

Dear Sir/Madam,

Firstly, I would like to state that I am vehemently opposed to the EU creating legislation to meet a problem which scientifically is not proven. There is clearly no direct correlation between CO<sub>2</sub> and global temperature, since there are significant periods of time in the temperature record where global temperature has failed to increase in line with increases in CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the atmosphere. It is also clear that climate model predictions can not be relied upon because:-

1. Their range of predictions are ludicrously wide even in the short term and get wider with time.
2. The global temperature in 2012 fell outside 90% of the IPCC AR4 climate model run predictions

Other supposed scientific evidence is either unreliable or anecdotal. The fact that there are 1000s of scientific papers supporting the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis does not mean that the quality of the papers is any good. Climate is no less complex than the weather, the reliability of predictions being accurate for no better than 5 days at maximum.

What is clear is that Europe has an energy problem, and we have fallen behind the United States in using new technology - fracking - to extract supplies of natural gas. The EU needs to invest significantly in energy supply, so that we can continue to compete globally.

It is also clear that the EU and the international community as a whole is not really interested in reducing CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the atmosphere as if they were, then action would be taken against the largest polluters and the fact they may be relatively low-income countries would not be considered. The fact that low income, high polluting countries are exempt or have lower emission reduction targets expose this as a socialist wealth redistribution exercise with no basis in science.

To respond to your specific questions:-

#### **4.1. General**

Which lessons from the 2020 framework and the present state of the EU energy system are most important when designing policies for 2030?

The need to expand energy supply

#### **4.2. Targets**

Which targets for 2030 would be most effective in driving the objectives of climate and energy policy? At what level should they apply (EU, Member States, or sectoral), and to what extent should they be legally binding?

There should be no targets to meet a discredited climate policy. The EU should focus on ensuring

that member states have access to cheaper energy so that they can fairly compete with the United States. EU directives need to be put in place to ensure that member states maximise their ability to exploit available natural resources. EU funding should be put in place to allow all countries to utilise new technologies such as fracking.

?

Have there been inconsistencies in the current 2020 targets and if so how can the coherence of potential 2030 targets be better ensured?

Exemptions from climate targets for low income, high polluting countries such as Poland exposes the climate policy as nothing to do with emission reductions but to do with wealth redistribution.

Are targets for sub-sectors such as transport, agriculture, industry appropriate and, if so, which ones? For example, is a renewables target necessary for transport, given the targets for CO2 reductions for passenger cars and light commercial vehicles?

Targets need to be based on cost to the consumer. i.e. there has to be a payback on the extra expense of eco-friendly products through reductions in running costs within a timescale - 7 years.

How can targets reflect better the economic viability and the changing degree of maturity of technologies in the 2030 framework?

Targets need to reflect improvements in cost of energy efficient products which have happened until now and an expectation that these improvements will continue going forward.

?

How should progress be assessed for other aspects of EU energy policy, such as security of supply, which may not be captured by the headline targets?

The EU needs to ensure that there is sufficient additional capacity to prevent short term spikes in prices due to shortage of supply.

#### **4.3. Instruments**

Are changes necessary to other policy instruments and how they interact with one another, including between the EU and national levels?

Not sure about the question here. The EU is there to provide directives that member states should act on.

How should specific measures at the EU and national level best be defined to optimise cost-efficiency of meeting climate and energy objectives?

The EU should be there to ensure that adequate energy is available to all member states.

□

How can fragmentation of the internal energy market best be avoided particularly in relation to the need to encourage and mobilise investment?

The EU needs to ensure agreement from all member states

Which measures could be envisaged to make further energy savings most costeffectively?

Best practice from individual member states could be disseminated to member states with similar climate / resources

?

How can EU research and innovation policies best support the achievement of the 2030 framework?

By providing best practice consultancy services

#### **4.4. Competitiveness and security of supply**

Which elements of the framework for climate and energy policies could be strengthened to better promote job creation, growth and competitiveness?

More investment in new technologies which are viable e.g. fracking

What evidence is there for carbon leakage under the current framework and can this be quantified? How could this problem be addressed in the 2030 framework?

Unsure.

□

What are the specific drivers in observed trends in energy costs and to what extent can the EU influence them?

Energy costs are driven by shortage of supply, increase in taxes and costs due to investments in renewable energy /energy efficiency programmes

How should uncertainty about efforts and the level of commitments that other developed countries and economically important developing nations will make in the on-going international negotiations be taken into account?

What other regions/countries are doing should be fully taken in to account. The EU has to compete economically. The EU is only responsible for 11% of CO2 emissions yet has made far larger commitments than competitor regions.

□

How to increase regulatory certainty for business while building in flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances (e.g. progress in international climate negotiations and changes in energy markets)?

Businesses need to be given 10 year plans which are fixed.

How can the EU increase the innovation capacity of manufacturing industry? Is there a role for the revenues from the auctioning of allowances?

Businesses should be provided with some support where it is envisaged that their product has a long term chance of success. Otherwise, it is up to manufacturing within the EU to compete with competitor countries such as China.

How can the EU best exploit the development of indigenous conventional and unconventional energy sources within the EU to contribute to reduced energy prices and import dependency?

The EU should just monitor development of these energy sources and ensure that each member state has an adequate supply of energy. Member states that have failed to develop their indigenous energy sources should be charged for the cost of receiving energy from member states who have.

How can the EU best improve security of energy supply internally by ensuring the full and effective functioning of the internal energy market (e.g. through the development of necessary interconnections), and externally by diversifying energy supply routes?

The EU should concentrate on exploiting energy sources within the EU and moving energy within the market, before looking for energy supply from outside the EU. In the short term, the EU will need to continue to make agreements with other countries e.g. Russia, however.

#### **4.5. Capacity and distributional aspect**

How should the new framework ensure an equitable distribution of effort among Member States? What concrete steps can be taken to reflect their different abilities to implement climate and energy measures?

Member states that have failed to develop their indigenous energy sources should be charged for the cost of receiving energy from member states who have. The charge should reflect the availability of the country's energy supply. There should be no steps taken to account for the relative wealth of a country when it comes to implementing climate change policies. Climate change policies are supposed to prevent environmental disaster not a wealth redistribution mechanism.

What mechanisms can be envisaged to promote cooperation and a fair effort sharing between Member States whilst seeking the most cost-effective delivery of new climate and energy objectives?

Agreements between member states should be coordinated centrally.

Are new financing instruments or arrangements required to support the new 2030 framework?

No

Your's sincerely,

James M. Dey

9 Milton Road

London

SW19 8SF