



Our leaders must choose MORE AMBITION TO RE-ENERGISE Europe towards 2030

The European Commission has presented different scenarios for cutting EU greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. Even when using forecasts for energy efficiency and renewable energy that other assessments suggest are much too pessimistic, the Commission's more ambitious scenario has greater benefits than its preferred less ambitious scenario.



More ambitious scenario

Scenario chosen by the European Commission

More ambition = MORE BENEFITS

-45 % greenhouse gases
+35 % ^{renewable energy target}
 + strong energy savings

2030

Less ambition = LESS BENEFITS

-40 % greenhouse gases

BETTER HEALTH

13 million

Total EU population life years saved because of less air pollution

WORSE HEALTH

only **4,2 million**

Total EU population life years saved because of less air pollution

LESS DAMAGE

€ 41.5 bn /year saved

Otherwise spent on the costs of pollution on the environment and on health

MORE DAMAGE

only **€ 13.5 bn** /year saved

Otherwise spent on the costs of pollution on the environment and on health

MORE SAVINGS

€ 555 bn saved over 20 years



From fossil fuel import bills

LESS SAVINGS

only **€ 190 bn saved over 20 years**



From fossil fuel import bills

How much more beneficial would the 55% scenario be that WWF is advocating? Apparently the European Commission doesn't want to know since they didn't even model it.