



# EU PARLIAMENT ACTION NEEDED!

## REJECT THE EU COMMISSION'S €13 BILLION FOSSIL FUEL PLANS!

In November 2021, the EU Commission published a priority list for energy infrastructure - containing **dozens of fossil gas infrastructure projects despite the evident need for urgent action in the face of the climate crisis.**

Ahead of the upcoming ITRE Committee vote at the beginning of February, and the subsequent Parliament Plenary vote in March, please find a detailed **overview of important, and common questions about why this list should be rejected**, what the **implications** of that rejection would be, and how **MEPS can take action.**



**Friends of the Earth Europe**

**FOOD & WATER ACTION EUROPE**



**CEE**

**Bankwatch Network**

**GREENPEACE**

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

### Opposing the 5th List of Projects of Common Interest (PCI list)



What is the PCI list & why is it important? **p.2**

Which gas projects are on this list and why are they unacceptable? **p.3**



What actually happens if the 5th PCI list is rejected? **p.3**

Could a rejection of the 5th PCI list benefit gas? **p.4**



What does it mean for electricity & smart grid projects which are also on the list? **p.5**

Would a PCI list without gas be in line with the TEN-E Regulation? **p.5**



Is the 5th list in line with EU law? **p.6**

Do we need these gas projects? **p.7**



Is one final list of fossil gas projects really that bad? **p.7**

Is the 5th PCI list transparent? **p.8**

What are the chances of the 5th PCI list being rejected? **p.8**

Is the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) the only possible funding route? **p.9**



**NEW:** ANNEX - project case studies **p.10**



# Frequently Asked Questions

## Opposing the 5th Projects of Common Interest (PCI) list

### What is the PCI list and why is it important?

The Union List of Projects of Common Interest - known commonly as the “PCI list” is **a priority list for trans-European energy infrastructure**. The EU Commission published in November the latest update of the Union list, the 5th PCI list. The rules for the selection process and project categories present in this list are stipulated by the [Regulation 347/2013](#) on guidelines for Trans-European energy infrastructure - the TEN-E Regulation. A [political agreement](#) was reached in December 2021 for a revised TEN-E Regulation, which will enter into force in 2022. Thus, **the current 5th PCI list has been drafted under highly outdated rules that do not consider the EU’s climate targets, since they were adopted prior to the Paris Agreement and the European Green Deal.**

The PCI list grants priority status to projects deemed to be in the “common interest”. These **projects can then benefit from a streamlined environmental impact assessment, a fast-tracked permitting procedure and even EU tax payers money.**

PCI lists are published every 2 years in the form of a delegated act - they contain a number of gas, electricity and smart grid projects.

Currently the list includes 30 fossil gas projects, which would contribute to the expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure across Europe. **Rolling out additional, unnecessary fossil fuel infrastructure is not aligned with the aim of the European Green Deal, and risks creating stranded assets and locking Europe further into a fossil fuel future.** It is for these reasons that we consider it of the utmost importance that these projects are not given PCI status in 2022, just 8 years away from our goal of a 55% emissions reduction target. **This is why we are urging you to consider a rejection of the 5th PCI list.**

**In an attempt to pre-empt some of the questions you may have, our FAQs provide more detail on what this rejection looks like.**

## Which gas projects are on this list and why are they unacceptable?

All 30 gas projects (the EU Commission clusters projects and thus claims only 20 projects are on the list) on the 5th PCI list are aimed at fossil gas transport, storage or import. They are not adapted to or aimed at non-fossil gases.

**The cost of all gas projects on the 5th list amounts to €13 billion**, up to half of a project's costs can be funded through tax money, namely the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF), directly linked to PCI status.

Please find a detailed overview of some of the key PCI list projects and their status, costs and associated corruptions in the [Annex](#) to this document. Additionally, please find [here](#) a list of all gas PCI projects including country, cost, capacity and commissioning date information.

## What actually happens if the 5th PCI list is rejected?

**Parliamentarians would be able to demand that the 5th PCI list must be fossil fuel free before entering into force, sending a clear political message that the fossil fuel era must come to an end.**

PCI lists have been protested before, previous list proposals in 2019 and 2017 faced opposition from MEPs in the form of a [motion to object to the delegated act](#) (the form in which PCI lists are updated and published). Up until now however, motions to object have not been supported by an MEP majority.

