

## **NOAH's position on the economics of CCS**

CCS is an excessively expensive way to reduce emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. With the prospect of a CO<sub>2</sub> reduction cost with CCS around €230-240 - or 15 -18 times more than the average allowance price in the EU ETS in 2009 - a political decision to spend billions of taxpayer funds to support the realisation of CCS would in practice mean that opportunities for renewables and energy efficiency improvements will be destroyed. CCS is liable to demand billions of Euros and dollars for research, development and demonstration.

CCS will play a negative role in the fight against climate change - because the technology is bound to drain resources otherwise available to combat the problem. Years will be lost that should be committed to the development of energy efficiency systems and renewable energy sources.

We believe that it will be a socio-economic mistake of huge proportions to proceed with CCS, be it with public or with private funds.

## **NOAH's position on public funding for CCS**

Funding is providing the necessary financial basis in the form of subsidies and/or private capital for the construction of the necessary installations needed for the CCS to work.

CCS is currently not operating or economically viable as a private business. And there is no prospect that this will change in the coming decades. If CCS is to be realized, it may in other words be made only through massive public investment in the technology.

### **NOAH is against any use of public funds to finance CCS**

Proponents of CCS have been very adept at raising awareness in Europe that there is a need for massive public support for research and development, pilot and demonstration plants. And the 'narrative' of CCS has largely succeeded in producing CCS as a necessary transitional technology.

Public support can help to provide CCS with a competitive advantage in relation to energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies.

Many private companies, energy companies and organizations as well as some public research institutions have a clear self-interest in very large projects as the development of CCS will entail. NOAH believes there is a great need for increased public scrutiny and discussion of these stakeholders in decision-making about CCS.

NOAH believes that public support in the energy and agriculture fields must go to

1. energy savings (stop wasting energy, change behaviour, drop the journey, neglect fashion dictates, turn off unnecessary light etc.);
2. energy efficiency in all sectors (insulation, improved technology);
3. renewable energy;
4. research and development in agriculture and forestry, so these sectors as a whole cease to contribute to climate change;
5. changes in land use so that agriculture and forestry together contribute to significant net uptake of carbon in soil and plants. The money can be used for research, development, demonstration, market introduction and land conversion.