



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

### **After Fukushima: Europe facing a nuclear phase-out?**

On this Friday and Saturday the European Council will debate on the issue whether Europe faces a nuclear phase-out after the horrific events in Fukushima. The day before this crucial meeting of the heads of state and heads of government of all 27 EU member states, a small number of the busy statesmen devoted a moment of their precious time to share their thoughts on the prospects of this meeting.

Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi said he was hoping for a fruitful debate and was optimistic that a satisfactory outcome for all member states could be reached. He emphasized that he was aware of the differing opinions and variety of interests, but was still confident that the European Council could achieve an agreement on common security standards for nuclear facilities which is Italy's top priority.

The Hungarian Presidency expected negotiations to be hard but not doomed to fail.

"The European Union must learn from the accident in Japan. Learning does not mean taking one step backwards, it means moving forward", stated Mark Rutte, Prime Minister of the Netherlands and stressed that this would take a collective effort by all member states.

The Swedish government said it expected a long and controversial discussion but would nevertheless hope for a reasonable compromise. Sweden's Prime Minister Fredrik Reinfeldt urged the other member states not to be guided "by panic" when deciding on this crucial issue.

Bulgaria's Prime Minister Boyko Borisov, who is opposing a nuclear phase-out, expected support for his position from big European powers such as the UK and France.

Nicolas Sarkozy who wants to continue using nuclear energy in the EU promised to "try everything to find a consensus".

Another big European player, Germany, acting as a driving force behind the pursuit



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

of a European nuclear phase-out emphasized that the European Union had to “act like a role model” to ensure our own safety and “the safety of future generations”.

Malta, the smallest EU member state, stood out with the friendly and warm tone of its circular letter to all member states. Malta’s Prime Minister Lawrence Gonzi said he was looking forward to an “effective” and “fertile” debate to show that the representatives of the EU member states as ordinary people could do extraordinary things in exceptional times as these. The EU had shown in the past it could handle the “big problems of our time” and he was sure it could do it again. The coming days will show whether this optimism is justified.



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

### **Michael Müller: The future belongs to renewable energies**

Michael Müller, the Former state secretary at the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety yesterday presented his expertise about the subject of nuclear power and renewable energies at the European Union Conference meeting in Berlin.

As he was speaking in the German capital, he emphasized the particular responsibility that Germany has concerning the use of nuclear technologies. In 1938, in Hitler's Germany, it was German scientists Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassmann who discovered the nuclear fission. Albert Einstein's warnings in his letter to President Roosevelt in which he called for "watchfulness" and "immediate actions" because "it may become possible to set up a nuclear chain reaction in a large mass of uranium, by which vast amounts of power and large quantities of new radium-like elements would be generated[...]; this new phenomenon would also lead to the construction of bombs, and it is conceivable - though much less certain - that extremely powerful bombs of a new type may thus be constructed." was not taken seriously. Only six years after his warning, Hiroshima and Nagasaki proved the deadly and devastating force of nuclear bombs.

Nevertheless, the power that comes along with the possession of nuclear bombs made the acquisition of nuclear capacities very tempting to states both in the East and the West. According to Müller, the civil nuclear programs were initiated to „cover up the intentions to build a nuclear bomb“, and were driven by the fascination to use such a devastating power in a way that could benefit people. He pointed out that even today many countries run a civil nuclear program in order to be able to work on a military nuclear program.

In terms of the security of the civil use of nuclear power, Müller criticized the misjudgment of the authorities and their miscalculation which was due to the fact that the probability of nuclear accidents is very low. The potential extent of the damage, however, was unacceptably high and therefore the use of nuclear technology unjustifiable. Moreover, the question of how to manage nuclear waste remained unresolved.

Müller outlined the major challenges for the upcoming years and proposed solutions.

Firstly, existing technologies should be made more efficient, but more importantly awareness among consumers should be raised so they take actions to save energy.

Secondly, power generation and energy supply should be decentralized taking into



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

account the local conditions in each member state.

