national taxes and saw a need for greater transparency in how the prices were made. She also highlighted investments in research, development and innovation and the need to focus on future technologies. In the context of an internal energy market, she emphasised better cooperation and communication between Member States. Addressing the lacking of concrete proposals in the text, she recalled that the text was a consensus of two rapporteurs and concrete actions could be added via amendments.

Timetable:            deadline for amendments:    12 November 2013  
                              provisional ITRE vote:        January 2014

#### **Next meeting**

- 2 December 2013, 15.00 – 18.30 (Brussels)
-