If a majority were to be reached, **there would be some level of uncertainty since there is no provision in the TEN-E Regulation, currently in force, as to what exactly happens once the delegated act is rejected.** This uncertainty makes the detail of the motion significant, likely carrying important weight, as ultimately the 5th PCI list cannot be adopted without majority support by the EU Parliament and Council.

**Should the 5th PCI list be objected to by the Parliament, the 4th PCI list would likely remain in force - but not for another full 2 year cycle.** This year's [motion for a rejection](#) calls on the EU Commission to propose a new 5th PCI list in line with EU law and climate commitments no later than June 2022 in recognition of the fact that an extensive delay is not optimal. This

deadline is possible to achieve, as the selection process would not need to start again from scratch.

**A rejection of the 5th list would immediately send a strong message to the Commission and European Citizens - making clear that European decision makers plan to support the Green Deal not just with words but in practice.** So even if the 4th PCI list remained in force temporarily, the reduction of political and symbolic support - an important factor for PCIs - would be felt immediately. Similarly, investors would know that gas PCIs are likely to lose their priority status with the updated 5th PCI list, a consideration that cannot be underestimated.

We believe it's critical to send the EU Commission back to the drawing board. The Commission recognised the need to get Europe off gas in their TEN-E proposal, we must not let them pass on the PCI list as another critical battleground for ensuring a fossil free future.

Please note that rejecting the proposed 5th PCI list is not the same as MEPs demanding a phase out of fossil gas overnight. It **simply means that the EU Parliament does not support the further expansion of an unsustainable, long-lasting, costly fossil gas grid infrastructure.**

## Could a rejection of the 5th PCI list benefit gas?

**The political message, and action, that a rejection of the 5th PCI list proposal sends will be far more damaging to gas than any short term protections.**

There are 30 fossil gas projects on the proposed 5th PCI list, the 4th PCI list contains 55 fossil gas projects. Each year, the EU Commission claims that a rejection of the current, shorter list would lead to the previous list staying in force longer, thus indirectly supporting fossil gas.

This argument is somewhat flawed, since:

- **The 4th PCI list would only remain in force a few additional months.** The aim of the rejection of the 5th PCI list as proposed is to require that the EU Commission swiftly presents, no later than June 2022, a new PCI list in line with EU climate commitments. As most of the basic analysis has been carried out already, a renewed 5th PCI list would not need to be drafted again from scratch, it would simply need a political discussion to

[FAQ on rejecting the 5th PCI List: January 2022](#)

[Food & Water Action Europe](#) | [Friends of the Earth Europe](#) | [CEE Bankwatch](#) | [Gastivists](#) | [Greenpeace](#)

agree on the removal of unnecessary fossil fuel projects from the list. Developers of gas PCI projects would be aware of the possibility of their projects losing PCI status in the near future and would be reluctant to continue development of and further investing in their projects.

- **The political message, and action, that a rejection of the 5th PCI list proposal sends will be far more damaging to gas than any short term protections.** The potential benefits of a 5th PCI list that is fossil free, Paris Agreement aligned, and takes steps to protect European Citizens from fossil fuel lock-in, far outweighs the costs of a few extra months of PCI status for projects already on the 4th PCI list.
- Many of the projects included on the 4th but not the 5th list have been finalised already or are facing substantial delays, **the 4th list being in force a few months longer is unlikely to generate significant additional benefits for those projects.**

## What does it mean for electricity & smart grid projects which are also on the list?

**Clear communication can ensure that these projects are protected in the 5th PCI list. Any delay would impact 5 out of 67 electricity projects which are not on the previous list.**

While the 4th PCI list contained 102 electricity projects, the 5th list contains far less, only 67, electricity projects. This is partially due to completion of electricity projects, and the influence of Brexit on the eligibility of certain projects. Only a small handful of electricity projects proposed for the 5th list did not appear on the 4th list previously. This means that in the **worst case scenario, 5 out of 67 electricity projects could have some delay in their PCI status.**

However, there would be no change for smart grids, as the 4th and 5th list projects are essentially the same.

