

This verbatim report is not an official record.  
Only the video is the authentic version.

5-001

**VIERNES 15 DE ENERO DE 2010**

**PÁTEK, 15. LEDNA 2010**

**FREITAG, 15. JANUAR 2010**

**BRÜSSEL**

**AUSSCHUSS FÜR UMWELTFRAGEN,  
VOLKSGESUNDHEIT UND  
LEBENSMITTELSICHERHEIT**

**ANHÖRUNG VON CONNIE HEDEGAARD  
DESIGNIERTES KOMMISSIONSMITGLIED  
KLIMAPOLITIK**

**ΠΑΡΑΣΚΕΥΗ 15 ΙΑΝΟΥΑΡΙΟΥ 2010**

**VENERDI' 15 GENNAIO 2010**

**VRIJDAG 15 JANUARI 2010**

**SEXTA-FEIRA, 15 DE JANEIRO DE 2010**

**PIATOK 15. JANUÁRA 2010**

**PETEK, 15. JANUAR 2010**

**PERJANTAI 15. TAMMIKUUTA 2010**

**FREDAGEN DEN 15 JANUARI 2010**

5-002

**VORSITZ: JO LEINEN***(Die Sitzung wird um 9.00 Uhr eröffnet.)*

5-003

**Der Vorsitzende.** – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Herzlich willkommen zur Anhörung der designierten Kommissarin für Klimapolitik. Ich begrüße ganz herzlich Frau Connie Hedegaard: Herzlich willkommen in unserem Ausschuss! Wir haben schon Routine in dieser Woche. Ich begrüße die Kolleginnen und Kollegen des Industrieausschusses – der Vorsitzende Herbert Reul ist auch hier, Herr Reul, herzlich willkommen! –, und die Kolleginnen und Kollegen des Verkehrsausschusses.

Wir machen also eine Anhörung mit drei verschiedenen Ausschüssen. In den nächsten drei Stunden will das Parlament einen Eindruck gewinnen, ob die Kandidatin generell die Kompetenz für ein so wichtiges Amt hat, eine europäische Überzeugung mitbringt und persönlich unabhängig ist, um ihr Amt auszuüben. Das Parlament beurteilt auch die spezifischen Kenntnisse des vorgesehenen Portfolios wie auch die Fähigkeit zur Kommunikation, was in der Politik und besonders in der Europapolitik ja von großer Bedeutung ist. So steht es in den Richtlinien für die Akzeptanz des Europaparlaments gegenüber einer neuen Kommission, die wir uns selbst gegeben haben.

Wir haben in den nächsten drei Stunden die Regeln zu befolgen, die Sie schon alle kennen. Es ist ein Zeitkorsett, an das wir uns halten wollen und müssen. Frau Hedegaard hat zehn Minuten zur Einführung und dann gibt es die üblichen Pingpong-Spiele: eine Minute Frage, zwei Minuten Antwort, 45 Sekunden Nachfrage, eine Minute Antwort. Wer nicht da ist, dessen Frage entfällt automatisch. Ich weise nochmals darauf hin, dass sich die zweite Frage auf das Thema der ersten Frage und der Antwort beziehen muss. Also die zweite Frage eröffnet nicht ein neues Themenfeld. Ich habe das Recht, die zweite Frage zu verwerfen, wenn das nicht eingehalten wird.

Frau Hedegaard, ich hoffe, Sie haben sich vom Marathon der Verhandlungen in Kopenhagen erholt. Ich war auch eine Woche in dieser Kälte. Es war ebenso stressig wie natürlich auch vom Ergebnis her frustrierend. Sie waren in mehreren Funktionen dort: Umweltministerin, zum Schluss auch Ministerin für Klima und Energie. Und jetzt sollen Sie das für Klimapolitik zuständige Kommissionsmitglied der Europäischen Union von 27 Ländern mit 500 Millionen Menschen werden. Sie wissen, dass das Europäische Parlament in den letzten Jahren ein Motor der Klimadebatte, auch der Klimagesetzgebung war. Also den Bürgervertretern hier in diesem Hause ist dieses Thema ganz, ganz wichtig. Sie werden in den nächsten drei Stunden auch merken, dass wir das ernst nehmen und wirklich vorankommen wollen.

Wir erhoffen uns von dieser Anhörung Aussagen von Ihnen dazu, wie die große Enttäuschung von Kopenhagen vielleicht in eine neue Hoffnung für Mexiko umgewandelt werden kann, auch, welche neuen Initiativen die Europäische Union ergreifen will, weil wir wissen, dass das noch nicht ausreicht, was wir bisher beschlossen haben, und natürlich, wie Sie erreichen wollen, dass Ihr Portfolio mit den anderen Ressortzuständigkeiten in der Kommission vernetzt und integriert wird. Soweit meine Begrüßung, Frau Hedegaard. Sie haben jetzt Zeit, für zehn Minuten eine Einführung zu geben.

5-004

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – Why are we in politics? I think we are in politics because we believe it is possible to change things, because despite our different views and ideas we share one inclination, to want something to be different tomorrow from what it is today. Over the next five years we have a lot to change in the EU. Otherwise we risk lagging behind politically, economically and strategically in the world of the 21st Century.

My first conscious political act was back in 1972, when I put up a poster in my classroom which said ‘Vote yes to the European Community’. My class teacher took it down immediately, but still... Later in 1986, as a young parliamentarian, I advocated a ‘yes’ vote when we had a referendum on the Single European Act – of course we should strengthen European cooperation. Later, during the referendums on Maastricht, as a journalist, I reported on the growing scepticism towards Europe, and therefore I was thrilled to witness the historic enlargement ten years later, proving the need for a strong European Union.

In the last five and half years, as Minister for the Environment and then for Climate and Energy, I have seen first hand how much more we can do together. Actually, I have often been able to use the EU as a lever for domestic action. I have also had the privilege of working with the MEPs on REACH, on cars and ship scrapping, and in October 2008, I came here to the Temporary Committee on Climate Change to hear your views prior to COP 14 in Potsdam. So I know the value of working closely with you in the early stages of trying to change things.

If you allow me the chance to work as the first Climate Action Commissioner of the European Union, I am sure that I will still need your help and your ideas to keep the level of ambition high. So how would I like to see Europe having changed five years from now? I would like to see a Europe that is the most climate-friendly region in the world and which is living proof that by investing in climate friendly and energy efficient technologies you do not lose economically. You gain.

If, five years ago, I had told you that in 2009, despite a historic economic crisis, climate change would top the international agenda – so much so that 120 heads of state

and government would come to the Copenhagen Climate Conference – you would not have believed me. Had I told you that all the major emitters and the United States would sit around the same table acknowledging a shared responsibility and the two degree target, you would have thought I was dreaming. I was certainly disappointed that COP 15 did not deliver binding targets. Definitely, there is still a lot of work to do.

However, a lot has changed in the last few years and the EU has played a tremendously important role in paving the way for change, not least – very importantly – in public opinion and awareness. The next five years could also bring significant change, not just because of the climate, but also because if we hesitate, if we drag our feet, Europe will lose growth, jobs and prosperity. Because international climate deal or not, China is moving and it is moving fast – very fast. The US has now understood the message and is moving rapidly on energy efficiency and technology, as are Japan, Brazil and South Korea. In other words, Europe's strongholds are being challenged. Europe must pull itself together and we must work together. If we do not we will lose, if we do we, have a chance of winning.

To save resources is to save money. In the future, when my children are my age, there will be nine billion people on planet Earth, all wanting a share in the good life, and making resources scarce and consequently expensive. As we invest in a sustainable future, let us choose solutions that at the same time can benefit climate, energy security and job creation.

Let me give you just one example. If Europe produces smarter and more energy-efficient vehicles than others, it will not only benefit our climate and our environment, it will also lessen the need for imported fuels and it will make it more likely that we can secure jobs. Some may say we cannot afford it – I say we cannot afford not to. Therefore, we must mainstream climate into all relevant policy areas. To achieve that I will work closely with my Commission colleagues for transport, research, agriculture, energy, industry, development and, naturally, with the Environment Commissioner. Where Mr Dimas was one strong voice, Mr Potočnik and I will have two voices in the college.

However, the whole Commission must be measured as to whether it delivers on President Barroso's political guidelines for the next mandate. The successor to the Lisbon Strategy must have incentives that promote low-carbon and green technologies. Resources for research in these areas must be increased, as must policy support for demonstration and deployment of new green technologies.

It goes without saying that I will implement the agreed climate and energy package with all the secondary legislation required, but mainstreaming is much more than that. When, for example, we reform agriculture we must systematically sink climate perspectives into our priorities. Another area is transport. Transport-related emissions keep growing and offset all too often the

emissions reductions achieved in the power and manufacturing sectors. Some headway has been made with CO<sub>2</sub> and car legislation, the forthcoming integration of aviation into the European carbon market and the Commission proposal on CO<sub>2</sub> and light vehicles, but more needs to be done and I will work with the Commissioner for Transport towards a comprehensive climate and transport package.

When it comes to adaptation we must also mainstream, as part of the upcoming debate on the Financial Perspective. I believe there needs to be a systematic climate-proofing of all new infrastructure projects that are financed by the European Union. I hope that this will trigger wider action on how to develop comprehensive adaptation strategies in all Member States. On the international level, I will work very hard to bring about an international carbon market across as many countries as possible and across the OECD countries by 2015. My objective is to link the EU ETS with the US's system, if possible, by 2015. My predecessor put the European carbon market on a solid footing. This now allows the EU ETS to become more international.

Finally, there are many lessons to be drawn from COP 15. I am sure I will get the opportunity to come back to that seam. However, there are some very important lessons for Europe which we must learn. In the final hours at Copenhagen, China, India, Russia, the US and Japan each spoke with one voice, while Europe spoke with many different voices. Sometimes we spend so much time agreeing with one another that when finally the EU comes to international negotiations we are almost unable to negotiate. Here we must improve, in order to give Europe a stronger voice. The next five years definitely will bring changes. Our goal must be to mainstream resources and to mainstream climate into EU policy-making. It would be a privilege to work with you and colleagues in order to ensure that the Europe of tomorrow is more sustainable than the Europe of today.

*(Applause)*

5-005

**Chair.** – Commissioner-designate Hedegaard, thank you for this introduction. You are the first candidate to have hit 10 minutes – exactly to the second! That was precise, very good, and thank you for these messages: the EU, the most climate-friendly region in the world. You are a strong single voice in national climate policy.

We will now start the hearing.

5-006

**Richard Seeber (PPE).** – Herr Vorsitzender, Frau Kommissarskandidatin! Herzlichen Glückwunsch, dass Sie für wohl eines der schwierigsten Dossiers, die zu vergeben waren, ausgesucht wurden! Sie haben ja bereits viel Erfahrung gesammelt. Wie Sie in Ihrer Einführungsrede bereits gesagt haben, ist der Klimawandel eine klassische Querschnittsmaterie, und weltweit werden unterschiedliche Ansätze gewählt. Ich möchte mich aber eher darauf konzentrieren, von Ihnen zu hören, was Sie jetzt in Europa zu tun planen. Die

Chinesen schlafen nicht, wie Sie gesagt haben, sie sind der größte Produzent von Windrädern. Amerika schläft nicht. Trotzdem, wir haben kein Abkommen in Kopenhagen zustande gebracht, weil eben unterschiedliche Ansätze der Politikgestaltung vorherrschen. Wie soll Ihrer Ansicht nach Europa im Klimaschutz voranschreiten? Welche konkreten *policy tools* planen Sie jetzt in den nächsten fünf Jahren? Was ist nach fünf Jahren anders?

5-007

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – Actually, I think we have already set a lot of fine targets: the targets for renewables, our goal for energy efficiency, the targets for reductions. Some of the main aims are already there. I think that the challenge for the next five years would be to actually implement here. As I said, there are areas where we could do even more.

National states are already working with these things after the effort-sharing. A lot of initiatives are already taking place out there. I think that there are areas where we could do more as a European Union – for instance, as I mentioned, in transport. There are numerous suggestions that will have to come up over the next years, for lorries for example, but there could also be other areas within transport.

One of the areas that I think we should look into would be shipping. I would very much prefer international regulations on shipping. I had hoped this could be part of a Copenhagen Agreement, but I think Europe must try to define how we can be sure that in the next few years we will actually also somehow be able to address emissions from shipping, preferably of course in an international regulation.

Then, when we make our agricultural policies, for example, we should incorporate new technologies that could make some more climate-friendly and environmental ways to produce the food and crops. There are lots of things that can be done in that area as well. I think we should also be able to be clever not only when we build new buildings – the EU has already taken initiatives there – but also when we renovate. How can we be sure that we do it in the best possible way, seen from future generations, when we know where we need to be, not only by 2020 but also by 2050?

5-008

**Richard Seeber (PPE).** – Sie haben eben auf die teilweise fehlende Implementierung hingewiesen. Das war ja ein Vorwurf, den wir in Kopenhagen immer wieder zu hören bekommen haben, dass wir zwar ein schönes Regelwerk haben, dass aber andere Staaten, die das nicht haben, genauso weit sind wie wir. Glauben Sie, dass man die vorhandenen *policy tools*, die wir heute in Europa haben, ausbauen soll, um Mitgliedstaaten zu zwingen, die Verpflichtungen, die sie übernommen haben, auch einzuhalten bzw. auch Sektoren verstärkt an die Kandare zu nehmen? Wie wollen Sie hier von Ihrer Seite bewirken, dass man wirklich das einhält, was konkret vereinbart wurde?

5-009

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I think you are very right to say that there is a challenge. It is one thing to set up fine targets and make the tools at European level, but I think there are around 3 000 different cases, many of them in the field of the environment, where Member States are still not living up to what they are supposed to do – I think 600 or something similar. I think we should try to look at this.

That is very generally speaking, because I think that, in the area of climate, there are some rather specific tools as to how to deal with lack of implementation. For instance, if you do not live up to the defined climate policies, then you can even be fined – according to the Kyoto Protocol there are some international regulations for that. There will be ways to ensure that you implement, or else it will be very expensive for you. There could also be a system whereby, when you give out the allowances, if nations have not lived up, in the first period, to what they were supposed to live up to, then that will come at a price later on.

5-010

**Marita Ulvskog (S&D).** – Välkommen hit Connie Hedegaard! Köpenhamnstoppmötet blev ett misslyckande och du var en del av detta, eftersom du var en av dem som hade en nyckelroll. Under mötets avgörande skede var det USA och Kina som ledde diskussionerna medan EU var frånvarande. Jag vill veta vilka initiativ du kommer att ta för att EU ska återta en ledande och pådrivande roll i kampen mot klimatförändringarna om du godkänns som klimatkommissionär. Jag tänker alltså inte bara på genomförande av ingångna åtaganden utan också nya initiativ. När kommer du till exempel att föreslå att EU ökar sina åtaganden när det gäller utsläppsminskningar från 20 till 30 procent?

5-011

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – First, as I have said before, yes, I would very much have liked to have seen even more progress in Copenhagen.

But we should also not forget that we had finance delivered. We had all the developing emerging economies – and the USA – saying ‘we have a co-responsibility’. In the run-up to Copenhagen, due to the fact that we set that deadline three years back, Brazil, South Africa, India, China and the USA – all countries which were not part of the Kyoto deal – had set up proposals and targets for domestic action in their national systems. So I really do think that we also achieved substantial things in Copenhagen. Also we achieved the 2°C. But of course, as I also said in my first presentation, there is still a lot to do.

