

1 **On greenwashing in energy production from fossil fuels**

2  
3 The Paris Agreement has set an ambitious goal to keep worldwide temperature rise well  
4 below 2°C, and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1,5°C, compared to the  
5 pre-industrial era. To meet this requirement, the targets of the European Union are to cut  
6 greenhouse gas emissions by 20% by 2020, at least 40% by 2030 and 80-95% by 2050. The  
7 consumption of renewable energy must increase from 20% by 2020 to 27% by 2030. We  
8 criticise the weak ambitions of the EU Governments in terms of European energy transition  
9 and reduction of energy consumption. We aim for a renewable European Energy union  
10 without fossil and nuclear energy production. Another factor in the global carbon balance -  
11 reducing the increase of atmospheric carbon dioxide levels - is binding the carbon in forest  
12 stands. In the European Union, the total forest area has grown by 17 million hectares since  
13 1990, constituting 180 million hectares by 2015, as a result of forestation and natural  
14 expansion of forests to abandoned lands. However, this shall not lead to any loopholes to  
15 decrease carbon emissions in other sectors as foreseen within the current draft of climate  
16 action regulation concerning land use, land use change and forestry.

17 Not all the member countries, however, are currently implementing policies to reduce the  
18 carbon emissions. Instead, they enforce energy production from fossil fuels, in an attempt to  
19 misuse sustainable energy production support tools to do so. Estonia is a dramatic example of  
20 such a policy.

21 Since 1960s, the locally mined *Kukersite* oil shale is the main fuel for electricity production in  
22 Estonia and the raw material to produce a liquid fuel, shale oil, in the retorting process. In the  
23 governmental rhetoric of Estonia, the oil shale is often referred as a "national treasure" and  
24 the guarantee of energy independence.

25 Instead of divestment from fossil fuels, the government of Estonia proceeds to invest into oil-  
26 shale-based energy production. The recent developments are:

- 27 • The annually mined amount of oil shale in this century has continuously increased from  
28 12 million tonnes (2000) to 20 million tonnes (2015);
- 29 • In 2016, the environmental levy charged per tonne of carbon dioxide emission was  
30 reduced and set dependent on oil prices in the global market, which, however, has no  
31 relation to climate effects of emissions from oil-shale-fired power plants;
- 32 • The national energy production company Eesti Energia launched a new 300 MW oil-  
33 shale-fired power plant in 2015, financed with a governmental guarantee;
- 34 • As a side effect of reduced environmental levy, the income of Estonian Environmental  
35 Investment Centre has decreased by 63%. Thus, funding of environmental projects is hindered,  
36 including the co-funding of projects funded by the European Union.

37 The energy value of *Kukersite* oil shale is three times lower than that of coal, thus, much larger  
38 quantities have to be mined to produce the equal amount of energy, making respective  
39 damage to groundwater and ecosystems due to open-pit mining. The *Kukersite* contains  
40 certain carbonaceous minerals, resulting in nearly 20% larger carbon dioxide emission per  
41 energy unit produced, compared to coal. Production of 1 MWh electricity by oil-shale fueled  
42 power plants emits as average 1.18 tons CO<sub>2</sub>. More than 70% of the CO<sub>2</sub> released into the  
43 air in Estonia originates from the oil shale power industry. More than 80% of the waste  
44 produced in Estonia is related to oil shale industry. Nearly 80% of the consumption of water  
45 in Estonia takes place during the production of oil shale electricity. Because of its reliance on  
46 oil shale, Estonia has the most carbon-intense economy among OECD countries.

Anna Yeliseyeva 3/31/2017 14:32

Deleted: (as a minimum),

Anna Yeliseyeva 3/31/2017 14:33

Deleted: 5

49 On 14 January 2015, the government of Estonia proposed changes to the Electricity Market  
50 Act to enable Eesti Energia to receive subsidies for burning biomass in oil shale power plants.  
51 A precondition for subsidies is that the Estonian state can sell its surplus share of energy from  
52 renewable sources to Member States lagging behind their binding renewable targets by way of  
53 statistical transfers as envisaged in article 6 of Directive 2009/28/EC. The expected countries  
54 are Luxembourg, Austria and the Netherlands in first order. Estonia has sold AAU-s to  
55 Luxembourg and Austria before. The draft Electricity Market Act, which has passed the first  
56 reading in the parliament of Estonia, allows annually burning up to 3.4 million cubic metres of  
57 wood in the furnaces of power plants, in addition to oil shale, to produce 2.5 TWh of electric  
58 energy.