Thirdly, investments in research and establishment of renewable energies should be made as nuclear power was an idea that belonged to the past whereas the future belonged to renewable energies. In his opinion, the problem of scarcity of resources could no longer be ignored by Europe if it wanted to be a dominating economic power on the world stage. He underlined that Europe's only chance to remain relevant would be an investment in future technologies and the saving and recycling of resources.

In order to be able to tackle these issues, he advised an amendment of the EURATOM treaty.

Having organized several big demonstrations in Germany in the past months, Müller said he was skeptical that a European solution would be found easily, because the debates on the EU level were to formalized and open discussions would only take place in informal meetings. Furthermore, he made clear that he believes in decentralized, local solutions and the EU should only set political targets. This afternoon in Berlin, we will see if the delegates can make a decision on this issue that is essential to the future of the European Union.

## Interview with the German delegation

*When you heard first about the earthquake in Japan, did you envision that a nuclear accident on such a scale might happen?*

No, I never imagined an event like this to happen. Japan is a very developed country, they were using a the best and safest technology.

*How have the events in Fukushima affected your country's view on the use of nuclear energy?*

Our view on the use of nuclear energy has entirely changed since the terrible events in Fukushima. To us the situation looks completely different now that in a country like Japan an accident like this happened.

*But then why has there been such a misjudgment of the dangers of nuclear energy by your government?*

We have to admit that we looked more at the advantages of the use of nuclear power because it obviously has some advantages such as efficiency and affordability on the short term, so we didn't see clearly the disadvantages of the use of nuclear power.

*What is your opinion on the draft that was introduced by the Hungarian Presidency?*

The draft by the Hungarian presidency is warmly welcomed by the German delegation and we think it's a good basis for our work. However, there are some points we need to specify and what is also very important is that we introduce as a main goal of European politics the complete nuclear phase-out in Europe.

*How optimistic are you that a consensus can be reached that respects the interests of all 27 member states?*

We are very optimistic that a consensus can be reached because we are certain the delegates of the member states will assume their responsibility and vote for a consensus. We know that we cannot expect all of our domestic interests to be represented by such a consensus but we will try our best to get a satisfactory result for all member states.

*Doesn't the European Union risk losing economic power if it votes for a nuclear phase-out in Europe while emerging economies such as China for India are using this technology as a basis for the expansion of their economy and to prove that they are dominating actors on the world stage?*

No, absolutely not. First of all uranium resources are finite so we can not count on nuclear power anymore than on fossil sources of energy. Secondly, the future belongs to renewable energies and only those powers that are prepared for these developments can gain economic power. Here lies a great chance for Europe to be a role model for the world.



MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011

*Would you dispute the assumption made by the UK that the consequences of climate change are more deadly than the use of nuclear power?*

I think it is absolutely irresponsible of the UK to play down the dangers of the use of nuclear power. The negative influence on the climate by nuclear accidents is goes far beyond the consequences of any natural disasters.

*Regarding the firm position of other member states opposing a nuclear phase-out, don't you think that it would be more efficient to reach a compromise by implementing a mix of energy (as suggested by the European Commission) sources than to insist on a complete nuclear phase-out?*

Germany is aware that there are Eastern European states whose economies are not strong enough yet to phase-out of nuclear technology immediately. For those countries an energy mix could be seen as a step forward towards the ultimate phase-out.

*Can renewable energy be regarded as a reliable source of energy considering the fact that its supply highly depends on the climate and nature?*

Even though nature can't be controlled, there will always be wind and sun. So renewable energies are not less reliable than conventional energies, they are just different in handling. We need to develop new technologies how to use them more efficiently and how to save that energy. Of course, Germany is willing to invest in the research of such technologies.

---

## Interview with the Italian delegation

*When you heard first about the earthquake in Japan, did you envision that a nuclear accident on such a scale might happen?*

No, we were not aware that a nuclear accident in such a high develop country could happen.

*How have the events in Fukushima affected your country's view on the use of nuclear energy?*

It did have an impact since we are now more aware of the risks. However, we still believe that nuclear power is essential for Europe and the safest bridge technology. We just have to agree on high common security standards.