I agree with you: it is very important that the EU takes a leading role. I just emphasised the need for Europe to speak with a more united voice. I know very well it is easier said than done. But I think we must reflect on and learn from what happened in the last 24 hours in Copenhagen, because in an international world Europe must stand more united if we are to be heard.

One way in which I think the EU could have played a better role would probably have been if we had come

forward with financial offers at an earlier stage. The finance came to the table very late, and I think that it could have had a positive impact with the developing countries if, before they left their capitals, they had seen that money would actually come their way.

So there is something to learn from that, and, when it comes to the 30% – I would like us to go to the 30% as soon as possible – but in hindsight, now, having seen what happened in Copenhagen, I think that up to 1 February we should be very cautious about using our move from 20% to 30% in a manner that can make others deliver more than they have announced so far.

5-012

**Marita Ulvskog (S&D).** – Tack för svaret. Med tanke på finansieringens betydelse vill jag fortsätta med denna fråga. Du har ett smalt ansvarsområde och måste samarbeta mycket nära och vara överens med ett antal kommissionärer. Du kommer till ett EU där det i princip inte finns några pengar avsatta till klimatåtgärder. Hur tänker du göra för att få fram de pengarna? Du nämnde jordbrukspolitiken i inledningen. Är du beredd att se till så att det överförs medel från jordbruksbudgeten till klimatåtgärder?

5-013

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I am very much aware that these years we will not be swimming in money, not in the European Union, not in the Member States. How you describe the situation in Europe sounds very familiar.

Yes, I think there are huge funds here; and, when discussing the Financial Perspectives, I think it is crucial that there is better coordination between what we say will be our political priorities and targets for the next period and what we actually prioritise in our budgets. I think there is a lot to be gained, for instance, by greening the way we conduct our agriculture.

By the way, I also think that, by investing in new technologies and introducing pilot projects within the agricultural sector, we could also modernise this sector in a way that would not just benefit environmentally and for its own sake, but that would also make it an export asset for the European Union, because how to green agriculture is a worldwide challenge.

5-014

**Chris Davies (ALDE).** – I think of you as a rather feisty Environment Minister and I have enjoyed our previous discussions even though we have not always agreed, and I think almost everyone here, when it was announced that you were proposed as Commissioner-designate for Climate Action, thought that this is excellent: the President of COP – a perfect role.

There is no question that, by the standards that the European Union set itself for Copenhagen, it was a failure. We did not come close to reaching those standards. Now you hear around the corridors: ‘Why do we want a Commissioner for Climate Action associated with such failure?’ How would you respond?

5-015

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – It is good to be able to answer that question here instead of in the corridors. I basically think that you can criticise a lot what happened in Copenhagen, but I do not think it is fair to criticise those who spent years trying to mobilise the world. Yes, we did not get to exactly where we would have liked to be in Copenhagen – where I would have liked to be and where you would have liked to be.

However, as I said at the beginning: who would have imagined, only a few years back, that one of the main priorities, including for the European Union, would be to have all the emerging economies saying ‘Yes, we know we have a co-responsibility’? That was said loud and clear in Copenhagen.

The developed countries will now have to come up with commitments to reduce. Emerging economies have accepted that they must commit to action and even that they must be verified, monitored and reported in a domestic way, through the national communications that they now accept they will have to send in every second year.

So we have also gained a lot of things and, in the run-up to Copenhagen, the deadline that we set, and the idea that if we put the pressure very much on the parties then they had to prepare themselves before they came to Copenhagen, was a strategy that worked. In the end, for some reason, some countries decided at the very last minute that they did not want to deliver. You cannot blame the European Union that this is how it was. You cannot blame the Danish Presidency – actually it is a bit tough to blame those who worked most to achieve a turnaround in international climate politics for the actions of those who, in the end, did not want to deliver.

*(Applause)*

5-016

**Chris Davies (ALDE).** – I described you as a former feisty Environment Minister, but I know some of my colleagues say that Anders Rasmussen fled to NATO because he was being bashed around too much by you! But I think many of us like the idea of having a strong Commissioner who can give a really good lead to us all and, perhaps, push her way forward within the College. But so much of your work is going to be cross-sectoral within the Commission, and obviously you have got to keep the Council on board. I just wondered where you think the balance lies between being forthright, pugnacious and strong, and being obstinate.

5-017

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I am not sure I am able to define that line exactly, because the right balance to some is not the right balance to others. But I believe that politics is also about daring to fight for what you think is right. Yes, sometimes you have some battles, but, if you do not want battles, then stay out of politics.

When we talk about things that are a total paradigm shift in how we create our growth, our wealth, our jobs, our societies, our energy, the relationship between North and South, and all these issues that we are going to deal with here, then there will be battles. There will be fights and sometimes they will have to be tough.

I know that in the Commission it is not just like in a government: you stay there, you do your job and you work very often through colleagues, as I will very much have to do. I think that more and more in Europe we realise that if we do not move over the next five years, and we do not implement, then we will lag behind, and we will lose not just environmentally but also job-wise. I think that recognition is growing – not least, by the way, in industry – so I think there are a lot of allies there.

5-018

**Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE).** – I liked a lot your statement that you want Europe to be the most climate-friendly area in the world. Are you also ready to be tough towards the most polluting form of power production – coal power – because the present form of emission trading is not enough to make the transformation we need? We see new coal plants being built. Will you look at setting CO<sub>2</sub> emission performance standards for power stations to ensure the shift from unabated coal? Are you ready at least to make an impact assessment of this within one year?

5-019

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I understand your question. However, I think that we should recall that, when we talk about the coal power stations and other plants, then of course they are part of the ETS. I understand that we could say that we could help performance standards, and in my written reply I say that we should wait and see whether this CCS technology actually works before we start saying that it should be CCS-ready etc. I think that is why we should not just rush into this.

I also think that, if we had these performance standards for the new plants, how could we guarantee that some countries would not just prolong the living time of the old ones? I understand that we expect around maybe 60 plants to be built in the next few years and we should take care that some of the Member States, including some of the new Member States, will not get allowances for free for those new ones where they get it for the old ones. We should take care that we do not construct a policy that, in the end, just makes parties, Member States, keep their old plants, because in many cases it would be better to get some new technologies.

So I am a bit hesitant there about promising you that, yes, we will just do this, and about promising this before we know, for instance, whether the CCS technology works. There is one problem with CCS technology, and I think that was what Mr Davies just referred to – we have sometimes had some discussions on that – and that is it takes more energy. If you have three plants and you CCS equip them, then it takes the energy of four plants. That is one of the areas where I think we have to have some concerns as to how we do it in the wisest manner.

5-020

**Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE).** – I understand that you do not want to rush things, but I am disappointed that you did not say that you were ready at least to carry out an impact assessment. Performance standards can be differentiated according to the age of power stations. We know this very well, but it is not clear why you are so hesitant on this issue. You speak about -30%, but if we delay this decision to shift to -30%, what measures will you take to make certain we can do it without resorting to artificial tricks such as forestry projects in developing countries?

5-021

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I did not actually reject the idea of having an impact assessment. I always think it is a very good tool. It was just that, if you say, ‘Are you going to do this?’, then I think we should think twice because there may be some disadvantages that you would not like to see, and I would not like to see. I agree with you, however, that an impact assessment can always analyse the pros and cons. I just think that this is very much an issue where it is not black and white and we should take care not to double-regulate in any field.

5-022

**Martin Callanan (ECR).** – With our adoption of the climate change package in December 2008, the EU knowingly placed a lot of its heavy energy-consuming industry at a competitive disadvantage with the rest of the world. The assumption of course was that by giving a lead we would help to reach a global agreement at Copenhagen and other developing countries would then agree to similar measures.

We all of course live in the hope that there will be a binding agreement committing the US, China, India etc. to similar binding targets but, if there is not, what measures will you propose to us to mitigate the disadvantage to many EU industries and simply prevent the transfer of emissions from the EU to other developing countries?

5-023

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner designate.** – The threat of carbon leakage is real, and therefore whatever we do in this field must be balanced. However, I believe we should take care that we are not so cautious and so balanced that in the end it does not benefit our companies.

As I said at the beginning, I believe that – international climate deal or not – China is doing this now and doing it extremely fast. Last year, China was the biggest solar PV exporter; this year it is supposed to be the biggest exporter of wind energy. It is taking over some of the strongholds of European industry.

I used the example of car manufacturers. I know that they hate regulatory things, and of course they would argue that they cannot do it, it is too tough, not to be so tough on them because ‘What about our competitors?’, but what do we see now? We see things changing in the United States, we see things changing in China and we see things changing in India. We must take care that we

do not, out of the best of intentions, try to protect our own industries and actually protect them out of business, so to speak.

However, I agree with you that we must balance things. When we do the benchmarking for industries, then we must try to balance things. It is just that we cannot make such a solely industry-friendly benchmark that in the end this would prevent it from renewing itself.

I believe that European industry has to be pushed gently but decisively in the right direction – not just because of what is being done in China and the United States and elsewhere, but also because we need it if we are to protect our climate and our environment.

5-024

**Martin Callanan (ECR).** – I am not against industry being pushed in the right direction, and I am not against green measures being adopted. China clearly is manufacturing some green technologies, but they are also building huge quantities of new coal-fired power stations.

My point is very simply that we can do both. It does not make any sense whatsoever to simply transfer heavy energy-intensive industries from the EU to China and the rest of the world, because that is the process that has been happening over the last few years.

It is not an ‘either-or’ game: we can encourage green technologies, but we can also see that, without binding targets being adopted by China, India and elsewhere, they will simply do both. They will manufacture the green technology, but they will also take the heavy, energy-intensive industries as well.

5-025

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I agree with you, and that is exactly why I have been working for years to try to bring China and other major emerging economies on board in an international climate regime. That must be what we try to do – for many reasons from a European perspective and exactly because of the analysis that you just gave us.

We must of course take care that you cannot pollute for free as long as you do it in an emerging economy, for instance. I think that is where Copenhagen was a forceful step forward.

The next challenge for us is: what will happen on 1 February? Will China actually internationalise the national target that they set? That will be extremely crucial for the way forward in the international climate negotiations and for the prospect of bringing China into some kind of future regime which will be to the benefit of our industries also.

5-026

**Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL).** – Welkom, mevrouw Hedegaard. Een van de maatregelen om klimaatverandering tegen te gaan, is een duurzame, klantvriendelijke energiemix. In de resolutie van het

Europees Parlement voor de COP15 stond dat kernenergie hier een substantieel onderdeel van zou moeten uitmaken. Ik persoonlijk denk dat kernenergie absoluut niet duurzaam is. En toen ik aan de heer Dimas bij een bijeenkomst in Athene voorafgaand aan de COP15 vroeg wat het standpunt van de Commissie was, zei hij dat het standpunt van de Commissie was dat de Commissie geen standpunt had.

Graag zou ik uw mening horen over dit standpunt van de Commissie, dus geen standpunt. En wat is uw persoonlijke opvatting ten aanzien van kernenergie en duurzaamheid?

5-027

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I think that the policy in the European Union has long been that the energy mix will be up to the countries themselves. I come from a country where we decided, by a vote in Parliament in 1985, that we would not have nuclear. We decided instead to pursue a path involving renewables and energy efficiency, things like that, and we consider that we have had great success with that. So that is the background I come with.

But it is a fact that nuclear is in the world, and it will also be in the world for many years to come. I am in absolutely no doubt that that is the reality, and that is why it is important to take very good care of the security aspects, and why, for instance, in the case of Euratom and other institutions that do research and development in these areas, it is important that we take care that the nuclear reactors and plants that are there are as safe as possible.

Just one more thing: I think that, in my universe, nuclear is not a renewable resource.

5-028

**Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL).** – Buiten deze duurzame energiemix zijn er natuurlijk nog een heleboel andere acties die je kunt ondernemen om klimaatverandering tegen te gaan. Mijn vervolgvraag is dan ook: gaat u nog extra actie ondernemen voor het terugdringen van de uitstoot van bijvoorbeeld methaan, een zeer sterk broeikasgas dat veroorzaakt wordt door de bio-industrie in de Europese veestapel? Gaat u daar wat aan doen? En bent u iemand die bijvoorbeeld een goede voedselkeuze met weinig CO<sub>2</sub>-uitstoot zou stimuleren, bijvoorbeeld door lokaal voedsel te promoten tegenover voedsel dat van veraf moet komen?

5-029

**Der Vorsitzende.** – Das war sehr schlau: von der Atomenergie zur Viehzucht. Es ist ein sehr großer Bogen, der gespannt wird. Aber wir sind heute etwas relaxed, da lasse ich die Frage mal zu. Wir sind gut in der Zeit. Okay.

5-030

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I think trying to see if we can have some of the more dangerous substances included to a higher degree forms part of international negotiations. That was also one of the things we worked for in Copenhagen.

On the question of local food sources, I think it is fine if you make it apparent to people that it also makes sense climate-wise to buy things that have been produced locally or that you buy things that are seasonal or whatever, but in a global world we should regulate that kind of thing politically in a different way. People will have to have their choices, but we could take care by including emissions from aviation, from shipping and things like that and make the polluter pay. We can make importing foods from very far away come at a price, which will give a comparative advantage to those things produced locally.

5-031

**Anna Rosbach (EFD).** – Kære Connie Hedegaard! Først vil jeg takke Dem for nogle fine briefinger til dette udvalg under COP15-mødet i København. At samle 120 statsoverhoveder omkring et eneste emne på et sted er (set fra min stol) ikke en fiasko, men et historisk øjeblik.

Nu til mit spørgsmål, som bl.a. omhandler gasledningen Nordstream. Er De bekendt med, at estiske miljøorganisationer har indklaget Finland, Sverige, Danmark og Tyskland, fordi godkendelsen af Nordstream-projektet ikke lever op til de stillede miljøkrav? Og hvordan har De det med, at Europa bliver afhængig af endnu en russisk gasforsyning? Og til sidst, ved De, om der foreligger en undersøgelse af, hvor stort et ressourcspild der er ved forældede kraftværker og deres distributionsnet i Europa?

5-032

**Connie Hedegaard, udpeget kommissær.** – Tak, Anne Rosbach, også for de pæne ord. Først: Ja, jeg er godt klar over, at nogle ngo'ere har været bekymrede over nogen af forholdene omkring den påtænkte Nordstream-gasledning. Det er selvfølgelig også derfor, at det er vigtigt, at der nationalt gennemføres VVM-undersøgelser, og at der nu også på et samlet plan bliver set på, om der nu er gjort alt, hvad der skal gøres af hensyn til miljøet. Jeg kender især denne sag fra den danske sammenhæng. Det forholder sig sådan, at man i henhold til havretskonventionen skal give tilladelse til, at sådan en energiledning kan gå gennem et havområde, forudsat at den lever op til alle miljøkrav. Det vurderede den danske energistyrelse var tilfældet, for så vidt angår den del af ledningen, der går igennem Danmark. De andre (de svenske, de finske osv.) myndigheder har også lavet deres analyser, og nu skal EU så vurdere det samlede projekt, og selvfølgelig skal det kun godkendes, hvis det lever op til miljøkravene.

