

Unconventional fossil fuels (e.g. shale gas) in Europe

Your profile	
Whom do you represent? -single choice reply- (compulsory)	I am answering on behalf of a company or organisation
Please enter the name of your company or organisation -open reply-(compulsory)	Quaker Council for European Affairs aisbl
Please enter your e-mail address -open reply- (compulsory)	abosbeer@qcea.org
Are you answering on behalf of an EU-wide organisation? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes
Please select the option which best describes your organisation -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Other
If your answer is "Other", please specify -open reply-(compulsory)	Faith-based advocacy non-governmental organisation
Unless you specify otherwise, your contribution will be published on the Commission's website. Please indicate here if you wish your contribution to be anonymous. -single choice reply- (compulsory)	You can publish this contribution as it is.
Overall perception of unconventional fossil fuels (e.g. shale gas)	
Which of the following statements reflects your overall opinion about unconventional fossil fuels (e.g.shale gas) best? -single choice reply- (compulsory)	I believe unconventional fossil fuels extraction (e.g. shale gas) should not be developed in Europe at all
Main potential opportunities and challenges	
It could help diversify the EU energy mix -single choice reply-(compulsory)	No benefit
It could avoid increasing the EU's energy import dependency (e.g. imports of oil and gas from outside Europe) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Modest benefit
It could strengthen the negotiation position of EU operators towards external energy suppliers -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Modest benefit
It could make energy cheaper for consumers -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Modest benefit
It could enhance the competitiveness of Europe's industry -single choice reply-(compulsory)	No benefit
It could attract investment -single choice reply- (compulsory)	No benefit
It could create employment -single choice reply-	Modest benefit

(compulsory)	
It could generate revenues for public authorities (e.g. taxes or income benefits) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	No benefit
It could lead to technological innovations -single choice reply-(compulsory)	No benefit
It could lead to a substitution of coal to the benefit of the climate -single choice reply-(compulsory)	No benefit
It could help balancing the EU electrical grid -single choice reply-(compulsory)	I don't know
It could have other benefits (please specify and indicate the level of benefits you expect: major/significant/modest benefit) -open reply-(optional)	Although considering benefits & costs may seem to be a balanced approach, the many risks of fracking to all ecosystem services -water, soils, air, & even food safety- mean that benefits are far outweighed by costs. With climate change & the EU's own targets regarding energy & a sustainable future (only possible if we maintain the natural resources that underpin our entire economy & society), there is a clear need to focus on increasing energy efficiency rather than seeking new energy sources.
It could lead to new problems related to the quantity of used water -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge
It could lead to new problems related to water quality -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge
It could lead to new problems related to air quality -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Significant challenge
It could lead to new problems related to soil -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Significant challenge
It could lead to new problems related to land take -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Significant challenge
It could lead to new problems related to nature and biodiversity (e.g. forests, vegetation, wildlife) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Significant challenge
It could lead to new problems related to community disruption (e.g. noise, increased traffic) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge
It could lead to new problems related to seismic activity -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge
It could give rise to long term geological risks (i.e. after the cessation of the operations) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Significant challenge
It could increase risks to the climate (e.g. methane emissions) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge
It could divert resources away from other energy options (e.g. renewable energy sources, energy efficiency) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge

It could lead to health and safety risks for workers at the exploration and extraction sites -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge
It could be bad for local image, tourism, and the value of properties -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge
Lack of transparency and public information (<i>e.g on the foreseen licences and permits, on the operations (such as chemical additives used), their potential benefits and risks</i>) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge
Inadequate legislation applicable to these projects (<i>e.g insufficient level of protection of human health and the environment</i>) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Major challenge
Lack of level playing field for operators in Europe due to different national approaches -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Significant challenge
Lack of capacity of public authorities to supervise a large number of facilities -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Significant challenge
Lack of public acceptance -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Significant challenge
It could lead to other challenges (<i>please specify and indicate the level of challenges you expect: major/significant/modest challenge</i>) -open reply-(optional)	The evidence from the US, where fracking has a longer history, of damage to soils and agriculture, to water resources and even the air with methane leakage, makes it clear fracking is environmentally unsustainable. The social aspects, with boom-and-bust economies created by influxes of workers seeking employment, with related increases in crime and medical needs, give a further indication that fracking does not benefit locals or the environment except in the shortest term.