*What is your opinion on the draft that was introduced by the Hungarian Presidency?*

The draft is a really good starting point, but we want some amendments. We need more specification on the funds. What we find irritating is that the results of the stress



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

tests are to be published. In our opinion we make ourselves prone to terrorist attacks for example by Al Qaida. Also the deadline for the shutdown of nuclear plants should be extended to 18 months.

*How optimistic are you that a consensus can be reached that respects the interests of all 27 member states?*

We are very optimistic and sure that if we agree on common security standards we can reach a consensus.

*In a case of a nuclear accident in your country the nuclear fallout won't stop at the border, so don't you think that the other EU member states have a legitimate interest in deciding over the use of nuclear energy in your country?*

This is a fact that we just need to accept. It has always been the case that actions in one country have an impact on other countries. However, Italy wants to keep its national sovereignty and we will not allow for smaller countries such as Austria to dictate our energy policy.

*Experts have emphasized that nuclear accidents don't necessarily need to be caused by natural catastrophes such as earthquakes or tsunamis, but can simply be caused by a power outage or human errors. How do you want to eliminate these risks?*

Human errors can be avoided if we develop nuclear power that is run by computer programs instead of human beings.

*What about cyber terrorism?*

We will never have 100% safety but we can set the highest security standards also against cyber terrorism.

*In your opinion, how can the question of nuclear waste management be resolved?*

Nuclear waste management is a large problem but we are certain that we can find a solution.

*Would Italy be prepared to host a nuclear storage facility for the nuclear waste of all European countries on your own territory?*

No because beautiful Italy is not the rubbish bin for the whole world.

*Don't you think it would be more reasonable to invest money to realize a nuclear phase-out instead of and renewable energies rather than dealing with enormous economic in case of a nuclear accident?*

The problem with renewable energies like solar and wind power is that they ruin our beautiful landscapes. Italy makes a lot of profit with tourists and they don't want to see ugly wind parks or solar panels when they are traveling to Italy.



MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011

## Interview with the Maltese delegation

*When you heard first about the earthquake in Japan, did you envision that a nuclear accident on such a scale might happen?*

No, I thought in such a highly developed country and considering how disciplined the Japanese usually are, they would have training for such events.

*How have the events in Fukushima affected your country's view on the use of nuclear energy?*

Our view on the use of nuclear energy has changed very much. The awareness of the risks has increased a lot, because a hypothetical danger suddenly became real. Now our primary duty is the protection of our citizens. That's why we are particularly concerned about the construction of nuclear power plants in Sicily or Turkey because they could endanger the whole Mediterranean area.

*What is your opinion on the draft that was introduced by the Hungarian Presidency?*

We welcome the draft introduced by the Hungarian presidency. We are especially happy with the fact that the Hungarian Presidency placed great emphasis on the development and research of renewable energies and on the introduction of financial incentives for countries with weaker economies. Malta has great potential for alternative energies as we have a lot of wind and sun on our beautiful island, so Malta would profit a lot from such a fund.

*How optimistic are you that a consensus can be reached that respects the interests of all 27 member states?*

We are very optimistic that a uniform agreement can be reached.

*Doesn't the European Union risk losing economic power if it votes for a nuclear phase-out in Europe while emerging economies such as China or India are using this technology as a basis for the expansion of their economy and to prove that they are dominating actors on the world stage?*

We are not talking about an immediate or sudden phase-out but the member states will get the chance to adapt their energy policies. But besides that I am sure that the future of energy belongs to renewable energies. The EU will profit from these developments if it invests in renewable energies now. Uranium is also just a finite resource. In the end, China and India have to switch to renewable energies as well.

*Would you dispute the assumption made by the UK that the consequences of climate change are more deadly than the use of nuclear power?*

Of course it is important that we meet the emission target and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. However, we believe that this can be achieved best if we invest in alternative energies. Especially as the problem of nuclear waste management





*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

remains unresolved and the damage to the environment of this waste can not be underestimated.

---

## **Interview with the Finnish delegation**

*When you heard first about the earthquake in Japan, did you envision that a nuclear accident on such a scale might happen?*

Of course such a nuclear accident is not impossible, but the probability is very low. Finnish territory is safe and our safety standards are much higher than in Japan because our nuclear power plants have been built just recently. In Japan they did not take into account the risk of earthquakes and tsunamis in their country and they built the Fukushima nuclear power plant directly at the coast.