Den andel del af spørgsmålet, som jo er meget mere politisk: Hvad er min mening om, at vi er afhængige af endnu en russisk gasledning? Jeg ser det nok lidt anderledes. Jeg forstår godt bekymringen over et Europa, der i for høj grad er afhængigt af russisk gas, men dette projekt bidrager på sin vis til, at vi bliver en lille smule mindre afhængige. Netop derfor har det været et EU-ønske at få denne ledning, fordi det trods alt er bedre, at der er flere ledninger, end at der kun er en enkelt eller nogle meget få hovedledninger. Det er derfor, det har været et meget stort ønske for Europa, at der kom flere ledninger. Som jeg sagde tidligere, forholder det sig desuden således, uanset om vi kan lide

det eller ej, at man har ret til at etablere sådanne ledninger ifølge international havretskonvention, forudsat de lever op til forskellige miljøkrav. Denne ledning, Nordstream, vil ikke blive godkendt af EU, medmindre den lever op til dem.

5-033

**Anna Rosbach (EFD).** – Som opfølgning vil jeg ganske kort med henblik på, når De tager dette emne op, informere om, at der ligger utrolig mange udetonerede sennepsgasbomber fra både første og anden verdenskrig på havbunden, og at såvel Sverige som Finland har store problemer med kemisk affald fra deres papirindustri, og at der faktisk ikke er nogen, der ved, hvad der sker under arbejdet miljømæssigt set, hvis de to ting kommer i berøring med hinanden. Endelig var min sidste del af spørgsmålet omkring ressourcspild fra gamle forældede kraftværker og deres rørledninger, altså deres distributionsnet, måske ikke helt uinteressant.

5-034

**Connie Hedegaard, udpeget kommissær.** – Nej, problemstillingen var bare, at der var mange spørgsmål at besvare på meget kort tid. Men først problemet med sennepsgas. Den problemstilling havde vi også i Danmark i forbindelse med den påtænkte linjeføring omkring Bornholm, hvor der er nogle gamle sennepsgasdepoter. Netop for at undgå dem, blev linjeføringen ændret en smule. Det problem er der altså en mulighed for at komme uden om. Jeg er helt opmærksom på, at det er et kæmpe, kæmpe stort projekt, og derfor er VVM-undersøgelserne også komplicerede. Men grundlæggende mener jeg, at de svenske myndigheder og de finske myndigheder osv. selvfølgelig gør deres arbejde. Og som jeg sagde meget klart før: EU godkender ikke til sidst hele projektet, medmindre man har fået tilfredsstillende svar på den VVM-undersøgelse, der finder sted for projektet som helhed.

5-035

**Der Vorsitzende.** – Ich habe an sich eine andere Frage erwartet, denn jetzt gibt es wohl niemanden, der fragt, ob der Klimawandel überhaupt stattfindet oder ob das nicht eine Verschwörung düsterer, finsterer Kreise ist. Sie wären die einzige gewesen, die das hätte fragen können, wenn ich die Liste so sehe. Also die Klimaverweigerer sind heute nicht da und das Thema fällt aus. Auch das gibt es.

5-036

**Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE), ENVI** – Es ist eigentlich ein Problem, dass oft die Klimaverweigerer nicht da sind, weil man dann nicht mit ihnen reden kann. Ich möchte gerne meinen alten liberalen Freund Chris Davies ein bisschen verteidigen, weil er nur in der ersten Woche in Kopenhagen sein konnte, als die Apparatschiks da waren, und da war dann natürlich alles friedlich und undramatisch. Aber in der Woche, in der das Parlament da war, sah es schon ganz anders aus. Die Chinesen haben da schon eine Diktatur vorgeführt, die war wirklich dramatisch.

Frau Ministerin, ich hätte gerne ein bisschen mehr über Ihre Philosophie gehört. Ich habe den Eindruck, in Europa haben wir in den letzten zehn Jahren eine ziemlich harte Bestrafungspolitik im Klimabereich verfolgt. Und ich möchte ein bisschen von Ihnen hören,

wo das eigentlich hingehen kann und wie man das organisieren kann, dass wir viel mehr an Bord bekommen, dass das Klimaproblem zu einer Klimachance wird. Ich denke da an Nachhaltigkeit. Auch die Semantik bei uns ist falsch, ich denke an mehr Effizienz und damit automatisch an mehr Exportmöglichkeiten. Ich denke an Rohstoffsicherheit. Es geht bekanntlich um die Rohstoffe unserer Kinder. Also das hätte ich gerne mal von Ihnen gewusst.

5-037

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I do not know if we would have a punishment policy, but I think there would still be regulation; there would still be things that we have to do politically. There definitely will, but I think that it is very important to try to broaden the climate policy, and I also tried to do this in my introduction by saying that it is also a job-creating agenda.

It is a good thing for us if our children can have cleaner air and cleaner water. A lot of benefits come with addressing climate change. I also think that, in a future where we can see that there would be a deficit of resources, or at least they would be very scarce, it is of course sound economics to try to use fewer resources and less energy.

We had the International Energy Agency report recently and it showed us the prospects for oil prices in the next few years. There is only one long-term trend there: the price of oil is going to soar, indeed rocket. So it is also sound economics to be much more focused on this. I also think from what we saw up to Copenhagen, and the mobilisation that we also saw in Europe there, that it should also perhaps be a more fun agenda so that people can see the potential and the possibilities.

With my political background, being a European conservative in the tradition of conservatism, I think it is very important that we avoid a society where we would have to say 'you cannot do that', 'you must not do that', 'no free choices there'. This requires that we react sooner rather than later, because, the more we hesitate, the more we risk having to have some tools to combat climate change that you and I would not like to use.

5-038

**Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE).** – Vielen Dank, da gibt es keine Nachfrage.

5-039

**Dan Jørgensen (S&D), ENVI.** – Lad mig begynde med at byde Dem velkommen, Connie Hedegaard. Jeg forventer et godt samarbejde, hvis De bliver godkendt som kommissær. Nu til mit spørgsmål: I betragtning af, hvilket momentum der var bygget op før København, i betragtning af, hvilke målsætninger der var defineret – ikke mindst af det danske formandskab – så var mødet en fiasko. Så var resultatet en fiasko. Det hører jeg Dem egentlig også delvist anerkende, idet De siger, at De godt kunne have ønsket Dem et bedre resultat, men jeg savner lidt selvkritik. Hvis vi skal have tillid til, at De kan stå i spidsen for et europæisk lederskab globalt, kræver det

også, at vi har tillid til, at De har lidt selvkritik, og at De kan lære af Deres fejl. Så kunne De ikke her nævnte de tre vigtigste fejl, det danske formandskab begik i processen op til København og under mødet i København?

5-040

**Connie Hedegaard, udpeget kommissær.** – Det er en næsten grænseoverskridende oplevelse at være blevet Des med Dan Jørgensen. Hvis vi ikke havde defineret nogen målsætninger for København. Hvis vi havde ladet den internationale proces køre videre uden at forsøge at sætte en deadline for den, så tror jeg – og jeg tror i hvert fald, at jeg, hvis pressen ikke var til stede, kunne få Dan Jørgensen til at være enig med mig – at så var det nok gået rigtig meget værre. Der er alligevel sket det, at bl.a. inden for rammerne af Grønlandsdialogen – som Danmark har taget initiativ til, og som omfattede tre møder i juli, i september, i oktober og igen en pre-COP i november – allerede dér blev efter min mening mange af de ting defineret, som faktisk indgår i resultatet fra København. Der har Danmark altså taget et klart lederskab. Er der noget, vi kunne have gjort anderledes? Det er der sikkert. Jeg mener dog, at der ikke er noget, der ville have ført til et andet resultat. Man kan sikkert pege på det ene og det andet og det tredje, og spørge sig: "Hvad nu hvis man havde gjort sådan?" Men min analyse er – og jeg tror, jeg er enig med dem, der var der – at uanset, om vi havde gjort mere, så var der nogen lande, der, efter forskellige overvejelser (også med sig selv) og nogen strategiskifter, til sidst bestemte sig for, at de ikke ville det. Det er meget svært at besvare detaljeret på meget kort tid, fordi der skete rigtig, rigtig mange ting. Men det er nu engang min analyse, at selv om vi havde stået endnu mere på hovedet, ville der alligevel have været nogle lande, der til sidst havde bestemt sig for, at de ikke ville være med. Lad mig lige bemærke, at jeg gerne vil give både Dan Jørgensen og andre, der måtte kunne påvise det, en god flaske champagne, hvis man kan finde noget formandskabsland på tidligere COP-møder, der har gjort mere for at række hånden frem til ulandene, hjælpe dem også økonomisk med kapacitetsopbygning, invitere dem til flere dialogmøder, besøge flere af dem. Det var i hvert fald ikke dér, det haltede.

5-041

**Dan Jørgensen (S&D), ENVI.** – Nu er vi her for at arbejde og ikke for at drikke champagne! Men lad mig spørge lidt anderledes, hvis De ikke vil nævne de tre største fejl: Kan De overhovedet konkret pege på en eneste fejl? Og derudover, når det ikke så meget handler om det danske formandskab men EU, har De tidligere været inde på, at det var en ulempe, at vi ikke talte med én stemme. Det er jeg meget enig med Dem i. Spørgsmålet er bare: Hvordan vil De rette op på det? Har De tænkt Dem at give Sarkozy mundkurv på? Har De tænkt Dem at forbyde Deres kolleger Oettinger og andre, der kunne være interesseret i det, at udtale sig internationalt om klimaspørgsmål?

5-042

**Connie Hedegaard, udpeget kommissær.** – Det sidste vil jeg næppe gøre. Og jeg har heller ikke tænkt mig at

forbyde hverken den ene eller den anden at sige noget. Det er sådan set heller ikke det, jeg synes er EU's problem. Problemet er bare, når vi sidder i lokalet, og dér sidder USA's præsident, og dér sidder den kinesiske repræsentant, og dér sidder den indiske repræsentant, at der derudover sidder mange europæere i rummet. Det skal vi tænke over, og det behøver ikke at være et problem. Men det er unægtelig en fordel, hvis de siger det samme. Det er jo bl.a. det, Lissabontraktaten har handlet om: Hvordan kan vi blive meget, meget bedre i stand til at tale med denne ene stemme? Jeg har ikke den færdige opskrift. Det tror jeg faktisk ikke, at nogen har lige nu. Og jeg kan også se alle vanskelighederne i det, for hvem skal så denne ene stemme være? Jeg tror, at vi er nødt til at gøre os alvorlige tanker, fordi EU ellers taber lederskabet i verden. Det er enormt meget nemmere for de andre lande. Og jeg overhører hvad EU siger, hvis EU ikke i sådan nogle afgørende situationer siger det samme.

5-043

**Der Vorsitzende.** – Ja, Maulkorb für Sarkozy – das ist eine *mission impossible*. Das schafft wohl auch Frau Hedegaard nicht.

5-044

**Theodoros Skylakakis (PPE), ENVI.** – Commissioner-designate, can you clarify on mainstreaming? Do you intend to introduce climate impact assessments for relevant upcoming legislation?

In the EU budget revision, do you intend to propose a climate-proofing procedure?

Would you consider initiating a health check of relevant existing legislation policies, and could you give some concrete examples on that?

Should we look into the introduction of energy efficiency best practices in the EU procurement rules?

Should we prioritise reconsidering the EU's forestry strategy? We are going to lose millions of hectares in southern Europe in the next two to three decades.

One final question: state subsidies for hard coal are to be reconsidered during your mandate. Do you intend to mainstream climate action into this policy?

5-045

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner designate.** – This one question concerns all my five years, probably, so it will be difficult to cover in two minutes! But, yes, impact assessment will be important but maybe not in everything, because we should also take care that we do not do things like that where it is not necessary.

In the beginning, I mentioned climate-proofing, for instance, of things that the Union pays for in the different funds. It is only logical that we ensure that, when we get European funding, we spend the money according to the knowledge that we have, climate-wise. It is silly to finance a road project, which will be there for the next many decades, if you do not climate-proof it from the very beginning and then you spend taxpayers'

money throughout Europe. That is the kind of stupid thing that we should correct.

As I said, I would like to make a transport and climate package with my colleague, the Transport Commissioner, and we could do things like that in different areas. The health check, CO<sub>2</sub> car reviews – you asked for specific examples – that could be one area, according to what I said earlier on transport.

Then you mentioned procurement. I think we should be much better at using green public procurement. There are so many areas where the different public sectors in the Union could help at pulling the market in the right direction, and we do not use these possibilities well enough.

Forest strategy is a very important area. I will discuss this with my colleague Mr Potočnik. I think it was almost embarrassing that we did not manage to get a European position on forestry up to COP-15: just one example of where we are really lagging behind.

5-046

**Theodoros Skylakakis (PPE), ENVI.** – To come back to the only question that you did not answer – so it was very impressive that you managed to answer the rest – fuel subsidies.

Worldwide we spend EUR 300 billion on fossil-fuel subsidies. This is totally unacceptable, and yet we don't have a real policy on it because of our own fuel subsidies. This is something which falls within your mandate.

5-047

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I do not think we should subsidise fuels; it was also part of the G8 declaration, if I recall it correctly, in L'Aquila this summer, that we should not subsidise fuels on our own soil and also globally.

I know that it is easier said than done in the case of many developing countries, and it will take some time, but evidently, if we are going to be less dependent on fossil fuels, then everybody ought to be able to see that it is not very wise politics to subsidise these fuels.

5-048

**Der Vorsitzende.** – Wir kommen jetzt zur ersten Frage aus dem Industrieausschuss. Der Kollege Herbert Reul war sehr schlau. Er hat aus sechs großen Fragen zehn kleine gemacht, sodass also zehn Kolleginnen und Kollegen aus dem Industrieausschuss Fragen stellen. Das ist ja auch wichtig, weil Klimaschutzpolitik natürlich viel mit Industrie zu tun hat, wenn sie nicht sogar Industriepolitik ist.

5-049

**Bendt Bendtsen (PPE), ITRE.** – Først velkommen til Bruxelles. Du har udført et fremragende stykke arbejde som Danmarks miljøminister og senere som Danmarks energi- og klimaminister, i øvrigt verdens første. Du har selv nævnt, at vi ikke fik en global bindende aftale i forbindelse med COP15. Sådan gik det desværre. Men afgørelsen i København betyder ikke, at verden står stille. USA og Kina fortsætter nu med at investere

ganske massivt i udvikling af nye energiteknologier. Vi har i Europa brug for at udvikle flere bæredygtige energiformer, så vi kan få skabt flere grønne job, konkurrencedygtige job. Og vi kan jo ikke konkurrere på timelønningerne i Europa. Vi skal tænke nyt. Jeg er bekymret over Europas erhvervsliv, og at det ikke får skabt de nye job. Hvad vil du gøre for at løfte den udfordring, der ligger i at få øget vores greentech, vores energiforskning, vores innovation, og også udviklingen af de nye teknologier?