Politically **MEPs can make it clear that they only veto the gas category of the PCI list.** Any rejection of the 5th PCI list is accompanied by a political statement - this is where the nature of the rejection could be specified, and clarity could be provided to ensure that impacts to PCI status for electricity and smart grid projects are minimal.

The aim of the [proposed rejection](#) is to demand a PCI list in line with EU law and commitments, this should protect electricity projects which support a future proof EU energy system.

## Would a PCI list without gas be in line with the TEN-E Regulation?

**Yes. There is no provision in the TEN-E Regulation currently in force that requires the EU**

[FAQ on rejecting the 5th PCI List: January 2022](#)

[Food & Water Action Europe](#) | [Friends of the Earth Europe](#) | [CEE Bankwatch](#) | [Gastivists](#) | [Greenpeace](#)



## **Commission to include fossil gas projects on the PCI list.**

The EU Commission has actually already dropped the entire oil transport infrastructure category from the 5th PCI list in its current proposal. It is therefore possible for the EU Commission to deliver a PCI list omitting the fossil gas category as well, and therefore excluding gas projects.

In the preamble to the Delegated Act adopting the 5th PCI list, the Commission refers to the Union's climate targets and the climate neutrality objective among the reasons for the dropping the oil infrastructure category. These same reasons would - and should - apply to the exclusion of gas projects. So, **it is entirely possible to deliver a PCI list without gas infrastructure projects.**

## **Is the 5th list in line with EU law?**

**No. The 5th PCI list as it currently stands does not align with the EU's climate commitments and promises to only finance projects that align with the EU Green Deal.**

There are strong doubts about the proposed 5th PCI list's alignment with the Paris Agreement, the European Green Deal and the EU Climate law, as its consistency with the EU's 2030 and 2050 targets has not been proved.

Under the European Climate Law, the EU Commission has an obligation to assess the consistency of any draft measure with the EU's climate-neutrality objective and climate targets. Such climate consistency assessment shall be published at the time of adoption of the measure. However, the EU Commission did not publish it when adopting the 5th PCI list. **It remains unclear how, if at all, the EU's climate commitments have been considered by the EU Commission when preparing the 5th PCI list.**

The 5th PCI list also **flies in the face of the EU Parliament resolution on the TEN-E guidelines**, calling on the Commission "to ensure that spending and selection [of PCIs] is in line with commitments made under the Paris Agreement" as well as of the EU Parliament [resolution](#) on the methane strategy - calling "for a halt to EU support for the expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure". Furthermore, the proposed list comes after the **failure of the EU Commission to keep its promise to only finance projects that support the EU Green Deal**, with over €27 million CEF tax money spent on fossil gas PCI projects since then.

For the first time in the history of the PCI list, the Agency for the Coordination of Energy Regulators (ACER) gave a [negative opinion](#) on the foundation of the PCI list. It found in May

2021 that the TYNDP, the network plan the 5th PCI list is based on, is **not in line with EU law**. A criticism the EU Commission did not react to.

## Do we need these gas projects?

**No. Research has shown that these projects are not necessary to deliver energy security for European citizens.**

For years, the EU Commission, leading the process to define PCI lists has claimed that the EU gas grid is close to finalisation and that only small interconnectors would be needed. This was further supported in a [study](#) by Artelys which found that **already in 2019 that the fossil gas projects proposed on the 4th PCI list were not necessary and that the EU gas grid at that time was resilient to a number of disruption scenarios** without the need to build any new pipelines or terminals.

Currently, Europe is suffering from an **unprecedented rise in energy prices, a problem aggravated by our over reliance on fossil gas**. The reality of this crisis has exacerbated energy poverty for many across Europe and will continue to do so if we cannot treat the root of the problem. **Continuing to rely on imported fossil fuels under the flimsy argument of energy security is not working for European Citizens**. We desperately need to reduce and eliminate our dependency on fossil fuels and invest and prioritise renewable solutions that provide clean, good quality energy to those in need, we definitely don't need to roll out more fossil fuel projects.

