

## DANIELA LULACHE

Chief Executive Officer, Nuclearelectrica, former Counselor of the Vice-Governor of the National Bank of Romania

### Donald JOHNSTON

Now I am going to turn to our nuclear expert from Romania, who will try to give us some highlights, because we have to get Korean Sherpa in to tell us what the G20 thinks about all of this, which is where we should hear the political side of the battle. Then I would like to have some wind-up questions from you people and conclusions.

### Daniela LULACHE

I will not talk too much about nuclear. If you ask me, nuclear is just a very obvious consequence. We cannot reach this target of decarbonisation and we cannot solve all the climate change problems that are occurring without nuclear. This is at least according to the current technologies as Mr Masuda just mentioned. There are a lot of technologies in research and development and there are a lot of potential technologies coming up, but for the time being, I think it is obvious. When I am saying for the time being, I would refer to the coming 30-50 years. It is not just about today or tomorrow or a year's time.

Nuclear is obviously part of the solution and it is one of the few stable, mature technologies. It is predictable, it is stable, it is low cost and it is neutral from the perspective of carbon emissions. It answers a lot of the questions raised by this new approach. However, there is something which I think is important and it was partially tackled by almost all the panellists. It is from my perspective the most important thing we have to accept, and it is that we really need a totally different approach.

We have been used to comparing technologies and we have been used to having different types of priorities. Today it is important to have cheap energy and tomorrow, it will be important to have a healthy environment. We look at tomorrow from the perspective of a business, because at the end of the day, most of us here somehow represent the business community. Tomorrow, we would just like the citizens of the planet to live in a healthy environment.

What I would really try to point out is that in order to find a fair, correct and proper answer to all these questions, first of all, we have to honestly address all of them. If we address all of them, obviously, the answer cannot just be a split one. It can be just a holistic one, because what we are trying today is ensuring this. It is obvious and we cannot imagine life without energy, and it is again a fact that energy is one of the biggest contributors to climate change.

However, obviously, because we cannot imagine life without energy, we cannot imagine life with expensive energy. We would like to have cheap energy on a constant basis and we do not want black-outs. We would like to have all this in a healthy planet for us, for our children and for the generations to come. I will go back to what I think is a must. It is a must to change our approach. We had several trials, including the greenhouse emissions; the price of carbon; the support schemes for the renewables. We have ended up with the conclusion that we did not have perfect solutions for any of them. At least what I know today is that Europe and North America are confronting market failures, and this is a fact. Energy markets do not function anymore.

I do not want to take too much from your time. I think that the answer is not a simple one and it is a complex one. This is because we have to mitigate short terms with long term, and renewables and a healthy environment with our need today. We have to have access to cheap resources. As a result, the answer is just common cooperation between



economic challenges, energy challenges and human welfare. It is just having cooperation between states and companies. It is not sufficient. I was really paying attention to what our colleague from Total said, about how they struggle to come up with their own strategy to try and tackle all of this. At the end of the day, the conclusion was that they have to talk with the governments. In conclusion, nuclear is part of the solution for sure.

**Donald JOHNSTON**

Nuclear, you said, had to be part of the answer on decarbonisation.