5-050

**Connie Hedegaard, udpeget kommissær.** – Allerstørst beroliger det mig, at jeg ikke også er blevet Des med Bendt Bendtsen. Jeg vil meget gerne fokusere på forskning. Jeg mener, at det er et af de områder, hvor der er en merværdi i, at 27 arbejder sammen, og hvor der også kunne være en merværdi for virksomhederne. Vi er gået i gang med det økonomiske genopretningsprogram, der er SET-planen på energi osv., så vi er allerede gået i gang. Men vi kunne godt på flere områder beslutte os for, hvor Europa har nogle styrkepositioner, hvor vi kunne nå meget, meget længere, hvis vi udviklede noget fælles forskning, flere demonstrationsprojekter. Vi ved alle sammen, at der ligger en kæmpe udfordring i at komme fra at have den gode ide på en forskningsinstitution til at bringe den ud på markedet og skabe en god forretning. Der bliver ved med at være et stort hul, man skal over, og det kræver enormt meget kapital. Der kunne EU også gå ind og spille en stærkere rolle. Det er den ene side af det. Og når man sammenligner med, hvad de bruger på forskningsbudgetter i Sydkorea, i Singapore, i Kina, alle mulige andre steder, så tror jeg altså, at det er et af de områder, hvor vi kunne gøre aller mest gavn ved at arbejde mere sammen.

Jeg tror også – og det lå måske også lidt i spørgsmålet – at der ligger muligheder i at se på, hvordan vi undgår hele tiden kun at fokusere på de store virksomheder, det store erhvervsliv. En meget stor del af EU's erhvervsliv udgøres af små og mellemstore virksomheder. Hvad det angår, har vi i Danmark taget kontakt til de forskellige organisationer og prøvet at drage dem mere ind i, hvad en virksomhed med 30 eller 50 ansatte kan gøre. Kan den genbruge noget overskudsvarme? Er der smartere løsninger? Her tror jeg også, at vi på europæisk plan skal være meget bedre til at inspirere hinanden. Når vi har nogle gode eksempler, når der er noget bedste praksis, så behøver alle jo ikke sidde hver for sig selv og genopfinde den dybe tallerken. Jeg tror, at et større fokus på små og mellemstore virksomheder også ville være rigtig nyttigt i denne sammenhæng.

5-051

**Britta Thomsen (S&D), ITRE.** – Ja, jeg vil også gerne byde dig velkommen til Bruxelles, og vi skal heller ikke være Des. Jeg vil godt vende lidt tilbage til spørgsmålet om atomkraft og bore lidt videre i det, fordi der under arbejdet med direktivet for de bindende mål for grøn energi og CO<sub>2</sub>-reduktion, de såkaldte 20-20-mål, var rigtig mange både statsministre og medlemmer af dette parlament, som plæderede for, at grøn energi og a-kraft sådan set kunne komme ud på et, fordi begge dele var

CO<sub>2</sub>-besparende. Den holdning kom ikke igennem dengang, men nu er diskussionen oppe igen. Under høringerne i denne uge af forskningskommissæren og energikommissæren sagde de begge, at a-kraft efter deres mening var et udmærket middel til at reducere CO<sub>2</sub>, og at de gerne ville satse mere på forskning i a-kraft. Da I tre kommissærer skal arbejde tæt sammen, og da du nu tidligere har sagt, at du tog afstand fra a-kraft, vil jeg gerne spørge, om du vil nedlægge veto imod, at a-kraft bliver en del af vejen til CO<sub>2</sub>-reduktion, og at der bruges flere penge på forskning i a-kraft? Du har også lige selv sagt, at forskning er noget af det, som du vil satse på. Skal vi forske mere i a-kraft?

5-052

**Connie Hedegaard, udpeget kommissær.** – Nej, det vil jeg ikke nedlægge veto mod, og jeg vil gerne sige, at jeg ikke tog afstand fra atomkraft. Jeg sagde, at vi i Danmark, hvor jeg kommer fra, har besluttet noget andet: Vi vil ikke have atomkraft. Vi har truffet nogle fundamentale anderledes valg. Men jeg mener – som jeg også sagde klart i mit første svar – at atomkraft er i verden. Det handler om at sørge for, at sikkerheden er i orden, at der er ny viden. Jeg forstår også, at der er en ny generation af atomkraftværker på vej, hvis affaldsproblemer måske ikke er så store. Vi kan godt tage diskussionen, men jeg mener sådan set, at man må acceptere, at der i de fem år, jeg får ansvaret på dette område, stadigvæk vil være atomkraft i Europa. Det er også indiskutabelt, at det selvfølgelig er CO<sub>2</sub>-neutralt. Men som jeg sagde, er det efter min mening ikke en vedvarende energikilde, og når man taler om forskning i det, så er jeg helt opmærksom på, at der er mange, der gerne vil have, at vi skal bruge rigtig, rigtig, rigtig mange penge på forskning i atomkraft og ikke så mange penge på forskning i vedvarende energi. Det ønsker jeg ikke. Jeg anser det for meget vigtigt, at vi ikke forsker en hel masse i atomkraft på bekostning af vedvarende energi. At balancen der ikke må tippe fuldstændig, var bl.a. en diskussion, vi havde for jeg tror et år eller halvandet år siden, da vi skulle fordele nogle penge. Der er nemlig stadigvæk også hårdt brug for, at EU bliver ved med at satse massivt på forskning på et felt, hvor EU faktisk har en styrkeposition, nemlig vedvarende energi.

5-053

**Ivo Belet (PPE), ITRE.** – I would like to ask you a question in Dutch about the planned offshore energy grid project in the North Sea.

5-054

**Ivo Belet (PPE), ITRE** – Het gaat over een gigantisch project waar onder andere landen als Denemarken, België, het VK en nog zes andere landen aan zullen deelnemen, een project van tientallen miljarden euro. Ik neem aan dat u dat project gaat steunen. Hoe gaat u dat project concreet steunen? Bent u bereid nieuwe EU-financieringsinstrumenten mee voor te stellen en mee te verdedigen binnen het college van de Europese commissarissen?

En ten tweede: wat vindt u van het idee om ook de Europese burgers, ons allemaal, daar rechtstreeks bij te betrekken door ons de gelegenheid te geven daar ook

financieel in te participeren? En zo eventueel een deel van de dividenden mee op te strijken, als ik het zo oneerbiedig mag zeggen?

5-055

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner-designate*. – Regarding this energy grid, I think that the more efficient grids we can make, the better, and also because we can make our energy supply as efficient as possible. As a Danish Energy Minister, I have been – not very much, but a bit – involved in this issue of how we can have much more flexibility in our energy systems. It is absolutely crucial that if we are also to have, for instance, a higher component of renewables, that we have much more flexible systems.

I must say I am not familiar with the financing and details of this. I also think it is the responsibility of the Commissioner for Energy, so I am not directly involved in this, and therefore I am not going to give you a very lengthy answer on it.

5-056

**Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE)**, *ENVI*. – Pani Komisarz desygnowana! W czasie ostatniego szczytu do spraw klimatu w Kopenhadze mimo wysiłków, jakie Unia Europejska w przygotowanie szczytu włożyła, nie doszło do podpisania zobowiązań dotyczących światowej redukcji emisji gazów cieplarnianych, głównie przez największych emitentów – taki sprzeciw z ich strony był widoczny – takich jak Chiny czy Indie. Czy tym samym Unia Europejska w międzynarodowym procesie negocjacyjnym powinna utrzymać dotychczasową linię polityczną i w dalszym ciągu działać? Czy powinna po prostu wykazać się może większą elastycznością w stosunku do tych państw? I pytanie drugie: Co sądzi Pani o wycieku z ośrodków naukowych informacji dotyczących fałszowania wyników badań w zakresie ocieplania się klimatu?

5-057

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner-designate*. – I will take the last point first of all, about the so-called 'climategate'. I know that the chairman of the International Climate Panel, Mr Pachauri, promised in Copenhagen that they would be looking into this, but, basically, my personal opinion is that it changes nothing for me. You can leak some mails now and then, but we are talking about several thousands of researchers, who really know what this is about, giving us some advice in this field. I do not think that is going to be changed because you have a leaked mail correspondence.

I also do not think that we should be too negative about what happened with the major economies in Copenhagen. I see it differently. A few weeks before Copenhagen, Brazil, domestically – in their Parliament – set a target according to which, in spite of their growth in the coming years, they will deviate from a business-as-usual trend to the tune of 35-38%. That is really substantial in an economy like Brazil. China came forward to say that they would reduce, compared to business as usual, by 40-45%. I would have liked to see rather more, but still, for such a huge economy, to deviate from their normal five-year plans and say, 'OK,

up until 2020 this is what we plan', I think that shows us that they are really serious about this.

Yes, you are right, in the sense that no commitment was signed, but it says in the Copenhagen Accord that they are going to take action on climate change and verify that they are actually delivering on this back home. I think this is a very important first step. In Kyoto, the United States, Brazil, China, India, South Africa and the emerging economies were not part of any obligation. Now they have said, 'We know that, in order to solve this problem globally, we will have to take co-responsibility'.

5-058

**Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE)**, *ENVI*. – W takim razie takie króciutkie pytanie, bo Pani ten temat już podjęła. Czy w takim razie Pani przewiduje spotkanie, skonfrontowanie tych danych, które wyciekły, ze światem naukowym w celu wyjaśnienia tych wszystkich kwestii?

5-059

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner designate*. – As I see it, this is something that the scientists themselves will have to take care of. Basically I think we have one choice as politicians. We can decide: do we want to listen to science, which tells us that, if we hesitate, we run a very high risk on behalf of future generations? That is one choice that we have: we can neglect what we hear. Or we can say: OK, if, in 20 or 30 years, science has told us something different, what would then have been the worst thing to happen if we had addressed climate change? Getting more, cleaner technologies, more efficient technologies; becoming less dependent on imported fuels from others: would that not, in any case – even if you are sceptical towards this – be a very good idea in a situation with nine billion people all wanting a share in the resources and in the scarce energy supply?

5-060

**Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)**, *ENVI*. – Madame la Commissaire désignée, on l'a dit tout à l'heure, après l'échec de la Conférence de Copenhague, les opinions publiques européennes sont extrêmement sévères. Pour elles, non seulement Copenhague est un échec, mais en plus, elles se disent que ceux qui, à terme, vont devoir payer le prix le plus cher, ce sont ceux qui, nombreux, subissent de plein fouet la crise économique et sociale sans précédent que nous connaissons.

Ainsi, je pense qu'il y a une confiance à rétablir, et cette confiance à rétablir, dans la perspective de Mexico, doit permettre à l'Union européenne de continuer à avoir ce leadership, comme vous le disiez tout à l'heure, de parler d'une seule voix, mais en proposant des mesures financières contraignantes. Et donc là, vous avez l'occasion, ce matin, pour la première fois, de prendre le leadership au sein de la Commission européenne, au nom de l'Union européenne, et de nous dire quelle est votre proposition pour permettre ainsi de rétablir cette confiance.

Vous pouvez proposer, comme le font certains, une taxe aux frontières de l'Europe ou, comme d'autres, une taxe verte sur les produits qui proviennent de pays qui ne

respectent pas les normes environnementales, ou encore une taxe carbone sur les transactions financières. Donc, dites-nous concrètement ce que vous, vous souhaitez.

5-061

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I understand your concern. We tried to mobilise public opinion but did not exactly succeed, so how can we maintain public interest in this? How can we make people see that this is important and that they are not going to pay the price alone?

You are right to stress the economic crisis. However, I see our focus here as a way of getting out of the economic crisis. If we do this wisely, then we can create some of the jobs we lost during the economic crisis by investing and focusing here. I think it is possible to make people see that this is not an anti-job or an anti-growth agenda: it is the opposite. It is a way of creating more intelligent growth.

Concerning the carbon tax, I know that many Member States will have some kind of carbon tax for areas that are not covered by the ETS, but basically I believe we should now work hard to get the international agreement in Mexico that has been a top priority in Europe for years, and not go to the lowest common denominator such as a carbon tax or a border tax or whatever.

At this point we see the US Congress agreeing to have a carbon trading system. Japan is going to have a carbon trading system from next year. Australia is fighting to get it through their Parliament. New Zealand has said it is going to have a carbon trading system. I think that is the most efficient way and the reason why European business has preferred it to the other solution. This is environmentally proven and it gives the right incentives to do what is required.

I think it would be bad timing at this stage to turn to the tax tool. It could come later if we cannot have what I think we should be working very hard to get and which I think is within reach.

5-062

**Gilles Pargneaux (S&D), ENVI.** – Il est évident que les fuites de carbone vont être au centre de la préoccupation en matière de marché européen en faveur de l'emploi mais, au-delà de l'industrie, préoccupons-nous, dans les semaines et les mois à venir, des travailleurs qui sont fort inquiets, vous le savez.

5-063

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I am not sure I have understood the translation of this. Would you say it again?

5-064

**Gilles Pargneaux (S&D), ENVI.** – J'ai dit que, comme vous l'avez ainsi précisé, les fuites de carbone vont être au centre de la préoccupation en matière de marché de l'emploi.

Mais cette confiance, nous ne pouvons la donner à ces travailleurs qui, après Copenhague, sont, au-delà de ce

que je disais, sévères mais, en même temps, trouvent que c'est l'injustice qui prédomine. Il va falloir tout de même qu'on leur donne un certain nombre de perspectives qui vont leur permettre de penser que les recettes ne vont pas être uniquement en leur défaveur.

5-065

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I understand this concern over carbon leakage. But I also think that if we get too afraid now then that would be a recipe for disaster job-wise. I fear very much for the job situation in Europe for many years to come because competition is so fierce. May I give you just one example of why I really believe that if we do this wisely we can create jobs.

In Denmark, in 2008, the last relatively normal year before the crisis, energy-efficient and renewable exports – the exports of goods in this field – grew by 19%. That is why I think that in my country it is not that difficult to convince people that if we do this right then we will also gain jobs, we will have income from increasing exports and we will have increased wealth. So, again, it is about doing it right.

5-066

**Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), ENVI.** – You quite rightly pointed out that we need green growth and also that we need to help our industries change and be very competitive in the future.

In fact I am not so afraid of this kind of carbon leakage, because companies do not usually move to regions with worse services or worse legislation or worse knowledge. But what I am afraid of is that we are not helping them to change as profitably and as quickly as needed.

You also pointed out the need for prompt action. And, as you very well know, the trick is how to make it happen.

There might be a risk that, now that we have this 2020 Strategy, there is more talk – a bit too much talk – about this 'greening the growth'; what we lack is the tools – effective tools.

We need more sustainable and effective use of resources and energy. My question would be: how would you ensure that this will happen, and what tools will be used – climate proofing, carbon disclosure subsidies?

5-067

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – Well, I think that the ECS is a very important tool because by that we show that if you are very inefficient it comes with a very high price, so there is a very strong incentive to try to rethink your production chain.

How can you do things differently tomorrow than you used to do?

I think that these benchmarks which we are going to make now, 50 different benchmarks covering 80% of industry, could hopefully not just be seen as a burden, but also as an inspiration.

How can we try to copy those who are doing this in the best possible way?

As I have stressed a number of times now, I think that where we could really do something good for business and industry would be to be much more focused when it comes to research and development and particularly demonstration projects.

I think we could do much more; we could also do much more in the field of education. I recall, some years back, people in Europe said: 'We will always be those who are designing these new fine good products, China will be doing the bulk work, we will do the innovation and the design'. I am not so sure that is how it is even today. I am sure that it is not going to be like that tomorrow.