## Is one final list of fossil gas projects really that bad?

**Yes. Two more years of support for gas infrastructure projects is two more years than we can afford. And support for gas projects won't end with the 5th list, the revised TEN-E regulation contains loopholes for gas which will carry on into the 6th list.**

Firstly, the revised TEN-E Regulation recently agreed upon does not fully exclude fossil gas projects and allows not only indirect support for fossil fuel projects through blending, but also **direct support for two significant fossil gas projects - namely Melita and the EastMed pipeline**. Both of these projects have links to corruption, political tensions, human right violations and in the case of Melita have [murder accusations attached to them](#).

Secondly, the transitional provision in the agreed text for a revised TEN-E Regulation establishes that the 5th PCI list, along with most of the provisions of the old TEN-E Regulation, will remain in force until the 6th PCI list enters into force. In other words, **not objecting to the 5th PCI list**

FAQ on rejecting the 5th PCI List: January 2022

[Food & Water Action Europe](#) | [Friends of the Earth Europe](#) | [CEE Bankwatch](#) | [Gastivists](#) | [Greenpeace](#)

means two more years of support to gas projects, even after the revised TEN-E Regulation comes into force.

## Is the 5th PCI list transparent?

**No. PCI lists are drafted and adopted by the EU Commission following a process that is not fully transparent**

While stakeholders and the public are invited to be involved in a process to define gas needs and the project selection methodology, there is no independent oversight that governs how, and to which, extent these methodologies are applied or whether political considerations render futile any prior sustainability, needs or cost assessments of projects. Additionally, the project ranking, established based on the methodologies set out in the PCI process, is [withheld](#) from the public.

In its Opinion on the PCI list process from October 2021, **ACER criticised the PCI list process for a grave lack of transparency**. It also found that it was **unable to replicate the results of the assessment of the projects** as a result of undisclosed data. The lack of transparency associated with this process therefore raises questions about whether it is truly fit for purpose. ACER also repeatedly criticises the heavy industry involvement in the PCI selection process. The important role of ENTSO-G in the PCI process represents a grave **conflict of interest**, where the **fossil gas transport industry, whose business model is the construction and operation of fossil gas infrastructure, gets to decide on gas infrastructure expansion plans of the EU**.

## What are the chances of the 5th PCI list being rejected? What if the list is not rejected, but receives significant opposition?

**Significant opposition will signal that the Parliament is acting in support of citizens and the planet and in the real common interest of Europeans. We need each and every MEP to take action for a clean future and oppose waving through a costly, unsustainable and unneeded expansion of our gas grid.**

Rejection of the list requires a veto in either Parliament or the Council. This is more likely to come from Parliament as in January, a motion for rejection of the PCI list was already introduced by a number of MEPs. To be successful, the rejection would require the majority of component Members in plenary.

**The rejection of the 4th PCI list was supported by 169 MEPs in plenary, with 36 abstention, which means we would need additional support for a rejection of the 5th PCI list, in favour of a**

[FAQ on rejecting the 5th PCI List: January 2022](#)

[Food & Water Action Europe](#) | [Friends of the Earth Europe](#) | [CEE Bankwatch](#) | [Gastivists](#) | [Greenpeace](#)



**fossil free future. We need each and every MEP to take action for a clean future and oppose waving through a costly, unsustainable and unneeded expansion of our gas grid.**

Even if there is an insufficient, but a considerable number of MEPs rejecting the proposed 5th PCI list it will send a resounding message to the EU Commission, and European citizens, that the era of fossil fuel allowances, funding and support is over. It will demonstrate political willingness to not just talk the talk, but walk the walk.

Additionally, in the coming years, the EU Commission will have to lead on the process to define priority infrastructure. With the EU Parliament positioning itself strongly in opposition to any expansion of fossil fuel projects, the likelihood for such projects to be proposed for support by the Commission will decrease. **Widespread opposition to the 5th PCI list will signal that the Parliament is acting in support of citizens and the planet and in the real common interest of Europeans.**

## **Is the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) the only possible funding route for gas infrastructure projects?**

**No. But removing gas projects from this limited funding source would help speed up the transition to genuinely green deal compatible projects.**

Gas infrastructure projects in Europe could also access financial support through the Just Transition Fund, the Innovation Fund, the Resilience and Recovery Funds, InvestEU, and the European Regional Development Fund. That's not to mention national funds and other private investment finance streams.