59 This initiative, in fact, is by no means sustainable, as:

- 60 • Adding 3.4 million m<sup>3</sup> to 10.4 m<sup>3</sup> of wood harvested annually (2014) in Estonia exceeds  
61 its annual growth, which is estimated 12 million m<sup>3</sup> by the Estonian Environmental  
62 Agency.
- 63 • Also Germany is no longer frontrunner: Under the Chancellery of Angela Merkel, Germany  
64 lost track of its energy transition and climate policy. Instead of accelerating the energy  
65 transition, the expansion of renewables was slowed down and the development of a modern  
66 grid is constantly sabotaged. This shows why Greens are so direly needed to shape European  
67 policies on energy. Coal and nuclear power are not sustainable and forward looking. We  
68 support the energy resources of the future. It is possible to cover our energy demand  
69 completely with sun, wind, water, sustained bioenergy and geothermal energy. We want to  
70 convert completely to renewable energies, to promote energy efficiency and saving, and to  
71 permanently switch off nuclear power.
- 72 • No more than 0.5 million m<sup>3</sup> (estimated by the Estonian State Forest Management  
73 Centre) for combustion can be extracted from forests of North-East Estonia -  
74 distances up to 100 km from oil-shale-fired Narva power plants - without either  
75 heavily over-cutting the forest or causing lack of wood for industries, local co-  
76 generation plants and boiler houses, and households.
- 77 • As co-generation of electric energy and heat is not possible in the main oil-shale-fired  
78 power plant (no local demand for excess heat), the conversion efficiency of the  
79 process is only 35%; all the residual heat is released to the Narva river.

80 State aid in form of including the electricity generated by the co-combustion of wood-chips  
81 together with oil-shale in the boilers of Narva Power Plants with energetic efficiency below  
82 45% eligible for statistical transfer of renewable energy, as proposed by Estonian Government  
83 in recent amendment to the Estonian Electricity Market Act, cannot be considered compatible  
84 with the internal market under Article 107(3)(c) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the  
85 European Union. Subsidized co-combustion of wood biomass in the inefficient boilers of  
86 Narva PP-s, which do not meet the efficiency requirements set for co-generation by Article  
87 2(34) of Directive 2012/27/EU and will adversely affect other biomass fueled co-generation  
88 plants with far higher primary energy efficiency at limited domestic market, therefore should  
89 not be allowed by the Commission.

90 President Juncker promised to make Europe number one in renewables. But the Clean Energy  
91 package falls short of matching that aim but maintains privileges for existing coal and nuclear.  
92 Under these plans, Europe faces a lost decade for energy transition. The only good news is  
93 that the mobilisation of progressive forces led to the introduction of emission performance  
94 standards which should at least prevent the building of new coal capacity in Europe. The  
95 Commission continues to turn a blind eye to the environmental risks of bioenergy, failing to  
96 take any effective measures to address them.

97 establish meaningful safeguards. The new sustainability safeguards for biomass fail to address  
98 the climate risks of using sources other than waste and residues, or resource efficiency. The  
99 European Union has a responsibility to align its policies to what it committed to in Paris last  
100 year. Instead, it has presented one big compromise, that will go some way to appeasing the  
101 Member States and energy companies that wish to continue with fossil fuels, but do painfully  
102 little to meet our international responsibilities or seize the opportunities offered by energy  
103 transition. The European Union has a responsibility to align its policies to what it committed  
104 to in Paris last year.

106 Regarding fracking in general, we adopt the "Korbach resolution"<sup>1</sup> demanding from our  
107 national governments and the European Union:

- 108 • An immediate ban without any exemptions of all types of fracking with regard to the  
109 research, exploration and exploitation of fossil energy sources and a general import-  
110 and trade-ban on "fracked" fossil energy sources.
- 111 • A revision of the mining law. The revision must focus on ensuring the highest  
112 environmental standards and the participation rights of the public.
- 113 • A consistent implementation of the political decision in favour of a move away from  
114 fossil energy sources, a development of renewable energies and an improvement of  
115 energy efficiency.

116 We call all relevant actors to mobilise their forces against the projects that, formally  
117 pretending to fulfil the criteria of green energy, undermine the European policies of  
118 sustainable energy production and the Paris Agreement:

- 119 • We call on the Government of Estonia immediately withdraw the draft Electricity  
120 Market Act and to start the process of transition from oil-shale-based energies to an  
121 energy production fully based on renewables.
- 122 • We call on the European Commission and European Council to use all legal and  
123 political means to stop the government-aided greenwashing schemes in energy  
124 industries, practiced as such in Estonia.
- 125 • We call on the Greens in EU member countries to be aware of the possibility of such  
126 schemes and to prevent them by all parliamentary and public means.

127 We strongly believe that it makes no sense to build further infrastructure for fossil fuels  
128 when the EU is legally obliged by the Paris Agreement to have all its energy come from  
129 renewable sources by midcentury. Therefore, we oppose carbon lock-in-projects such as  
130 Nord Stream II, as it weakens the goal to improve our energy efficiency as well as fosters  
131 Europes dependencies on Russian gas.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.resolutionkorbach.org/project/unterst-aus-en.php>