I think we have to focus a lot on entrepreneurship, on innovation, on giving incentives for those who innovate and also on taking care that our education levels, in these areas too, are being very much improved. I think there are things we can do, and basically I also think that we are not very good in the European Union in sharing best practices.

We had this back home in Denmark some years ago where some companies thought: 'We cannot sit together talking about being one stronghold in one sector, because we used to be competitors'. Yes, but now they have understood: 'Wow! It makes sense, we are such a small economy, why do we not sit together, and learn from one another? That way, when we go to the external markets, we could have a much stronger position'. I think there is much we could learn from one another, benefiting from the best practices and the good examples.

5-068

**Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), ENVI.** – A bit more concretely: are you ready to support expanding ecodesign to all fields of products and resources? What about carbon accounting for companies, and tools like that?

5-069

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I think that the Ecodesign Directive is extremely interesting, and I have seen it. It has not worked as fast as we could have hoped. As a Danish Minister, it was my experience that I would come back every six months to ask how many things they had done and how many categories they had been through, and I saw that it is a relatively slow process.

But I think it is very efficient, so I will be looking positively into whether it should be expanded. I am not quite sure what the limitations are today as to what they can do, but I think it is a very efficient tool. It is a tool that really makes sense in line with what I just said about us cooperating and setting standards.

Setting standards is a very good tool for us in Europe. Take electric cars, for instance: yes, we will have competition, but it does not do any harm if we try to coordinate just a bit so that we ultimately have some

standards that fit, instead of wasting so much energy in trying to innovate more or less against one another.

5-070

**Ville Itälä (PPE), TRAN.** – Kysymykseni liittyy merenkulkuun. Jokainen liikennepoliittinen päätös on tietyllä tavalla myös ympäristöpoliittinen päätös. Merenkulun osalta IMO on tehnyt päätöksen, jonka mukaan tulevaisuudessa rikkipäästöt leikataan 0,5 prosentista 0,1 prosenttiin. Tämä koskee Euroopan alueella vain Itämeren ja Pohjanmeren eli kilpailu EU:n sisällä vääristyy. Se on epäoikeudenmukaista, se ei ole tasapuolista.

Mitä mieltä Te olette liikenne- ja ympäristöpolitiikan yhdistämisestä tässä asiassa? Pitäisikö tämän päätöksen koskea kaikkia EU:n alueella olevia jäsenvaltioita vai pitäisikö tätä päätöstä lykätä vai miten nämä kaksi vastakkaista asiaa voitaisiin yhdistää?

5-071

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – If the IMO has agreed on that, then that is fine with me. Basically the parties are very strong in the IMO and if they can live with that then I think it is good.

We should try, as much as we can, to make shipping regulations come through the IMO, but I must also say very clearly that sometimes the IMO has acted very slowly. I have been working with it for many years now, and I had hoped that in Copenhagen we could have an agreement that included international maritime and aviation. We did not get it this time, so I hope we will get it the next time.

I want to say, very loudly and clearly, that I would very much prefer the IMO to decide on the frameworks for shipping, but this requires that it move and not continue to hesitate. As I have just said, sometimes you need to push a sector to modernise, and this also applies to the shipping industry. I can see that this works, and I can also see that, in a time of crisis, for instance, many shipping companies have started to do many of these things by themselves, because in the end they have seen that it makes sense environmentally, and also economically.

5-072

**Ville Itälä (PPE).** – Vielä lisäkysymys. Itämeren alueella käy helposti niin, että venäläiset eivät todennäköisesti tule noudattamaan ja ratifioimaan tätä IMO:n päätöstä. He tulevat hallitsemaan Itämeren laivaliikennettä, jolloin me olemme tehneet karhunpalveluksen. Heidän päästönsä tulevat olemaan paljon korkeampia. Miten Teidän mielestänne EU voi suoriutua Venäjän kanssa liikennepolitiikan ja ympäristöpolitiikan yhdistämisestä?

5-073

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I agree with you that that is a challenge, and that goes for no matter what kind of environmental regulation we talk about for the Baltic Sea. I do, however, see some changes in the Russian position. Whether this also accounts for this very specific issue, I cannot tell, but, as I have seen over recent months, it seems that President Medvedev is embracing the environmental agenda in a

different way from what I have seen before from the Russian leadership.

I think that is something we should see whether we can explore further in the EU-Russia dialogue, and eventually we might achieve some results from that.

5-074

**Christa Klab (PPE), ENVI.** – Vielen Dank, Herr Vorsitzender! Frau Hedegaard, die Konferenz von Kopenhagen hat ja nicht die Ergebnisse gezeitigt, die wir eigentlich erwartet haben. Wir haben uns in Europa aber ehrgeizige Ziele gesetzt, und wir haben sie in der Emissionshandelsrichtlinie festgeschrieben. Hier wird auch festgeschrieben, dass sich diese Handelsrichtlinie an internationale Abkommen anpassen soll. Sehen Sie nun die Notwendigkeit, diese Emissionshandelsrichtlinie anzupassen? Welche Konsequenzen ziehen Sie nun hier in Bezug auf unsere Vereinbarungen nach dem Scheitern der Verhandlungen in Kopenhagen? Halten Sie eine Änderung der Richtlinie gemäß Artikel 10b oder Artikel 28 für notwendig, und wenn ja, welche Elemente ziehen Sie denn da in Betracht?

Zum anderen haben wir schon über die Benchmarks gesprochen. Wenn wir Benchmarks festlegen und anhand einer Durchschnittsleistung den Besten herauskristallisieren, werden Sie dann zusichern, dass die effizientesten Anlagen innerhalb eines *Carbon-Leakage*-Sektors auch tatsächlich 100 % ihres Bedarfs an Zertifikaten kostenfrei erhalten?

5-075

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I do not think that we will have to change the directive because of the Copenhagen Accord, but I think that there are some very good prospects for the ETS system in the future. This is because some MEPs and ministers have, over the past year, been in very close contact with representatives from the US Congress, for instance, sitting down to try and work together to see how they are going to formulate the American system.

So I think there are very good prospects now for bridging the system that we have been successful with. I think, yes, there were some teething problems, but today it is acknowledged that we were successful in bridging it with the American system, for instance, enabling us to try to work out a global price on carbon.

Regarding the benchmark: if people have to live up to better performance standards, no, I do not think this will have to be 100% reimbursed, if that was what was in your question. I do not think so. I think the companies will definitely have to do some of these things by themselves.

5-076

**Christa Klab (PPE), ENVI.** – Ich möchte noch ein bisschen überleiten. Die Benchmarks kann man festlegen. Aber Sie haben eben auch in Bezug auf den anderen Bereich, wenn es um den CO<sub>2</sub>-Ausstoß geht, gesagt, dass Sie auch die landwirtschaftlichen Produkte wie Lebensmittel mit einbeziehen wollen. Das wird aber

ein bisschen schwieriger. Wie stellen Sie sich das denn vor? Auf der einen Seite nehmen Pflanzen CO<sub>2</sub> auf und produzieren Sauerstoff, und auf der anderen Seite wird dann bei der Verrottung natürlich CO<sub>2</sub> freigesetzt. Aber es muss uns doch auch etwas wert sein. Man muss doch das, was die Produktion von Lebensmitteln aus unserer Kulturlandschaft macht, auch mit in die Waagschale werfen. Also wie wollen Sie das denn messen?

5-077

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – How exactly you measure this is an extremely technical question, but very specific ways are being developed for measuring, for instance, emissions from agriculture. In Denmark, for instance, we have made a plan, called the Green Growth Plan, for agriculture. According to this, if you change the way you produce crops – if you set up a regulation concerning when you are going to have crops during the winter time, how you can use fertiliser in a more efficient way, things like that – then knowing what is the best practice seen from a climate perspective is a science in itself. But there will be ways and means of measuring that. Emissions can also be kept in the soil, so to speak.

I think we should also be able to use these kinds of things, and the question of exactly how we are going to do that in the European Union is probably one of the areas we will have to work more with. We can already include sinks, as we call them, although this is a possibility that only a few Member States – only Denmark and Portugal, I think, and a few others – have used.

5-078

**Linda McAvan (S&D), ENVI.** – I want to talk about ETS as well.

In your introductory remarks you spoke about transport emissions rising and you spoke about maritime. In the Directive there is a commitment, by 2011, to bring forward something on maritime if there is no international agreement. So I hope you will stick to that.

Secondly, on road transport. In our ETS we do not have road transport. In the US system there will be taxing at the source, at the refinery source of fuel, and in the Australian system.

We as MEPs want at least a study from the Commission on road transport and ETS. How would you feel about that?

5-079

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – First, yes, I stick to the 2011 deadline for maritime. That was also why earlier I stressed very clearly – also saying it loud and clear to the IMO – that time is running out. If they want to decide themselves exactly how they can deliver, that is fine with me. I do not have a special need for us to do this in a European manner. Shipping is very much a global sector. It is very easy for the industry just to flag out, so it would be far preferable if the IMO did its work. But then I think that they have to hurry and

they have to speed up compared to what they used to do earlier on.

I know the discussion about whether we could broaden the basis of the ETS and I also saw the Florenz report, from this room, saying that we should do that. I think that is an interesting idea. We should, however, then just consider what that would mean in respect of what we can get other sectors to deliver now. Because of the way we have constructed the climate and energy package – and I think from my own experience – national states are now making their transport policies because that is outside the ETS. So it seems very simple, but I am not sure it is so simple compared to the climate and energy package, where different countries have of course started to make arrangements for an ETS system and a non-ETS system. The ETS system is national up to 2012. After that it is a European thing, I know. But now countries are, I hope, making their national plans on transport, because we cannot solve the challenge on emissions that we are facing in the Union if we do not address transport in a much more efficient way.

5-080

**Linda McAvan (S&D), ENVI.** – ETS is mitigation for industry, but everybody needs to make their efforts to cut climate change, so I will ask you the same question my colleague asked Mr Potočník. What have you changed about your lifestyle to meet the challenge of climate change?

5-081

**Chair.** – One minute, please!

*(Laughter)*

5-082

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – This was always the worst question to get as Climate Minister, and now as Climate Commissioner because, as we all know, like yourselves, I fly a lot. I offset it, but still.

As private individuals we have done what many normal families have done, I suppose: not hysterically but just doing different things smoothly. When buying a new car, we had to replace the very old one with an energy category 'A' car. It is a simple choice. It is workable: you can have two teenage boys in the back. Or making the house better insulated: just in December – during the COP, actually – we had some of the windows replaced with more energy-efficient ones. When we buy new electronic appliances or whatever, we look for the energy labelling.

Things like that. It is not rocket science. It is just practical things in practical life. Everybody can do that and be more conscious about it.

5-083

**Chair.** – I think that question will come up again during the next two hours.

5-084

**Bogusław Sonik (PPE), komisja ENVI.** – W Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej w wielu krajach ponad 90% energii pochodzi z węgla. Nie można błyskawicznie

zmienić tych proporcji, prowadziłyby to do obciążenia obywateli tych państw ogromnymi kosztami i zadławienia przemysłu. Czy Pani bierze pod uwagę, że koszty walki z globalnym ociepleniem winny być rozkładane sprawiedliwie pomiędzy poszczególne kraje Unii Europejskiej? I w jaki sposób chce Pani dbać o zachowanie równowagi w tej materii? Jakie perspektywy czasowe stawia Pani przed technologią czystego węgla (CCS)? Kiedy według Pani ta technologia będzie mogła być wprowadzona w życie na skalę przemysłową?

5-085

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I do not think that we can have a system in Europe where we will have exactly the same pricing so that people can be compensated totally, but I think that in the climate and energy package we, as a Union, really did something to compensate the new Member States. For those of them very much dependent on coal, for instance, we gave out free allowances for existing coal plants. I think we did something in that respect to try to level out the costs for different Member States and for different citizens.

I believe that, yes, coal will be in this world for a long time. I think that clean coal is better than dirty coal, but even clean coal is what we should try to get rid of in the long-term perspective. It is polluting, it does emit CO<sub>2</sub> – of course it would be fine if we could find some fantastic technologies – but I still think that we should try to seek ever cleaner ways of producing our goods.

Just one final thing: I also think that, from an energy-security perspective, we should try to be as independent as possible of fossil fuels in the future, and we must keep that vision.

5-086

**Bogusław Sonik (PPE), ENVI.** – Nie wiem, czy dobrze zrozumiałem: Pani Minister powiedziała, że w przyszłości czysty węgiel trzeba będzie wyeliminować?

5-087

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – No, I said that coal will be in this world for a very long time. I am also very well aware that coal will also be in Europe for a very long time. What I am saying is that in my very long-term vision – and that is definitely not within the next five years – I would very much like to see a low-carbon society and a society where we can get rid of fossil fuels. Do you think it is possible? Maybe not in our lifetime, but I think, as a vision, it will be possible. Mankind has always been very good at inventing new technologies when mankind has needed them.

5-088

**Der Vorsitzende.** – Ja, das ist Prinzip Hoffnung.

5-089

**Kriton Arsenis (S&D), ENVI.** – I would like to welcome Mrs Hedegaard. It is very nice to see a person devoted to climate action in this position, although I would sincerely welcome also more self-reflection on the mistakes the Danish Presidency made in Copenhagen.

5-090

**Κρίτων Αρσένης (S&D), ENVI.** – Κυρία Επίτροπε, πώς θα εγγυηθείτε ότι τα φυσικά οικοσυστήματα, που είναι οι αποθήκες άνθρακα της γης και εκτελούν την επιτακτικά αναγκαία για τον πλανήτη απορρόφηση άνθρακα, θα προστατευθούν επαρκώς;

Πιο συγκεκριμένα, πώς θα ενσωματώσετε πολιτικές για την προστασία του εδάφους, των οικοτόπων, των δασών, των θαλασσών και των υδάτων σε μια συνεκτική πολιτική για την κλιματική αλλαγή, η οποία είναι απαραίτητη τόσο σε ευρωπαϊκό όσο και σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο;

5-091

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – We have already touched on this with the sinks, the possibilities and practice of how you cultivate soil and what your forestry practices are like, and I think we should be much better at having a coordinated view on that in Europe. So far we have not got that. The paths we are following are very different; the system is not very sustainable; we do not know whether permanence is a criterion for our forestry policy. So there are lots of things we should do in this area in a more coordinated way.

I would like to work with my colleague Mr Potočnik – provided I am the Commissioner – on what you mentioned about habitat. For instance, the Water Framework: this is a fantastic tool to include in our nature policy's climate protection, because, in the Water Framework, each Member State right now will have to make its own very specific plans, and one of the most efficient ways of taking care of soil protection and habitat protection would be with wetlands and similar things – things that are also controlled, in a way, through the Water Framework Directive.

So I think there are a lot of areas where the EU, over the last five years, actually got started with a lot of very important directives during Mr Dimas's time in office. We should now work together to implement these, thereby helping us to live up to our target of being more sustainable.