**By rejecting the 5th PCI list and requiring a fossil free list, the already scarce EU CEF money pot would instead be focused on fossil free cross-border energy infrastructure projects.**

## ANNEX: A deep dive into costs, corruptions, climate impacts and some of the 5th PCI list projects in reality

PROJECT	<b>EastMed Pipeline</b>
COUNTRY	<b>Cyprus</b>
COSTS	<b>6 Billion</b>
<p><u>EU goals and finance:</u> Project is projected to run for 50 years, with the proposed (not final) date of operation mid 2025. The project does not coincide with European and national targets for reducing fossil fuel use and emissions, and as scheduled, the arrival of natural gas will not be able to help achieve the targets. The feasibility study for EastMed does not reflect EU's decarbonisation goals and future gas demand, and the long term goal of the project cannot be further supported by EU finance. The project, according to the data of the feasibility study, is not ready for Hydrogen incorporation and transport, since studies and assessments remained to be conducted to define the technical standards and requirements to ensure safe and optimised hydrogen transport.</p> <p><u>Delays:</u> Schedules constructions and implementation of the pilot phase delayed. Final surveys and decisions will be available at the end of 2022.</p> <p><u>Technical issues:</u> The feasibility study (supported by the EU) presented with only preliminary data, and leaves various questions unanswered concerning the technical, environmental, social and economic specifications that make the project viable. The process of optimising the submarine pipelines is not complete, the Detailed Marine Survey is ongoing, the maximum depth of the pipelines is still to be confirmed, and other specialised surveys that involve the project are not executed.</p> <p><u>Transparency and financial viability:</u> The financial viability and competitiveness of the project were not the subject of the feasibility study, therefore they are not reported and are not available to the public as they are considered confidential data.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Friends of the Earth Cyprus</i></p> <p>For more details please also see: <a href="https://www.banktrack.org/project/eastmed_pipeline">https://www.banktrack.org/project/eastmed_pipeline</a></p>	

PROJECT	<b>Melita Transgas Pipeline</b>
COUNTRY	<b>Malta</b>
COSTS	<b>€400 million</b>
<p>The Melita pipeline is a proposed two-way gas pipeline between Delimara, Malta and Gela, Sicily, with a length of 159 km and 22" diameter, enabling a capacity of 2 Billion cubic metres</p>	

FAQ on rejecting the 5th PCI List: January 2022

[Food & Water Action Europe](#) | [Friends of the Earth Europe](#) | [CEE Bankwatch](#) | [Gastivists](#) | [Greenpeace](#)

(Bcm)/year. The costs of the €400 million pipeline, proposed by Maltese company Melita Transgas, will be shouldered by Malta. The pipeline is proposed to be operational by 2024. The EIA for the project was published in 2021.

**The Melita pipeline would lock Malta further into a fossil fuel future, instead of investing in clean energy for the islands. European funding for the Melita gas pipeline may flow to Electrogas shareholders – associated with corrupt deals and the murder of Daphne Caruana Galizia.**

The gas would be used to fuel the power station in Delimara to produce electricity, currently supplied by gas from an LNG tanker moored off Delimara, which is procured from Azerbaijan under a contract with the company Electrogas, who also operate the power station. Electrogas' shareholders includes Tumas magnate Yorgen Fenech, the alleged mastermind behind the assassination of journalist Daphne Caruana Galizia. An investigation by Malta's National Audit Office in 2018 found that the Electrogas bid to build a new power station and supply electricity to the national grid, did not comply with minimum requirements to win the lucrative contract. The final assessment of the bid was overseen by a firm that set up Panama companies for the Prime Minister's Chief of Staff and Energy Minister at the time, who were set to receive kickbacks totalling €2 million from Yorgen Fenech's company.

The Melita gas pipeline is included in the latest European Union List of Projects of Common Interest (PCI). Although in principle the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) will no longer fund fossil fuel infrastructure - including natural gas - Malta obtained a derogation, alongside Cyprus, to still be eligible for EU funding, on the basis that they are not connected to the trans-European gas network. Under this derogation their gas pipeline projects may be included on the PCI List, and be eligible for CEF funding, until the interconnection is complete. The European Council said the purpose of this exception is to end the isolation of these two member states and to give them access to future energy markets, including hydrogen.