*How have the events in Fukushima affected your country's view on the use of nuclear energy?*

They don't have an impact on our policy because we have always pursued a very reasonable safety strategy. We'll soon have 5 nuclear power plants, and the safety standards are very high. The construction of our last power plant became more expensive only because we are constantly increasing security standards.

*What is your opinion on the draft that was introduced by the Hungarian Presidency?*

We have a very positive view on the draft because it recognizes that nuclear energy is part of a pragmatic European energy policy and it doesn't seek to impose anything on the member states.

*How optimistic are you that a consensus can be reached that respects the interests of all 27 member states?*

It is not impossible because the draft is very sympathetic to the interests of all member states. However, it seems that the large players want to push through some underlying agenda. With a caucus after only 5 minutes of plenary debate we think it's going to be a long and difficult way to get to a consensus.

*In a case of a nuclear accident in your country the nuclear fallout won't stop at the border, so don't you think that the other EU member states have a legitimate interest in deciding over the use of nuclear energy in your country?*

All of our actions and decisions in this globalized world have an international impact. To us that means it is legitimate to have common safety standards and stress tests, but not that the other member states can dictate the exact composition of our energy mix. That must always remain a matter of national sovereignty.

*In your opinion, how can the question of nuclear waste management be resolved?*

Waste management is a very important issue. Currently we have one storage place approved that is located in the South-West of Finland. Finish law foresees an obligation for energy providers to deal with the nuclear waste and as always in Finland the standards are very high.

## Record of the Course of Negotiations on Day 1

On Friday, May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011 first negotiations on one of the most disputable topics of our time were successfully held. Negotiations were divided in two rounds: at the first round of negotiations honorable members of the European Union Conference introduced their positions and expressed clearly their views and expectations of the upcoming meeting. The Hungarian Presidency introduced its Conclusions which were warmly welcomed and highly appreciated by the delegations. During the second round of negotiations a number of Amendments were suggested to Sections I and II of the Draft which were debated by all members. Among these amendments were:

### Section I. Use of atomic energy in the European Union

**Six Amendments** were made, among them: **one Amendment** was **passed** and the other **five** failed.

### Section II. Safety

**Sixteen Amendments** were made, among them: **eight Amendments** were **passed**, the other **seven** failed and one Amendment was revoked.

The overall number of Amendments proposed by all delegations: **22 Amendments**.

Let us take a closer look at these Amendments:

1. Amendment to Section I Clause 3 was made by Slovakia and concerned the clarification of the term “neighbouring countries”. This Amendment was **passed** and the term replaced with “especially non-EU neighbouring countries”.
2. Amendment to Section I Clause 3 was made by Turkey and suggested to consider the Turkish opinion with special regards, i.e. naming specific neighboring countries like Turkey. This Amendment failed.
3. Amendment to Section I Clause 4 was made by Belgium and suggested that each state should be free to produce and use nuclear energy as long as it ensures its own and respects its neighbours’ security. This Amendment failed.
4. Amendment to Section I Clause 5 was made by Cyprus against the construction of a nuclear power plant (NPP) in Akkuyu near the border between Turkey and Cyprus. Cyprus regarded it as a precondition that NPPs, such as in Akkuyy, shall comply with the safety standards agreed upon in the Draft version of the Conclusions. This Amendment failed.