5-092

**Κρίτων Αρσένης (S&D), ENVI.** – Κυρία Επίτροπε, ποια μέτρα σκοπεύετε να πάρετε προκειμένου να διασφαλίσετε ότι η προστασία των τροπικών δασών δεν θα καταλήξει να γίνει ένας τρόπος αντιστάθμισης εκπομπών αερίων, αλλά θα αποτελεί ανεξάρτητο πλώνα αντιμετώπισης της κλιματικής αλλαγής;

Συμφωνείτε πως οι δεσμεύσεις για μείωση των εκπομπών θα πρέπει να μεταφράζονται σε πραγματικές μετρήσιμες μειώσεις σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο; Και αν ναι, πως σκοπεύετε να το πετύχετε;

5-093

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – On this question about tropical forestry and how we can ensure that it does not just end up as an offsetting mechanism, I think one of the tools will be to have some very clear rules set internationally as part of an international

agreement. Also, so that we do not double-count, and that we know that we actually get value for money.

That means, among other things, that we should not include forestry measures that are just 'business as usual'. One of the discussions out there is whether practices that are already there could be counted as some climate thing that you actually do. No, because you would do that no matter what: it can only be the additional things that you would do in your forestry policy that we should count as something that you could include in your climate effort.

This is one of the very difficult areas also in the international negotiations, but I think it is also one of the areas where the international negotiations have progressed the most, so that we can pay the farmer in the developing countries who protects his forest instead of chopping it down so that he changes his practice. He can get paid. We can get a preserved forestry. There are really many interesting options there that could also benefit the development perspective between North and South.

5-094

**Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D), ITRE.** – Welkom, mevrouw de minister. We zijn meer dan halverwege en u hebt me zeker overtuigd, niet alleen van uw competenties, maar ook van uw engagement voor het klimaatbeleid. Ik denk dat dat ontzettend belangrijk is.

Waarover ik echter nog wel twijfels heb, is of uw departement niet redelijk machteloos zal blijken te zijn. Dat u met andere woorden aan het handje gaat moeten lopen van andere commissarissen, onder meer degene die bevoegd is voor energie? Uw antwoorden zijn ook soms een beetje dubieus. Ik verwijz naar uw antwoord aan mevrouw Britta Thomson over kernenergie. U neemt afstand en geen afstand. U bent bij machte om daar echt afstand van te nemen. Bent u bereid om een echte coördinerende rol te spelen op het vlak van alle mogelijke subsidies die gegeven worden aan verschillende energiebronnen? Met andere woorden, bent u bereid afstand te nemen van én fossiele energie én kernenergie in de subsidies die de Europese Unie geeft? Ik denk dat dit echt een rol is voor de klimaatcommissaris.

5-095

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I will definitely fight for resources in a direction that works to the benefit of our climate. I think I was very clear in saying that I do not want subsidies for fossil fuels – not in Europe, not anywhere. I have just said that I know that, if you are in Indonesia where there are a lot of poor people, what you do with this is also social policy, so it is not that easy just to say let us get rid of that. But even the International Energy Agency would now recommend getting rid of subsidies for fossil fuels. We should not give subsidies for fossil fuels. That should not be the European policy.

You are right that what you call my department – the Directorate-General – will not be very easy to construct.

I also understand that some of you might have some uncertainty. Why? In many ways our discussion this morning has proved that climate can be almost anything – industry, development, research, environment, energy, transport. It is evident that you must make a more profound choice. Do you want everything under one hat? We all know that this is not possible. Therefore we must do it the other way: by mainstreaming. Then of course it is clear that you must have some tools with which you can mainstream.

It is also clear that, when this Commission says that we are going to give very high priority – increased priority – to the fight against climate change and that we want to mainstream climate, as all the vision papers say very clearly, then you must be ready to give some resources so that task can actually be done.

5-096

**Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), ITRE.** – You have expressed your belief in EU ETS and you are hoping to get it linked to other robust systems outside of the EU. Does the linking require identical targets as well as the allocation of allowances? If not, can you give us some examples of how the linking of these two ETS might work in this case? In general we know the scarcity of the allowance market determines the price of the allowance. What is, then, the correct value of the allowance in the US and in the EU in this case? The US Congress is discussing the minimum price and the ceiling price of the allowance. In the EU we do not have this kind of regulation of the allowance price. How do you link to systems with different currencies?

5-097

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – As far as I understand the techniques involved, you do not have to have exactly the same allowances or give out exactly the same – it is not required – but I think that there would be one very big benefit: if we could set the standard or the norm that this is the European way of doing this, that would become the global norm. That would be extremely interesting. If we could link first the European and the American system, then I think we would have secured for ourselves that which would also be of inspiration for many others coming into this: Japan, Australia, New Zealand etc.

So of course the vision must be one where we have a global system with a global price on carbon. I think therefore it would be best and much to be preferred that we in Europe do not have 27 different auctioning platforms. I think it is much better that we do it in a concerted way, that it is Europe that has the auctioning and it is Europe that takes care of granting the allowances. That would be the strongest way to do it as I see it.

5-098

**Chair.** – As I understand it, the worry is that if you have a wide speculation on the stock-markets you do not know what the price will be, and hedge funds etc. will take over. So we need to have security planification in place. It is a question that needs to be looked at.

5-099

**Fiona Hall (ALDE), ITRE.** – Precisely on that very point: within the EU ETS there has been a problem because for cap-and-trade schemes to work you need to have a stable and rising price for carbon and, in practice, for various reasons of course – the recession is one of those and there are others – the carbon price has in fact been unstable and weak. Would you support the imposition of a floor price for carbon at least as a short-term measure?

5-100

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – This idea has been in international debates and now also in the European forum for quite a while. I know they have been discussing it a lot in the United States for instance.

I am very doubtful that that would be helpful for what we want to achieve. There are many reasons. One of them being: if you have this floor, how could we be sure that in the next economic situation there would not be also a demand for a ceiling? That is one of the problems. In the end you would have a very planned system. I know very well business would say: ‘Oh, it would be nice for our predictability to have a “floor price” at least’.

Now we should remind one another – as far as I understand it – that the price has been fluctuating between EUR 10 and EUR 25. Compared to the fluctuation of oil prices, that is not such a huge fluctuation. I think that it is much more important that we are very good in not giving out too many allowances. That is where the control and the political regulation should be; then, I think, we could make the market work.

I see a lot of complications if we start with this ‘floor’ thing; and then, if there are surplus allowances, who is going to buy? And things like that. It seems tempting in a way, because we would all like to have that flexibility and predictability.

But I just fear what would happen the day when industry comes back and says: ‘Now we want to have a ceiling’. Where are we then? Are we going to make one fixed price? How can we ever then make the market work?

In a way, the fact that prices go down in times of crisis is not such a mystical thing. It is actually how markets work; when there is not such a huge demand, prices go down.

But we should be careful how many allowances we give out.

5-101

**Chair.** – So we have confidence in the market that they will do it right. We will see whether this works.

5-102

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), ITRE.** – Senhora Comissária indigitada, a investigação científica e o desenvolvimento tecnológico na área das energias limpas constituem um pilar fundamental na luta contra as alterações climáticas. No entanto, a Europa investe, hoje, em investigação científica na área da energia menos do que investia em 1980.

Como irá proceder para garantir que esta área será uma prioridade na revisão das Perspectivas Financeiras? Como será feito o financiamento das iniciativas industriais europeias expressas no Plano SET, nomeadamente a energia solar, SmartGrids, CCS, hidrogénio e pilhas de combustível? A Comissão tem também desenvolvido uma série de programas e iniciativas com o objectivo de reduzir as emissões de CO<sub>2</sub> nas cidades: Pacto dos Autarcas, Programa Concerto, CIVITAS, SmartGrids. Como prevê o financiamento destas iniciativas e sua articulação? Como irá incentivar a introdução de renováveis, microgeração e eficiência energética nos edifícios?

5-103

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner designate*. – Are you speaking about research for the last one with buildings?

I think that it is crucial when we have the discussion on the Financial Perspectives – as I have said earlier – that the priorities in the Financial Perspectives will fit in with our political priorities. We cannot just continue the Financial Perspectives in the next five years as in the former five years. Is it that we do not have any new ideas, or what? We must dare to do some things differently. It has changed a bit in recent years and research money for this area has started to come up, also in some Member States at least. This was also prioritised in the European Economic Recovery Programme.

Basically you are right that the long-term trend has been that investments in this area, research-wise, have gone down, and that is not a wise policy if you really want to have strongholds here. Europe has strongholds here and that is why we must make it a priority.

I also think that, when it comes to our agricultural funds, we should also set aside more money for research, for new technologies, biogas – it is fantastic what biogas can do. We do not have to wait for all Member States to find out their own bad experiences. Why not say: ‘Now we do it’, and we do it on a large scale, because we know it will benefit the common environment’?

So this will be one of the areas where I think it is crucial to fight for this line, also within the Commission; and I can say, provided that I come through this hearing as a confirmed Commissioner, that it will be one of the first meetings I will have with my new colleague the Commissioner for Research. We have already briefly discussed that we will work together on this and try to see how we can put more emphasis on this area.

5-104

**Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)**, *TRAN*. – Mevrouw de kandidaat-commissaris, u heeft reeds verscheidene malen het belang benadrukt van transport in het klimaatdebat en het klopt dat het transport verantwoordelijk is voor 25% van de CO<sub>2</sub>-uitstoot. Het is niet eenvoudig om dat aan te pakken. Mijn aanvoelen is dat er toch wel zeer fundamentele, zeer ambitieuze maatregelen nodig zullen zijn om daar iets aan te doen,

meer nog dan bijvoorbeeld het vastleggen van uitstootnormen voor lichte vrachtwagens, wat eigenlijk maar een kleine maatregel is in de marge.

U hebt verwezen naar het transport-klimaatpakket. Ik zou van u willen weten wat de timing is die u voor ogen heeft. En vooral, kunt u wat concreter zijn over de ideeën die u daarover persoonlijk heeft? Wat zou de invulling moeten zijn van het klimaat-transportpakket? Moeten wij bindende concrete doelstellingen stellen? Wat zijn die dan, en hoe ziet u dat?

5-105

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner designate*. – The answer to the timing will be: as soon as possible. I cannot tell you exactly when, because I also have to discuss this with my colleague the Transport Commissioner. But I think we have a huge challenge here, with emissions from transport more or less offsetting what we are doing in other sectors. We also know that, if we do things differently in the rail business, for instance, it takes years – more than five years: it takes 10 years – from when we decide to do something until we see the result. So this is why this is an urgent matter.

I told you earlier that lorries will have to be one of the initiatives. We have to review CO<sub>2</sub> for cars. I mentioned the maritime sector; now we are including aviation. I think that what the Transport Commissioner and myself could do together is try to think through the whole transport area. Are things interlinked in a convenient way, also from a citizen’s perspective? If people do not use trains or public transport enough, why is that? Is there something there that we in the EU could do: sharing best practice, for example? I am perfectly aware that many of these issues, for instance planning, depend very much on the Member States. But again, maybe we should be better at disseminating best practice when it comes to planning.

In Denmark we made a huge transport plan last year in which, for the first time ever – even though it is an investment plan for 2022 – we turned the system around: where normally, private means of transport get the most investment, we turned it around so that now, two thirds will go into public transport. Of course there are many things you could do there, with electrification and other things that you could do in a much more efficient way, and there we could also help by setting up some standards.

5-106

**Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)**, *TRAN*. – Dank u voor uw antwoord. Ik wou nog even ingaan op een ander punt dat ermee te maken heeft. Er is in de transportsector al jaren een heel groot debat aan de gang over *pricing*, het stimuleren van gedrag via prijsprikkels in het kader van het concept internalisering van externe kosten. CO<sub>2</sub> is natuurlijk een belangrijke externe kost, een van de vele. Mijn vraag aan u is: steunt u dat concept en dat principe, de internalisering van externe kosten in de transportsector? En welk instrument is volgens u het meest geschikt is om dat ook echt te realiseren?

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner-designate*. – Yes, I support that, and I think it is important that we can be open to that and make it a possibility.

In the end, of course, this is also a taxation and economics question. Member States will have to decide whether they will use it and exactly how they are going to use it. But I think to internalise external costs is a very appropriate method.

I think for some of the changes that we will have to come through with in this field that we will have to try and think more outside the box. You have to make it clear for people that, for instance, at certain times of the day it will cost something if you want to go into this area or that area. I think we simply are going to have to realise that that is how it is, or else we will drown in congestion. We will waste a lot of time in congestion, but also we will have to build a lot of roads that would basically only be used for one or two hours a day at maximum capacity.

We must find smarter ways of doing this. We must use technology and we could also look at the way people have to pay for things.

5-108

**Jens Rohde (ALDE)**, *ENVI*. – Fru Hedegaard, det må jeg vel godt kalde Dem. Vi har haft mange høringer i denne uge, og jeg synes, at Deres præstation næsten sprænger rammerne for, hvor mange stjerner man kan give. Det håber jeg, De tager med Dem i Kommissionen, for De får brug for det. Vi har haft høringer med meget stærke personligheder som hr. Oettinger på energiområdet, hvis filosofi nok divergerer en anelse fra Deres, tror jeg godt, man kan sige. Vi har haft en udpeget forskningskommissær, fru Geoghegan-Quinn, som proklamerede, at hun ikke ville flytte en eneste krone fra atomkraft over til andre områder, og mon ikke vi vil opdage, at man i Landbrugsudvalget i talende stund sidder og deler landbrugsstøtte ud i stor stil. Hvordan vil De overbevise Deres kolleger om at flytte midler og indflydelse og magt fra deres respektive områder over til Deres område? Har De fået nogle strategiske instrumenter fra kommissionsformand Barroso til at implementere en horisontal strategi med?

5-109

**Connie Hedegaard**, *udpeget kommissær*. – Tak for de pæne ord. Ja, jeg ved jo godt, at man skal slås, også her. Jeg tror ikke, at det bliver enormt nemt. Jeg tror ikke, at det bare lykkes uden kamp, hvis man går til en kollega, som har ti andre prioriteter også, og beder vedkommende om at prioritere klima. Jeg mener, som jeg sagde i min indledning, at hele Kommissionen, ikke kun klimakommissæren eller miljøkommissæren, men hele Kommissionen vil blive målt på, at den europæiske borger om fem år fra nu kan se, at det ikke bare var ord, men at det også blev vist i handling, at vi faktisk prioriterede dette område. Jeg tror, at det er muligt at argumentere på en sådan måde, at den, der er ansvarlig for innovation, den, der er ansvarlig for jobskabelse, den, der er ansvarlig for, at der er industri i Europa, ikke bare om fem år, men om ti og om tyve år, også kan se, hvorfor der er nogle benefits på dette område. Derfor

tror jeg, at jeg ikke skal gøre det hele selv, men at jeg skal arbejde igennem dem. Og derfor er jeg selvfølgelig også nødt til at forstå, at de også har nogle andre hensyn at tage, og på den baggrund prøve at skabe den gode sag. Derfor er det selvfølgelig også vigtigt at have et GD, der har ressourcer nok til indimellem at kunne forberede de virkelig gode argumenter, så også folk fra de andre områder kan se, at den sag faktisk også vil være en fordel for dem.

5-110

**Judith A. Merkies (S&D)**, *ITRE*. – Mrs Hedegaard, Copenhagen did not bring the results that we all wanted – you included, of course. As you mentioned, one solution would be for Europe to speak with one voice, and you really sound very convinced and resolute in saying that. So may I take it that you will commit yourself to trying to convince the Commission, the Council and us to move this from a shared competence to an exclusive competence for the European Union in climate policy?