With gas prices currently skyrocketing across Europe and the world, arguments that investments in a gas pipeline and connection to the European gas network are needed to improve energy security run hollow. Furthermore, while Malta's current gas price under the Electrogas deal is fixed, even that price is almost double that of electricity purchased through the existing electricity interconnector between Malta and Sicily.

It is now a condition that the gas pipeline will be adapted to a hydrogen pipeline by 2029 latest. To this end, the Melita gas pipeline is branded as a 'hydrogen-ready' pipeline. The Connecting Europe Facility could fund up to €200 million for a hydrogen-ready, gas pipeline connecting Malta to the trans-European gas network. However, while hydrogen may be presented as a 'green' energy source, 99% of hydrogen is still produced from fossil fuels. Furthermore, there is no plan or policy in place in Malta to stipulate the (future) strategy for hydrogen production, storage or usage.

The Melita gas pipeline would further lock Malta into a fossil fuel future by investing in new fossil gas infrastructure with a lifespan of several decades, which goes contrary to global, EU and national climate targets and the need to transition to renewable energy sources to meet

these goals. A pipeline around Delimara impacts the seabed and benthic ecosystems, such as *Posidonia oceanica*, the seagrass that has been called the 'lungs of the Mediterranean', which can capture up to 15x as much carbon dioxide as the same area of rainforest.

*Friends of the Earth Malta*

PROJECT	<b>Cyprus LNG Import Terminal (Former CyprusGas2EU)</b>
COUNTRY	<b>Cyprus</b>
COSTS	<b>289 Million</b>

In December 2019 Cyprus and a consortium led by China Petroleum Pipeline Engineering Co Ltd signed a contract for the construction of the infrastructure for the LNG Import Terminal. The project has secured a €101 million grant from the EU under the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) financial instrument.

Delays: First delays were reported in November 2021, with the timetable for the start of operations updated to within the first half of 2023. Between the awarding of the contract in December 2019 and the project's kick-off meeting in September 2020, absolutely nothing was done with regard to the deliverable requirements of the contract. Further delays were reported in February 2022, with the construction progress reaching 4%. By now, there should be at least 50-65% progress. The new, but only tentative, July 2023 completion date may be optimistic owing to the extent of the project's difficulties which have been stirring debate in Cyprus.

Safety, Technical and construction problems: a litany of problems were revealed. Sources reveal that the contract is "impossible to fulfil" as drafted and considering the parties involved. Safety considerations are revealed (since the prime fuel supply jetty for the island will be used as a gas station as well), and regarding the position of the project in a heavily industrial area in Vasilikos, this will hinder the safety of the nearby communities.

Corruption allegations are also involved since sources indicate that the contractor lacks experience in building LNG facilities of any sort, let alone operating one as a gas station as well as a regasification facility. When China Petroleum Pipeline Engineering (contractor) signed the contract, they had no jetty design capability, no cryogenic pipeline experience and had never heard of BS EN 1473. Neither had Defa/Etyfa (the Cyprus parties). The contractor has hired and fired at least four subcontractors to date.

Dispute over contracts - Additional funding for a 4% project The Chinese contractors are seeking additional funds of between €25 million and €100 million to cover cost overruns. The auditor-general of Cyprus states that if the contractor does not meet its contractual obligations to the letter, the contract stipulates arbitration to resolve the dispute, costs that will need to be paid by the Cypriot government.

*Friends of the Earth Cyprus*

**FAQ on rejecting the 5th PCI List: January 2022**

[Food & Water Action Europe](#) | [Friends of the Earth Europe](#) | [CEE Bankwatch](#) | [Gastivists](#) | [Greenpeace](#)

PROJECT	<b>Baltic Pipe</b>
COUNTRY	<b>Denmark</b>
COSTS	<b>629 million</b> (Denmark section) <i>An additional 749 million if Polish section is included</i>

It is uncertain whether the Baltic Pipe will be useful to carry so-called “green” gases in the future. This seems needed however, in order to avoid the massive pipeline from becoming a stranded asset. The background to this is that Energinet (the Danish TSO) has claimed that Baltic Pipe will only carry “green” gas after 2050. NOAH, Friends of the Earth Denmark debunk these claims as greenwashing attempts and provide a number of reasons why the transport of green gas in the Baltic Pipe is unrealistic from Norwegian and Danish side.