5. Amendment to Section I Clause 4 made by Greece, Cyprus, Austria and Portugal stated that the EU should replace nuclear power with renewable technology; each member state shall be free to decide on a particular date for a nuclear phase-out as long as it does not extend 30 years from now. This Amendment failed.
6. Amendment to Section I made by Italy aiming to emphasize that the EU was going towards a phase-out as soon as possible, hopefully until 2050, if it can be accomplished. However not mandatory. This Amendment failed.
7. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 a. and 1 d. made by Slovakia, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Italy and Portugal. As to 1 a. – a scale of NPPs should be introduced. As to 1 d.- support from the other member states should be received for installing or increasing safe measures or introducing alternative measures to ensure a sufficient energy supply. It also stated that support shall be given to those NPPs that could fail stress tests in order to avoid an energetic collapse. This Amendment failed.
8. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 a. made by Latvia suggested expanding the second sentence in this clause as to ‘all EU members and members applying for the EU membership’. This Amendment was **passed**.
9. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 a. made by the European Commission to expand the term ‘extreme situation’ and include ‘terrorist attacks’ in it. This Amendment was **passed**.
10. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 b. made by Turkey suggested that countries that voluntarily submit the stress tests shall be granted a priority access to the EU. This Amendment failed.
11. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 made by Cyprus suggested that the stress tests should be carried out by an independent regulatory body of the EU (e.g. the energy division of the European Commission). Each member state should assure the access of this body to conduct stress test at all NPPs in the EU. This Amendment failed.
12. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 c. made by Luxembourg concerning the replacing the term “committee of national regulators” with “independent committee of national regulators”. This Amendment was **passed**.
13. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 c. made by Belgium expanding the term “independent committee of national regulators” with “independent committee of national regulators and assessed by at least one member of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER)”. This Amendment also suggested to include that this procedure should be repeated every five years. This Amendment was **passed**.



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

A friendly Amendment was suggested to replace “the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER)” with “the European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group (ENSREG)”.

14. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 c. made by Estonia suggesting to include “which are controlled by an European international nuclear safety commission” after the words “the European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group (ENSREG)”. This Amendment failed.
15. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 c. made by the UK suggesting to include to the clause that only information not deemed of value for potential terrorist attacks shall be published until the counter-measures have been completed. This Amendment was **passed**.
16. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 d. made by Hungary suggesting that member states should in consultation with the Commission take appropriate measures to bring the plant into line with the safety standards required. This Amendment failed.
17. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 d. made by Sweden suggesting to increase the deadline of nine months to 12 months with the option to prolong the deadline under special circumstances for additional six months. This Amendment was **passed**.
18. Amendment was revoked by the European Commission.
19. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 d. made by Portugal suggesting that during the reparation period the affected nuclear plant needs to remain turned off. This Amendment failed.
20. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 d. made by Belgium suggesting to include “member states and ENSREG” and expand the last sentence by adding “will be shut down within a time individually assessed by a member of ENSREG but a maximum of three years”. This Amendment failed.
21. Amendment to Section II Clause 1 e. made by Cyprus suggesting adding the following provision “the Member states declare that current and future negotiations between the EU and possible EU candidates shall only be begun or continued if the regulations, in particular all safety standards, agreed upon in this document are fulfilled.” This Amendment was **passed**.
22. Amendment to Section II Clause 2 a. made by Lithuania suggesting to establish an EU-wide solidarity fund to help countries with low financial potential to ensure the security standards. This Amendment was **passed**.

Members of the European Union Conference	Number of Amendments submitted	Amendments failed	Amendments passed
Austria	1	1	
Belgium	3	2	1
Cyprus	4	3	1
Czech Republic	1	1	
Estonia	1	1	
European Commission	1		1
Greece	1	1	
Hungary	1	1	
Italy	2	2	
Latvia	1		1
Lithuania	1		1
Luxembourg	1		1
Portugal	3	3	
Slovakia	2	1	1
Slovenia	1	1	
Sweden	1		1
Turkey	2	2	
UK	1		1

During all rounds of negotiations the members of the European Union Conference were open to discuss various current issues that do not necessarily affect their own country but were trying to consider interests pursued by other member states and problems they are dealing with.

However there are still questions that remained unanswered and many more Amendments to be discussed during the second day of negotiations. We are all looking forward to the third round of negotiations and the final decision on the Draft of the Conclusions!

### Interview with the delegation of the United Kingdom

*When you heard first about the earthquake in Japan, did you envision that a nuclear accident on such a scale might happen?*

In fact, I as a person feared for an nuclear accident on a much larger scale. The Japanese people have showed unimaginable bravery and competence in coping with the nuclear incident so closely following the devastating earthquake and tsunami.