Addressing the challenges

Plan ahead of developments (<i>e.g expected number of wells; space between wells; distance to residential areas, aquifers, protected areas</i>) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Assess the risks of the underground (geological) formation before deciding whether to proceed with drilling and hydraulic fracturing -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Characterise operational risks before, during and after operations, including through the use of specific models -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Make sure the well is properly constructed, isolated and does not leak -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Monitor the quality of water, air and seismicity aspects before, during and after operations	Very important

-single choice reply-(compulsory)	
Disclose operational data (<i>e.g volumes of water used; chemical additives used; waste characteristics; incidents</i>) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Minimise the use of fracturing fluids, and substitute hasardous ones with safer alternatives -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Minimise the use of water -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Manage fracturing fluids and waste appropriately -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Control releases to air, including of greenhouse gases such as methane -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Limit noise -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Minimise transportation needs -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Ensure clear and robust liability regimes, including for the post-closure phase -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Ensure that operators or permit holders have appropriate financial security in place (<i>e.g to cover possible accidents or post-closure requirements</i>) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Provide for inspection of the wells and surveyance of the operations in the wider area -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Provide for independent evaluation and verification of the projects -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Ensure adequate responses in case of emergency -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
I have further recommendations (<i>if so, please specify and indicate for each recommendation how important you consider it is to avoid or minimise environmental, climate and health risks of unconventional fossil fuels (e.g shale gas): very important/important/somewhat important</i>) -open reply-(optional)	No amount of monitoring, financial indemnity, or predicting risks will prevent problems. It is wise to learn from the experience of others, such as in the US. Monitoring is only useful if a solution exists to immediately remedy the problem, but none exists. The risks of polluting groundwater, of methane leakage through soils, of dealing with waste water & its impacts when left deep underground, are simply too great to attempt to control them through monitoring and attempting to require cleanup.
If the above measures were implemented according to your ranking, would this change	No

your overall opinion about unconventional fossil fuels (e.g. shale gas)? (as indicated in section 2) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	
Do nothing, the current framework is appropriate -single choice reply-(compulsory)	No
Develop information exchange, guidance on best practices and encourage voluntary approaches by the industry -single choice reply-(compulsory)	No
Clarify existing EU legislation through guidelines -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes
Adapt individual pieces of existing EU legislation -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Maybe
Develop a comprehensive and specific EU piece of legislation for unconventional fossil fuels (e.g. shale gas) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes
I have further suggestions or details on the above options -open reply-(optional)	Money and effort should not be spent on developing fracking but rather on the innovations essential to meeting existing targets on energy efficiency & reduction of GHG emissions. We must de-couple our economic activity at every level – from extraction, production, & transportation, to consumption & assimilation of waste. Seeking a temporary solution in fracking is spending resources to counteract the EU's own targets regarding the major threat of climate change.
Planned developments (<i>e.g. number of wells and localisation</i>) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Information about operators involved in unconventional fossil fuels (e.g. shale gas) activities, their licences and permits -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Baseline data (<i>e.g. data on water and air quality prior to operations</i>) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Operational data (<i>e.g. volumes of water used; chemical additives used</i>) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Information on incidents associated with unconventional fossil fuels (e.g shale gas) exploration and extraction -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Information on potential risks associated with unconventional fossil fuels (e.g shale gas) exploration and extraction -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Very important
Information on potential benefits (<i>e.g. employment and tax revenues</i>) -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Important
Thinking about the next 40 years, do you	No

consider that the development of unconventional fossil fuels (e.g. shale gas) fits within the EU objectives towards a resource-efficient and low carbon economy?

-single choice reply-(**compulsory**)

Are you satisfied with this survey? -single choice reply-(**optional**)

I am not satisfied

If you have further comments or suggestions, please write them in the box below. -open reply-(**optional**)

Regarding the survey, we are of the view that it should be more neutral in design. Survey respondents tend to agree with the surveyor, and therefore non-neutral surveys are less likely to stimulate a broad and balanced response. Also, additional space for explanations would permit more nuanced explanation of the respondents' viewpoints, and better information for the Commission regarding the views of the public. Regarding fracking, without circumventing the EU existing legislation on human health and safety, environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments, protection of surface and groundwater, biodiversity and habitats, and management of waste and permission to use chemicals, fracking will not be possible in Europe. This is because the risks have been shown to be too high to be confident that Europe's natural resources and ecosystem services will not be damaged. The precautionary principle must be applied. Energy prices are often cited as an obstacle to growth – but we need urgently to de-couple our desire for well-being from energy. The limits of our natural world with regards to climate change are not something we can ignore or negotiate. Well-being – which encompasses social as well as economic aspects of human life – must be our goal. This means not seeking new energy sources but instead developing a truly green economy, one that protects the ecosystem services that comprise the foundation of all our economic activity.