A Danish briefing with further details can be found at:  
<https://noah.dk/nyheder/energinet-groenvasker-baltic-pipe>.

PROJECT	<b>Adriatica SNAM TRA-N-0007</b>
COUNTRY	<b>Italy</b>
COSTS	<b>1384 million</b>

Development for new imports from the South via the Adriatica Line is a useless and expensive pipeline. Since the TAP became operational more than one year ago, Italy has diversified gas imports, and enough gas to meet its needs.

The new project Adriatica Line is a 48 inch pipeline from Sulmona to Minerbio, 433 KM in length, and the track is not along the Adriatic sea, but along the Appennin Mountains, crossing Norcia and the territories where the terrible earthquake was in 2016 resulting in 300 dead and, before, the Aquila Earthquake in 2009 resulting in another 300 dead. The project is therefore dangerously crossing natural landscapes, creating environmental and safety impacts. Additionally, included in the project is the pipeline receiving terminal of Sulmona in Casa Pente, taking up 12 hectares of land in a natural park, which has the presence of wolves.

On the 18th of April 2019 groups organised a manifestation in Sulmona against the pipeline with more than 15.000 people, including a variety of civil society groups, from catholic groups to social and environmental groups, as well as the bishop of Sulmona, local and national politicians, and all the mayors of the territory. There is huge local opposition to the pipeline from the People of Sulmona.

*Mario Pizzola, Comitato Cittadini per l'Ambiente Sulmona*

PROJECT	<b>Poseidon Pipeline TRA-A-0010</b>
COUNTRY	<b>Italy</b>
COSTS	<b>1103 million</b>
<p>IGI Poseidon is an anachronistic project from 2006, and has since been abandoned by US President Biden for geopolitical reasons. Having visited the landing beach at less than 1km from the port of Otranto, and the pipeline receiving terminal, an illegal landfill with asbestos was discovered - a court decision resulted in the confiscation of the area.</p> <p>The Pipeline is 32 inches, but in Otranto there is only an interconnection with a 18 inch pipe in San Donato and no interconnection project with the national SNAM Adriatica Line has been presented. Clearly, this project is unnecessary and useless.</p> <p><i>Angelo Gagliani, Redazione Emergenzaclimatica.it</i></p>	

PROJECT	<b>Matagiola - Massafra Pipeline, TRA-N-1195</b>
COUNTRY	<b>Italy</b>
COSTS	<b>240 million</b>
<p>The current situation in this region of Italy is that the SNAM interconnection Matagiola, connects to the TAP pipeline, a 56 inch pipeline, which has been transporting gas since January 2021. From Matagiola there is only a 18 inch pipe to Palagiano connecting the gas to the national SNAM gas network. Part of the TAP gas serves the ENI Power gas power plant in Brindisi, the rest is completely sufficient to meet the needs of the provinces of Brindisi and Lecce. The new pipeline to interconnect TAP with the Rete Adriatica SNAM is therefore completely useless. The 90 km long new pipe will interfere with 12,000 olive trees, destroying natural habitat and beauty.</p> <p>Additionally, as the project was presented at the European Commission PCI meeting on the 24th of april 2021, it is expected to be completed by 2028, yet in the PCI list it's declared for 2026 and on the SNAM website for 2025. Clearly there are discrepancies as to when the project is expected to be completed. Regardless, this is an unnecessary project lacking proper studies and cost-benefits analyses, as requested for PCI list projects from the European Commission.</p> <p><i>Cosimo Quaranta, Movimento No TAP/SNAM della Provincia di Brindisi</i></p>	

**FAQ on rejecting the 5th PCI List: January 2022**

[Food & Water Action Europe](#) | [Friends of the Earth Europe](#) | [CEE Bankwatch](#) | [Gastivists](#) | [Greenpeace](#)