*How have the events in Fukushima affected your country's view on the use of nuclear energy?*

It has become clear to us that we may have to estimate risks and chances of nuclear power differently than before. Other than that, the UK sees no linkage between the events in Japan and our power stations.

*What is your opinion on the draft that was introduced by the Hungarian Presidency?*

We very much congratulate the presidency on this well written paper, which



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*  
satisfyingly outlines our position.

*How optimistic are you that a consensus can be reached that respects the interests of all 27 member states?*

I aspect that after the thorough and tedious discussion, we will all be willing to compromise.

*Experts have emphasized that nuclear accidents don't necessarily need to be caused by natural catastrophes such as earthquakes or tsunamis, but can simply be caused by a power outage or human errors. How do you want to eliminate these risks?*

There has been significant progress in nuclear power station design, which virtually eliminates the danger posed by a power outage and minor human errors. We nevertheless must not have imbeciles running our stations but have to ensure that we always have access to qualified staff.

*Don't you think that it would be more reasonable to invest money to nuclear phase-out and renewable energies rather than dealing with enormous economic loss of possible nuclear accidents?*

To our mind, the economic losses resulting from having little and/or expensive energy would be much greater than those potential costs of a nuclear accident.

The UK is of the opinion that by enhancing the reprocessing of nuclear waste, we can reduce the waste output by 80%. Any waste still produced will be stored in subterranean geological depositories.

---

## **Interview with the Irish delegation**

*When you heard first about the earthquake in Japan, did you envision that a nuclear accident on such a scale might happen?*

The general perception, which is a bit difficult to assess in retrospect, seemed to be that, also it was considered a great tragedy, the extent and the possible outcome was not considered to be as grave as it was, which obviously was not exclusive to Ireland.

*How have the events in Fukushima affected your country's view on the use of nuclear energy?*

The events in Japan have not really changed Ireland's position. Nuclear technology has not been an option for Ireland due to security, safety and economic feasibility and this stance has not changed. The opinion polls regarding this question also have not shown any significant change of opinion among Ireland's people, as a majority opposed nuclear energy before and still does.

*What is your opinion on the draft that was introduced by the Hungarian Presidency?*

We think that the Hungarian Presidency created a very well thought out draft, which provides a solid basis for further discussion. Obviously, there are some amendments necessary, but this was to be expected. So, overall they did a very good job.

*How optimistic are you that a consensus can be reached that respects the interests*



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011  
of all 27 member states?*

Ireland is cautiously optimistic that there can be consensus reached by Saturday evening, as there has been made quite some progress on Friday.

*Doesn't the European Union risk losing economic power if it votes for a nuclear phase-out in Europe while emerging economies such as China for India are using this technology as a basis for the expansion of their economy and to prove that they are dominating actors on the world stage?*

Well, first of all China and India, also this will not lead them to withdraw from nuclear energy, have at least had discussion on nuclear energy and its future, so this question is also pondered by these countries. Secondly, as it is, the European Union does not consider an immediate withdrawal, but only one in the long-run, so we think this risk is, given the EU position, not great.

*Would you dispute the assumption made by the UK that the consequences of climate change are more deadly than the use of nuclear power? Regarding the consequences of climate change don't you think that it would be inadmissible to give up on NPPs completely whereas they produce CO2-free source of energy (low-emission energy)?*

Well, it is a bit misleading to compare these risks, as for major consequences caused by nuclear energy there has to be some sort of accident or something similar, whereas consequences caused by the climate change are triggered by something different. We also think that there can be a non nuclear energy future in Europe without increased Carbon Dioxide emission. So we would not consider it to be inadmissible.

*What actions is your country going to take to ensure that renewable energies become an equal substitute to conventional power?*

Our country is expanding its use of wind, especially off shore and water power. *Considering the current financial crisis, do you believe that the EU can afford a nuclear phase-out?*

There are some financial constraints on some countries, Ireland obviously included, but we do not necessarily consider the possible move towards a more diversified energy mix as a waste of money in the long term.

*Regarding a firm position of other member states opposing a nuclear phase-out don't you think that it would be more efficient to reach a compromise by implementing a mix of energy sources as it was suggested by the European Commission?*

Yes we consider this to be a very interesting proposal that may be an quintessential part of the possible consensus reached.