5-111

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner-designate*. – I think that the Lisbon Treaty actually makes it very clear that we are going to have one lead negotiator, so there is a chance there with the Lisbon Treaty that already addresses this issue.

I also think that we should take this discussion very fast, and maybe they are already having it at the informal Environment Council today and tomorrow in Seville, because I think it is very important to have it while people still recall how they felt in Copenhagen. I also think it is very important that on 11 February the informal European Council will have a chance to discuss this.

I know perfectly well that it is not that easy then to decide who is doing this. I know there could be a huge fight, but we must reflect on it because I think the citizens out there expect, after years, now, of us being very much focused on institutional things here, to see that Europe acts more united.

Yes, I will do whatever I can to try to make my voice heard in the Council, when I get the chance to come there, and with my colleagues in the Commission, because I also think that this is something that the President and others are very much preoccupied with after having experienced Copenhagen.

5-112

**Chair**. – I have a question: who will put down the pledges on 31 January – is it all the 27 Member States or the EU?

5-113

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner-designate*. – I think that is still to be debated. As far as I have understood, that question will come up in COREPER against next week, as it did this week. As far as I know, there will be different views on that from the Member States.

I think that it is only logical for Europe to come up with one figure, just like we did in Kyoto, and then you could

also write down this figure for different countries, if they so wish.

But this is a decision which, I think, will have to be taken prior to 1 February, and that means prior to me being a Commissioner, if I become one.

5-114

**Chair.** – I applauded because I agree totally with what you said: it is true.

5-115

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – So was that the only time?

(Laughter)

5-116

**Chair.** – I was the only one, but I think colleagues tend to agree with this position. I do not know, but this is what I assume.

5-117

**Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE), ITRE.** – Madame la Commissaire désignée, vous avez évoqué les divergences au sein de l'Union européenne et entre les États membres. Je pense et j'espère que ce sera un message que nos grands leaders, notamment en France, en Grande-Bretagne et en Allemagne, entendront.

Mais comment allez-vous, par ailleurs, gérer les divergences au sein de la Commission? Vous-même, vous tenez parfois un discours ambigu, par exemple sur l'objectif de 30%. Vous dites: "Il faut que l'Europe reprenne du leadership", vous dites que les autres pays, comme la Chine, ont bougé mais, en même temps, vous dites que si, finalement, ils n'y vont pas, on n'ira pas, qu'il faut le faire pour avancer les négociations, mais que ce n'est pas encore le moment. On ne sait plus bien où on en est concernant votre objectif, votre perspective à vous.

Et puis, surtout, comment allez-vous arbitrer, au sein de vos services, le discours sur l'efficacité énergétique? Parfois, à force de faire du fétichisme autour du marché de carbone, au sein même de vos services, on va à l'encontre d'une politique ambitieuse d'efficacité énergétique. Est-ce que vous allez enfin proposer un objectif contraignant, je dis bien "contraignant" d'efficacité énergétique européen? Est-ce que, au-delà du volontarisme que vous affichez, vous allez prendre cette initiative, un objectif contraignant de 20 % d'efficacité énergétique?

5-118

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – Firstly, we have binding targets in the climate and energy package for renewables and we have it for emissions. We have this aspiration – or goal or whatever it is called – of 20% for energy efficiency. I would say that we do not need that thing to be binding because, if you put things together, then they have to start really focusing on energy efficiency out of the Member States, or they will not be able to live up to the other targets.

We all know that this was discussed at length during the climate and energy package and I do not think that it would make much sense to spend a lot of time on that debate again. It would probably end in the same place.

Regarding the 30%, I do not think I say different things about this. I have been a very strong advocate for Europe going for this 30%. However, as I said earlier this morning, in hindsight, seeing what happened in Copenhagen and Europe not giving the 30%, would you not then agree – it is not fair to ask you questions – that it is better now to give in, the 20% conditional 'blah blah blah' will go to 30%, in order to try to see whether we can squeeze out a few more percentages from other parties? From where we stand right now, we can all discuss: should the EU have had another strategy before Copenhagen – I am just arguing from where we are now – would it not be best to have had this conditional thing?

I must say just one more thing and that is something more tactical and political: I guess, from what I heard in Copenhagen and in the Environment Council, that if we reopen this discussion we should not fool ourselves: there is a big risk that we can no longer agree on this 30%.

5-119

**Zbigniew Ziobro (ECR), ITRE.** – Pani Komisarz! Polska jest liderem w zakresie ograniczenia emisji CO<sub>2</sub>, zgodnie bowiem z protokołem z Kioto Polska zobowiązana była do redukcji emisji o 6%, tym czasem zredukowała emisję gazów cieplarnianych o ponad 30% przy jednoczesnym wzroście PKB – o czym warto pamiętać – o 60%.

Warto przy tym zauważyć, że kraje dawnej piętnastki Unii Europejskiej nie wywiązały się ze swoich zobowiązań, a redukcja emisji sięgała w nich średnio zaledwie 1%, a bodaj zobowiązane były do wyższej redukcji. Na przykład Dania – o ile pamiętam – o 8%.

Mam pytanie: Czy nie jest więc teraz pewnego rodzaju hipokryzją domaganie się przez państwa starej piętnastki, aby główny ciężar walki ze zmianami klimatycznymi spadł teraz na te kraje, które musiały nadrobić cywilizacyjne opóźnienia wynikające z 50 lat komunistycznej dyktatury, w tym gospodarki, która uniemożliwiła prowadzenie suwerennej polityki, również w sferze energii, i pozyskiwanie różnych źródeł, w tym czystej energii?

Czy nie obawia się Pani, że aktualna polityka może prowadzić w tym względzie do dotowania przez kraje biedniejsze Unii Europejskiej, które do niej przystąpiły, krajów bogatszych w tym zakresie? Czy Pani chce podjąć jakieś konkretne działania, żeby równość i spójność została zachowana?

5-120

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I am not sure the translation was entirely clear and that I am 100% clear about the question, but, to take the issue of equality and who is doing what, I think that, when we made the climate and energy package, some of us would have liked to have seen 100% auctioning – the sooner the better. Some definitely did not want it, and I think we found a compromise that compensated the new

Member States with free allowances for already-existing plants. I think that was a way to accommodate the concern that you mentioned, but I think that, when we look ahead to building new plants, we must have a level playing field. Otherwise we risk a plant being built in another country just because in that Member State you get allowances for free, while in others you do not. I can see that this would be very much justified.

5-121

**Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE), TRAN.** – Herzlichen Dank! Frau Hedegaard, ich finde das natürlich sehr ermutigend, was Sie als Schwerpunkt im Bereich Verkehr setzen wollen, denn dass der Verkehr uns mit seinen Wachstumsraten sonst alle Einsparungen der anderen Sektoren vernichtet, das ist immer wieder festzuhalten. Nun haben wir es im Bereich des Verkehrs, sei es Luftfahrt, sei es Schwerverkehr, mit sehr extrem wirkenden und mächtigen Lobbies zu tun, die Forderungen wie etwa eine Befreiung des Kerosins von Subventionen nicht unterstützen. Meine Frage ist: Wo sehen Sie strategische Chancen, hier im Bereich Verkehr weiterzukommen? Und würden Sie meinen, dass so etwas wie Alpenkonvention, also Selbstverpflichtungen der Alpenstaaten, ein Mechanismus und Werkzeug sein könnte, um Klimapolitik umzusetzen?

5-122

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I must say that in my preparations, I did not reach the ALP Convention, so I would not dare go into that. I am not familiar enough with the details.

But I think you have a very important point concerning lobbyism in this field. I thought, for instance, when we tried to make the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions targets for cars, that there was an extremely powerful lobby, and I think that sometimes as a politician, you will have to do the right thing.

I can see already from the letters that you get – even as a Commissioner-designate – that we are talking about really big business, and I would say now that I will always listen to people with good arguments. But I always think it is much more interesting to listen to lobbyists who come with alternative ways where they themselves deliver answers to a question instead of just saying that somebody else should solve the problem.

But I am sure that, coming as I do from the little Kingdom of Denmark, lobbyism will reach a new level here as well.

5-123

**Der Vorsitzende.** - Es lohnt sich, die Alpenkonvention zu lesen, da stehen viele gute Dinge drin, auch für andere Regionen der EU. Sie werden das nachholen.

5-124

**Martin Callanan (ECR), ENVI.** – If you are confirmed as a Commissioner, one of the nice perks of the job is a chauffeur-driven car. Will you be taking advantage of this perk, and which vehicle will you be selecting as your personal transport?

5-125

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I think that, when you are a Commissioner-designate first having to pass this three-hour-long exam, I have postponed thoughts about cars and things like that until later!

As Minister of Climate and Energy and also as Minister of the Environment, I chose the car with the best energy performance on the market in a category that is big enough for the purpose of being an office as well. I think that is natural, and it is also very important. I believe that those of us who have different positions actually also prove to the citizens that we are serious, that we do not just talk about it but also try to do things in a conscious manner in everyday life.

5-126

**Martin Callanan (ECR), ENVI.** – I thought you might avoid the question, so I will give you another chance. Will you be choosing a European vehicle, a hybrid, electric, biofuel? When you were a Danish Minister – presumably the same perk is available – which vehicle did you choose then?

5-127

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – Now you are challenging me to say something very dirty about one or other manufacturer here; I am not going to do that. I come from Denmark, which produces absolutely no cars, so I can say for sure that I am not going to take a Danish car. But I will take the best-performing car when it comes to CO<sub>2</sub> and when it comes to energy. Then we can see who will win that battle. It will probably take a month or two, but then we will come to that.

5-128

**Chair.** – I have another idea for you. The distance between the Commission and Parliament is not so far. What about a bicycle?

*(Laughter)*

I will join you on the first ride if you visit Parliament!

5-129

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – As often as I can in Copenhagen (I live nine kilometres from my office), I have gone by bike – the Danes will know that. Not just because it is climate-friendly but also because it is one good way of clearing your head in the morning and evening – although I hear that there are not as many bike lanes in Belgium and in Brussels as I am used to in Copenhagen. I can bike all these nine kilometres on bike lanes only, so I will have to study the security situation. But my husband gave me a bicycle helmet for Christmas, so maybe he foresaw what is going to happen in Brussels.

5-130

**Chair.** – I can tell you that Brussels is much better in cycling terms than one thinks. It is really good, and you should try it.

5-131

**Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), ENVI.** – From bicycles to Mexico, I would say. I very much agree that we need a

legally binding agreement by the end of this year in Mexico, and I agree that the EU should speak with one voice in Mexico as well. But more needs to be done to regain leadership in the EU.

I was a bit disappointed by your answer – that you are not going for the -30% in the table by the end of this month, because of course you can think of -30% with a footnote. For example, visually you can already think of these kinds of ways to show leadership.

But in your opening speech you also said that your key target is linking the emission trading systems of the EU and the US. Nevertheless, in Copenhagen it was also clear that purely focusing on the US from an EU perspective can lead to deadlocks in negotiations.

So my exact question is: how will you invest in the UN process in the coming year, especially investing in a coalition of the willing, with countries like Brazil, Mexico, South Africa and many others who want to have a legally binding target and agreement by the end of this year?

5-132

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner-designate*. – About the end of this month: I just said that I am not going to have any position where I can decide that – I am not a Danish minister any more; I am not yet in the Commission – so I am simply not in a position where I can have a say there.

But, as I just said, I think what is most likely to happen is that it will be 20% conditional ‘blah, blah, blah’, going to 30. That is a realistic thing; I think that is why it is going to happen. It is much better than those who start to argue that maybe we should just give 25 or maybe we should sort of stick to the 20, which have also been set by Member States in recent deliberations on this issue, as far as I know. I very much hope that, by Mexico, of course we could go to 30%. Of course – that is the whole aim. And when we have the 2°C target, if Europe does not go to 30% – to the maximum – and others do not do the same and even add something to it and have some very ambitious pathway for after 2020, then we are not going to stay below the 2°C. That was the good thing about Copenhagen, that leaders said that they would stay below 2°C, that they knew they had co-responsibility. Okay, they said ‘A’, they said ‘B’ but, now, they have to say ‘C’. They cannot tell their people that they are going to stay below 2°C and not deliver on the necessary targets. So, there, we are in for some very interesting discussions.

On the UN process I know that there will be some – probably also here – arguing that that was just a failure, it is too difficult, and shouldn’t we just give up the UN process? No, I do not think we should do that. Well, if it cannot deliver for years from now, it is another situation. We would waste too much work: the flexible mechanisms, the national adaptation plans (NAPAs) that are already there, RED+ is almost there, a technology framework for which we know the elements and an

adaptation framework for which we know the elements. It would be too much of a waste of time.

I am running over time now, so I cannot elaborate more than that, but I really do think that it is crucial that the EU does not make the conclusion: let us drop the UN. That is too easy a conclusion and it would take us forever to complete what is already there in the LCE and KP.

5-133

**Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)**, *ENVI*. – I very much agree with you on fully supporting the UN process next year.

On concrete matters: now, when we are getting these kind of pledge-and-review types of agreement – which is the Copenhagen Agreement more or less – how can we ensure that there will not be any double-counting in the pledges from the developed and the developing countries that will be in those tables? Is it not better maybe to only come up with domestic reduction targets in a table to make sure that there will not be any double-counting in the tables?

5-134

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Commissioner-designate*. – How to avoid double-counting is very relevant. If anybody is very preoccupied with that, it would be the developing countries, because they would say, ‘OK, it is fine for you to come with your flexible mechanisms, but if you come and take all the low-hanging fruits – the cheapest reductions and the cheapest actions – and then afterwards we also have to deliver our domestic actions in some kind of appendix or something like that, how will that fit?’ I think that is one of the very big issues that experts must try to find a good solution to. Developing countries are, of course, also very sensitive to this because, on the other hand, they do not want a whole army of auditors going and telling them what they can and cannot do themselves. So this double-counting question is extremely complicated technically, as it also is in forestry.

These will be some of the things – if we make an agreement in Mexico – that will have to be sorted out technically by the time the Kyoto commitment period expires (the end of 2012) and the new period will have to start.

5-135

**Chair**. – So we would agree that it is fine to support the UN, but you need unanimity among 192 countries. Is there a Plan B if in Mexico, again, there is no consensus? This is perhaps Mr Eickhout’s question.

5-136

**Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)**. – If there were a good agreement, then Sudan would have no role to play whatsoever.

5-137

**Chair**. – But that agreement is as unrealistic as getting 192 countries to agree. We will see.

5-138

**Frédérique Ries (ALDE), ENVI.** – Madame la Commissaire désignée, la difficulté de passer presque en dernier, c'est effectivement que tout a été dit ou presque, et plusieurs fois même.

Néanmoins, Madame Hedegaard, votre portefeuille est la nouveauté de cette Commission. Il est particulièrement attendu; vous êtes particulièrement attendue, c'est dire la hauteur de la tâche qui vous incombe. J'ai envie de dire que je suis, comme mon collègue danois qui n'est plus là, Jens Rohde, très séduite jusqu'ici par ce que l'on a vu depuis deux heures et demie maintenant: votre engagement, votre volontarisme, le côté très assertif de vos propos. Et je ne suis pas danoise, contrairement à mon collègue, et je suis donc un petit peu moins suspecte dans mon appréciation.

