

**Question for written answer E-001644/2018  
to the Commission**

Rule 130

**Carolina Punset (ALDE)**

**Subject:** Investment in fossil fuels, counter to the Climate Agreement, which could give rise to stranded assets such as the Trans-Adriatic gas pipeline

The EU's official position is that natural gas is a 'bridge fuel' between coal and renewables, but methane has high leakage rates<sup>1</sup> and a strong impact on global warming, equivalent to or even worse than coal.

Despite this, the EIB has allocated EUR 1.5 billion for the construction of the Trans-Adriatic gas pipeline.

How can the Commission justify spending billions of euros on this pipeline when the EU wishes to combat climate change<sup>2</sup>?

It is also highly likely that the abundant reserves of natural gas will delay the deployment of renewable technologies. Furthermore, the provision of institutional funding for these infrastructures sends a contradictory message to private investors in renewable energies, whose price curves continue to trend downwards, while running the risk of seeing such large-scale fossil fuel infrastructure turn into stranded assets in a few short years.

How can the Commission justify the financial profitability of the Trans-Adriatic pipeline in respect of trends in prices for renewable energy?

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/343/6172/733.summary>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.eib.org/infocentre/press/releases/all/2018/2018-030-eib-backs-eur-6-5-billion-energy-sme-transport-and-urban-investment>