*Do you think that by applying new harsh rules and imposing a stricter liability (proposed by Austria and the Cyprus Republic) for insecure use of NPPs could help to avoid dangerous nuclear risks in future?*

These are steps that have to be considered and may very well, if implemented, lead to the decrease of risks posed by nuclear energy. The question is obviously if, and even more so, in which form such steps can be implemented.



MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011

*Can renewable energy be regarded as a reliable source of energy considering the fact that its supply highly depends on the climate and nature?*

We do believe that renewable energy is highly reliable and with a more interconnected energy grid these possible regional "problems" can be overcome.

---

### **Short notes on the Negotiations of the Second Day – Part I**

Turkey feels neglected by European Union because all their amendments fail due to "political reasons".

The UK accuses Turkey of blackmailing European Union with the Nabucco pipeline.

Greece says "members must accept giving up some aspects of their national sovereignty".

Austria has problems pronouncing "I.A.E.A."

Father of Austrian delegate is scientific expert who can foresee earthquakes.

Greece accuses Germany of wanting to exploit poorer countries by sending them their nuclear waste. The UK calls this "colonisation" and a "breach of international law".

European Commission not familiar with procedural rules.

Malta does not support "paranoid" amendment introduced by Poland, the Czech Republic and Italy.

Estonia insists on being a very developed country that is even connected to the internet.





*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

## **Short Notes on the Negotiations of the Second Day – Part II**

The Chair notices that there is a tied vote, delegates are asked “to rethink their opinion”.

France threatens that there will be no consensus whenever the French delegation is not pleased with what they hear.

Turkey is constantly reminded by the Chair it has no right to vote.

Philosophical discussion of whether the beauty of windmills is appreciated by tourists won't end.

Italy does not want “ridiculous” enumerations of islands such as Malta and Cyprus in the draft.

After two days of debate the Cypriote delegate notices that the Slovenian delegation is missing.

For some reason Germany's amendment gets lost on the way to the Chair.

## Record of the Course of Negotiations on Day 2

During the second day of negotiations the honorable delegates submitted the following Amendments:

### Section II. Safety

**Nine Amendments** were made, among them: **four Amendments** were **passed**, the other four **failed** and one Amendment was withdrawn.

Considering the first day of negotiations the delegates submitted on the Section II **25 Amendments**, among them: **12 Amendments** were **passed**, the other **11 failed** and two Amendments were withdrawn.

### Section III. Development of renewable energy (renamed to “Promotion of renewable energy”)

**15 Amendments** were made, among them: **six Amendments** were **passed**, the other **eight failed** and one Amendment was withdrawn.

### Section IV. Outlook

**10 Amendments** were made, among them: **seven Amendments** were **passed**, the other **two failed** and one Amendment was withdrawn.

Members of the European Union Conference	Number of Amendments submitted	Amendments failed	Amendments passed
Austria	5	1	4
Belgium	4	3	1
Bulgaria	1	1	
Cyprus	6	5	1
Czech Republic	2	2	
Denmark	4	3	1
Estonia	4	3	1
European Commission	3		3
Finland	2		2
France	2	1	1
Germany	4	2	2
Greece	1	1	
Hungary	3	1	2
Members of the European Union Conference	Number of Amendments submitted	Amendments failed	Amendments passed
Italy	5	4	1



MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011

Latvia	1		1
Lithuania	2	1	1
Luxembourg	1		1
Malta	1	1	
Netherlands	2	1	1
Poland	1	1	
Portugal	5	4	1
Romania	1		1
Slovakia	3	2	1
Slovenia	1	1	
Spain	1	1	
Sweden	6	2	4
Turkey	2	2	
UK	6	2	4

Overall Amendments submitted: 56  
 passed: 26  
 failed: 26  
 withdrawn: 4

### Interview with the Estonian delegation

*When you heard first about the earthquake in Japan, did you envision that a nuclear accident on such a scale might happen?*

Yes, also in that moment we thought that there would be a danger for the Japanese plants, but nobody could see, that it would end in a partial meltdown.