Vous avez déjà répondu à toute une série de questions que j'avais en tête, et notamment à celle qui concerne la difficulté de la compétence très transversale qui vous incombe. Tous les ministres européens du climat vous le diront, et vous en faites partie: c'est plus qu'un dialogue, c'est presque un combat permanent que d'être ministre chargé d'une telle responsabilité. Donc, ma question portera plutôt sur vos relations en externe. Ici, on n'a pas encore évoqué vos relations avec deux autres acteurs majeurs que sont Barack Obama et Hu Jintao. Comment allez-vous, là aussi, vous imposer, notamment par rapport à M. Barroso, dans ce dialogue?

5-139

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I did not get the last one in the translation.

5-140

**Frédérique Ries (ALDE), ENVI.** – Oui, j'ai été un peu vite parce que le temps me pressait. Je suis désolée.

Comment, ici aussi, avec ces deux acteurs majeurs du changement climatique que sont les États-Unis et la Chine, allez-vous imposer vos priorités, vos exigences, et notamment par rapport à M. Barroso?

5-141

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – One of the things I can bring to this job will be my experience with the different delegations from key countries: for instance, the Chinese Minister responsible for this. I think he and I have spent 10 weekends working on this – well, maybe not so many – but somehow we always met on different Sundays during the fall. I think I have met with him 10 times throughout 2009. Of course I know the different persons; I definitely intend to play as a strong a role as possible on behalf of the European Commission in the run-up to Mexico.

I think that there are many challenges there. I know that there has been a lot of questioning: Did we have a specific problem with developing countries? Basically, I think 'no'. I know how it looks with the G77 and Sudan holding the leadership. But I think that we have been working very intensely with a lot of developing countries and I think that might be one of the areas where Europe as Europe should strengthen its efforts towards Africa, towards AOSIS (Alliance of Small

Island States), things like that, in order to get a better understanding of the different priorities.

5-142

**Frédérique Ries (ALDE), ENVI.** – C'est lié, Monsieur le Président, car la communication est essentielle.

Mme Hedegaard – et nous venons de le voir encore – est une excellente communicante. On l'a constaté encore à Copenhague: au-delà des discours vertueux que nous partageons généralement, quand on atterrit dans la réalité, il n'y a plus grand monde pour s'engager en termes de contraintes et d'objectifs chiffrés, notamment.

Alors comment, là aussi, allez-vous faire en sorte de continuer à bénéficier de l'adhésion des citoyens par rapport à ce qu'évoquait mon collègue Pargneaux, par exemple, cette priorité qui est aujourd'hui la crise économique et sociale? Comment pouvez-vous vous assurer que cette lutte contre le changement climatique continue de figurer tout en haut des enquêtes eurobaromètre et des autres, parmi les priorités, car l'adhésion du citoyen, je pense, est essentielle pour nous armer dans ce combat difficile qui est le nôtre.

5-143

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – That is a very good question. I am in no doubt that due to all the media fuss about Copenhagen and the whole run-up, a lot of people have realised that there is a climate change. Public opinion and awareness is so different now compared to three, four or five years ago. It is on everybody's mind.

I believe it is possible to make it stay on everybody's mind because people have seen some context. Maybe the economic crisis has also made it clearer for people that maybe there is something wrong in our way of using nature and just consuming things and that maybe we should think twice about the footprint we make on Earth.

I think that the awareness is there but that those of us working in the European system, no matter at what level, have a very great obligation to try to communicate that message loud and clear to the citizens. When we look at Eurostat and other statistics we see that this is an area where people really expect the EU to be active, to make a difference, and there we must reach out together much more and communicate this message to the citizens.

5-144

**Åsa Westlund (S&D), ENVI.** – Med några få undantag har det du sagt idag låtit väldigt bra, men det är viktigt att EU:s klimatkommissionär blir mer än en pratkommissionär. Vi behöver en kommissionär som vidtar åtgärder och som driver och får igenom konkreta lagförslag. Därför är jag lite road av bristen på sådana besked från dig. Du har inte sagt någonting om vad du konkret tänker göra när du tillträder ditt uppdrag. Därför vill jag ge dig en chans att så här i slutet av utfrågningen säga vilken konkret åtgärd eller vilket konkret lagförslag du planerar att lägga fram först om du blir klimatkommissionär.

5-145

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I do not know if I would like to prioritise them like that, but I

think I have said very loud and clear that I want to make a climate and transport package. That is not a small thing. It is a huge thing and it is also a simple expression of what mainstreaming will say.

I have also spoken very clearly about research and the preparations for the Financial Perspective. This is not just talk. Ensuring that is done is a very hard political job.

There will be lots of initiatives which will spring from the climate and energy package and the ETS, and there will be something on ETS and abuse, and ETS and other issues. These will probably be some of the first specific initiatives because, as I said, they are already in the pipeline.

This year we will have to have a review on cars and see whether we have come far enough there, so these would be some of the more specific issues. But I must also say, do not be mistaken. I do not have a whole lot of legislation. Much of my work will consist of working with you, hopefully, to try to get ideas, to try to say: OK, how can we take the next step now through others?

That is not an easy task, it is rather difficult, but sometimes some of the results that I hope to help get through will not necessarily come in the form of legislation from me, but from some of my colleagues.

5-146

**Åsa Westlund (S&D), ENVI.** – Tack så mycket för svaret. Det är ganska lätt att prata om bilar, speciellt när man kommer från ett land som inte har en egen bilindustri. På transportområdet är det väl ändå godstransporterna som står för den största miljöbelastningen. Vilken konkret åtgärd tänker du föreslå inom ramen för det här paketet för att komma till rätta med de stora utsläppen från godstrafiken?

5-147

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – I believe that one of the first things is lorries, as the EU still has not acted there as it should have done, and there will be an initiative on that. So that will probably be one of the first things. Another thing is this regulation on cars. It is very important to review it because I recall as Minister how difficult that debate was, but often we see that industry will protest and say it is going to be extremely difficult – in fact almost impossible – but then, when we actually do these things, it turns out that they can often do it even quicker than assessed before and that they claimed before, and they can do it even more ambitiously. And that is why it can be important to try to review whether we went far enough at that time, because this is a field where technology is really moving very, very fast.

5-148

**Peter Liese (PPE), ENVI.** – Vielen Dank, Herr Vorsitzender! Frau designierte Kommissarin, Frédérique Ries hat gesagt, es ist ein Nachteil, wenn man als letzter Fragesteller an die Reihe kommt. Ich halte es für einen Vorteil, denn da kann man schon ein vorsichtiges

Resümee ziehen. Ich fand, Sie waren schon sehr konkret. Zum Beispiel – sogar schon schriftlich – bei der Frage zum Thema NOx im Flugverkehr. Da hat es Herr Dimas leider nicht geschafft, den Verkehrskommissar von einer Regelung zu überzeugen. Ich nehme es Ihnen ab, dass Sie das sehr energisch angehen. Und wenn jemand in der dänischen Regierung für das Scheitern von Kopenhagen oder das teilweise Scheitern Verantwortung trägt, dann sind das nicht Sie, sondern vielleicht der Ministerpräsident. Das dürfen Sie nicht sagen, aber ich darf das.

Meine Frage bezieht sich auf die Zusammenarbeit mit dem Parlament. Wir legen sehr viel Wert darauf, dass die Kommission, wenn wir nach einem geordneten Verfahren in einem legislativen Initiativbericht nach Artikel 225 des Vertrages einen Vorschlag machen, dann in der Regel auch einen Gesetzgebungsvorschlag macht. Herr Barroso zögert da noch ein bisschen. Sind Sie bereit, auf Herrn Barroso und Ihre Kollegen einzuwirken und die Parlamentsposition zu stützen? Und werden Sie in Ihrem eigenen Verantwortungsbereich den Forderungen des Parlaments diesbezüglich nachkommen und einen Vorschlag an das Kollegium der Kommissare machen?

5-149

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – Thank you, Mr Liese. You know as well as I do that there is this framework agreement that has to be renegotiated between Parliament and the President. That is why I cannot go deeply into the specifics on that. I can just draw on my experience in the Danish Parliament.

I would say that my experience is that it is often a huge advantage to work very closely with Parliament, not only when you have a piece of legislation you want to get through – there, it is very evident – but also before you get to that stage. So, provided that I become the Climate Action Commissioner, then I would love to work very closely with you. I would also often like to do it in a very informal way because I think that sometimes, if we take a round table with different actors around the table – and also some MEPs – just to get ideas on the table, then the quality that comes out in the end is often much better.

I will be very open to suggestions from Parliament. As you know, there are some overall policies regarding what exactly will be the labour division between Parliament and the Commission. I will have to respect that of course, but I will be very open to constructive ideas, including at the very early stages of what we are going to do.

5-150

**Peter Liese (PPE), ENVI.** – Vielen Dank, das war also generell ein *commitment*, aber ich frage trotzdem noch einmal spezifisch nach. Natürlich ist das interinstitutionelle Abkommen eine Sache, bei der Barroso verhandelt. Aber es gibt doch sicher Gespräche zwischen den designierten Kommissaren und Herrn Barroso. Und ich würde Sie einfach ermutigen, Herrn Barroso nochmals mit auf den Weg zu geben, dass das

für uns wichtig ist. Ich möchte Sie fragen, ob Sie in Ihrer Rolle als designierte Kommissarin informell die Position teilen, dass man normalerweise, wenn das Parlament nach einem qualifizierten Verfahren einen Vorschlag macht, diesem Vorschlag auch nachkommen müsste, und wenn Sie es nicht tun, dass Sie dann schon sehr gute Gründe brauchen, dies nicht zu tun.

5-151

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – Exactly, and that is how it is. You have to have very good reasons and I think that with the Lisbon Treaty it is very clear that the Council and the European Parliament are on an equal footing in a very large majority of cases. That is why we have to find a new way to benefit mutually from that and work very closely together. I think that the whole European project will really benefit from our being more visible, doing things that really concern people out there, and that is also one reason why we should work very closely together, because you are the representatives of the European citizens.

5-152

**Der Vorsitzende.** – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir sind am Ende der Fragerunden. Ich danke allen Mitgliedern des Umweltausschusses, des Industrieausschusses und des Verkehrsausschusses für ihre Fragen und Frau Hedegaard natürlich auch für ihre Antworten. Frau Hedegaard, Sie haben am Anfang gesagt: „Klimaschutz muss auch Spaß machen.“ Das habe ich mir aufgeschrieben, weil man in der Tat in Kopenhagen hat sehen können, mit wie viel Energie, mit wie viel Enthusiasmus Tausende von Menschen auch in der Kälte draußen und natürlich auch drinnen bei dem Thema waren. Weltweit sind es Millionen Menschen, die aktiv sind, und wir hoffen, dass wir das bei unseren Bürgerinnen und Bürgern und den anderen Akteuren wirklich auf eine breite Grundlage stellen können.

Ich glaube, diese Anhörung hat Spaß gemacht. Sie war wirklich sehr ergiebig, diese *tour d'horizon* durch die vielen Fragen. Ich bin ganz begeistert, weil ich nicht einmal den Gong, nicht einmal den Hammer benutzen musste. Das lief heute morgen einfach rund. Man hat nach dem dritten Mal natürlich auch Erfahrung. Ich danke allen, die sich an ihre Zeiten gehalten haben, auch Frau Hedegaard, die sehr *outspoken* ist und nicht immer die Zeit voll ausnutzen musste. Für Ihr Ressort brauchen Sie das Engagement. Sie brauchen die Überzeugungskraft, und Sie brauchen auch Rückgrat, weil es nicht leicht sein wird, diese Querschnittsaufgabe wahrzunehmen. Ich habe den Eindruck, dass Sie das können und das Rüstzeug mitbringen, diese Aufgabe durchzuführen.

Ich fahre heute nachmittag zu dem informellen Treffen der Umwelt- und Energieminister der EU. Vielleicht sehen wir uns dort. Jedenfalls dürfen wir bei aller Freude nicht den Ernst der Lage verkennen. Das, was in Kopenhagen nicht gelungen ist und was zum 31. Januar von den Mitgliedstaaten der UNO auf den Tisch gelegt wird, reicht nicht aus für 2 Grad Celsius Erderwärmung. Wir sind bei 3 bis 4 Grad und nicht bei 2 Grad. Das heißt, wir haben in den nächsten Jahren eine Riesenaufgabe vor uns. Wir müssen mehr tun und nicht weniger. Wenn es denn gelingt und Sie Kommissarin

werden, freuen wir uns natürlich auf eine engagierte und ambitionierte Zusammenarbeit in der neuen Kommission. Ich bitte nun um Ihre Schlussbemerkungen.

5-153

**Connie Hedegaard, Commissioner-designate.** – Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you very much also for the many good questions and the constructive atmosphere. If you asked me, I would have to say that this is the longest oral exam I have ever tried to pass. But it is good preparation and it makes you really try to focus on the portfolio, so thank you very much for that.

I will be very brief because we have already spent a lot of time airing many different things here this morning but as I see it, and as I hope you have been able to hear, basically I believe that climate change is the challenge of our generation. Yes, we have heard many of the problems and the challenges here this morning. It is not going to be easy to combat climate change. It is not a walk-over. It is not a cheap thing. We will have problems with targets, benchmarks and carbon leakage and many serious matters, but the fact of the matter is that, the longer the world hesitates to act, the more expensive it is going to be, the more severe the climate challenge is going to be and the more severe the changes in our lifestyles we will have to foresee for the future and for the future of our children. So, there is no easy quick-fix, but I really believe that if we use the innovative skills of man – man's ability to find new solutions technology-wise and otherwise – then we can do it.

I am in no doubt, as I said in the beginning, that the region of the world that deals with this in the most convincing way over the next five years, that region will prosper and benefit from it strategically, politically and economically. So, it is not just something we have to do morally, which I think it is, but it is also something that can benefit us if we do it. The EU has had the role of a front-runner; I think we should continue to be so. I also think that there is a lot to be gained in energy independence and energy security if we do this right, and that is why I will end up by saying that I hope we can find solutions that will work on several parameters at one time – climate, energy security and job creation. That must be the vision because that is the most efficient way of doing things. Therefore, we must bring the rest of the world on board; that is what the international negotiations are all about. Some important steps were taken in Copenhagen but, as we have seen this morning, there is still some way to go. As I said, we should not give up on the UN, not at this stage. That is much too easy. I wish it were so easy but it is not. We must still try to get a truly international deal. That means we must keep up the pressure and we must keep up the awareness among citizens too.

I think that one of the best ways of doing that is to show the good examples, to show that you can prosper by doing this, to show the good business cases and therefore, I think that we still have a very crucial role to play. I think the next five years will be absolutely crucial. I really would like to work together with you on

making the change that Europe deserves: the world deserves it and I think that citizens out there expect it from us. So, provided I am the Climate Action Commissioner, I think that together we should take a lot of action in the next five years.

*(Applause)*

5-154

**Chair.** – Ms Hedegaard, thank you for this message and your vision. The hearing is finished. The coordinators will meet at 12.30 in Room 1G2 for the assessment.

*(The hearing closed at 11.50.)*