*How have the events in Fukushima affected your country's view on the use of nuclear energy?*

Since Fukushima, the safety of nuclear power plants is our most important point. Because of that, the new Estonian power plant will have the highest security standards in the world.

*What is your opinion on the draft that was introduced by the Hungarian Presidency?*

The draft shows the difficult position of the Eastern European states, who see the problem of nuclear safety, but also need a possibility to be independent in their energy supply.

*How optimistic are you that a consensus can be reached that respects the interests of all 27 member states?*

It is always difficult to find a solution for all 27 member states, but we think, we are on a good way.

*In a case of a nuclear accident in your country the nuclear fallout won't stop at the border, so don't you think that the other EU member states have a legitimate interest*



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

*in deciding over the use of nuclear energy in your country?*

We know of the dangers of nuclear power. That is one of the reasons, why we have to discuss our plans with our neighbors and come to a compromise.

*Experts have emphasized that nuclear accidents don't necessarily need to be caused by natural catastrophes such as earthquakes or tsunamis, but can simply be caused by a power outage or human errors. How do you want to eliminate these risks?*

We can never eliminate all risks, but also coal or gas are not as safe as they seem. The air pollution and the climate change will cost even more lives in the next 100 years than for example the Fukushima crisis.

*In your opinion, how can the question of nuclear waste management be resolved?*

The best way of handling the nuclear waste would be, producing as few as possible. Facing this goal, we will also build one of the most effective plants in the EU.

*Don't you think that it would be more reasonable to invest money to nuclear phase-out and renewable energies rather than dealing with enormous economic loss of possible nuclear accidents?*

A nuclear accident in the Baltic Area is a very low risk, compared to the chances which are given to our people by this technology.

*One of your arguments for maintaining NPPs is because they produce CO2-free energy. But what about one of the renewable energy sources – 'technology of combined cycle gas turbine' (CCGT), which is supported by Belgium and which can allow a clean and efficient production of electricity using natural gas. Wouldn't it solve the problem with CO2 emission?*

Even CCGT would not be a solution for our dependence on Russian gas.

---

## **Interview with the Luxembourgish delegation**

*When you heard first about the earthquake in Japan, did you envision that a nuclear accident on such a scale might happen?*

No, I didn't have the assumption right away. But very soon after the earthquake and the tsunami happened it became clear that a nuclear accident of a historic dimension was taking place.

*How have the events in Fukushima affected your country's view on the use of nuclear energy?*

Luxembourg does not have any nuclear power station and wasn't planning on constructing a nuclear power plant. However, for the people of my country it was a wake up call. Many demonstrations took place and the position of our government is clear: we want a long-term phase-out as we regard an immediate phase-out as being impossible. As a short-term solution we suggest high level stress tests on a European level.



*MEUC Press News of May 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 2011*

*What is your opinion on the draft that was introduced by the Hungarian Presidency?*  
In general, we are very happy with the draft by the Hungarian Presidency. Of course, there are amendments and specifications to be made, but it's a good starting point.

*How optimistic are you that a consensus can be reached that respects the interests of all 27 member states?*

It's not going to be easy to find a consensus, because there are hardline promoters of nuclear energy such as Poland, the UK, Italy and France. However, it is not impossible to reach a consensus if we just focus on our common interests.

*Doesn't the European Union risk losing economic power if it votes for a nuclear phase-out in Europe while emerging economies such as China for India are using this technology as a basis for the expansion of their economy and to prove that they are dominating actors on the world stage?*

No, a nuclear phase-out is the only responsible choice. It is a choice that won't make us weaker or less competitive but instead stronger and better prepared for a world with ending resources and new ways of using energy.

*Would you dispute the assumption made by the UK that the consequences of climate change are more deadly than the use of nuclear power?*

Nuclear energy can never be controlled and is one of the most dangerous technologies ever invented by man.

*Considering the current financial crisis, do you believe that the EU can afford a nuclear phase-out?*

Yes the EU can afford a nuclear phase-out if it just wants to and if we all work together.

*Yulia Basurina and Sheila Ghaffari*