

ITER Forum Website Update July 2010

B.J.Green (10/710)

1. UN's climate report 'one-sided'
2. The visible tip of the fossil-fuel disaster
3. The heat is on for change: coal
4. Silex Systems opts for solar exposure
5. Siemens announces technology blueprint to solve energy issues
6. Finnish parliament approves new nuclear reactors
7. Bloomberg
8. Climate Change Scepticism Could Soon Be a Criminal Offence in the EU
9. Dire climate change warning to Australia

1. UN's climate report 'one-sided'

Ben Webster, London, The Australian July 07, 2010 12:00AM 10 comments

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/world/uns-climate-report-one-sided/story-e6frg6so-1225888714749>

THE IPCC's report on climate change failed to make clear it often presented a worst-case scenario on global warming, an investigation has found. The UN body that advises governments on climate change failed to make clear how its landmark report on the impact of global warming often presented a worst-case scenario, an investigation has concluded.

A summary report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on regional impacts focused on the negative consequences of climate change and failed to make clear that there would also be some benefits of rising temperatures. The report adopted a "one-sided" approach that risked being interpreted as an "alarmist view". For example, the IPCC had stated that 60 per cent of the Great Barrier Reef was projected to suffer regular bleaching by 2020 but had failed to make clear that this was the worst projected outcome and the impact might be far smaller.

The wording of a statement on between 3000 and 5000 more heat-related deaths a year in Australian cities had suggested that all of the projected increase would be the result of climate change, whereas most of it would be caused by the rising population and an increase in the number of elderly people. The report, which underpinned the Copenhagen summit last December, wrongly suggested that climate change was the main reason communities faced severe water shortages and neglected to make clear that population growth was a much bigger factor.

The inquiry into the IPCC was ordered by the Dutch government after the UN body admitted its 2007 report contained two important errors. It is the first of two studies this week into the veracity of climate science. The second, focusing on emails stolen from the University of East Anglia's Climatic Research Unit, will be published today. That study, led by Muir Russell, is expected to dismiss claims the unit's scientists manipulated their findings but may say they should have been more willing to share their data.

The IPCC's report, used by governments around the world to develop emissions policies, falsely claimed that Himalayan glaciers would disappear by 2035. Most glaciologists believe that they will take at least 300 years to melt. The report also said that more than half of The Netherlands was below sea level (the correct figure is 26 per cent). The Netherlands Environmental Assessment

Agency, which published the results of its investigation yesterday, concluded that the IPCC's main findings were justified and climate change did indeed pose substantial risks.

But it said the IPCC could strengthen its credibility by describing the full range of possible outcomes, rather than picking on the most alarming projections. It concluded: "Without proper explanation, the results at the summary level of Working Group II (which focused on regional impacts) could easily be interpreted as being an alarmist view."

It said the report had chosen to highlight the most serious risks but had "lacked a clear explanation of the choice of approach and its consequences".

The Times

2. The visible tip of the fossil-fuel disaster

Ziggy Switkowski, The Australian July 06, 2010 12:00AM 2 comments

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/the-visible-tip-of-the-fossil-fuel-disaster/story-e6frq6zo-1225888223812>

SUDDENLY, nuclear looks safer than oil.

The Deepwater Horizon deep sea drilling rig off the coast of Louisiana in the Gulf of Mexico exploded on April 20 with 11 fatalities. Until recent progress in partially capping the leak, oil was spilling at a rate estimated to be between 35,000 and 60,000 barrels a day, sufficient petrol to fuel about a half-million cars.

The world consumes about 85 million barrels of oil a day. That's 1700 Deepwater Horizon flows, 24-7, year-round and \$2.5 trillion wholesale revenues annually. If the Deepwater Horizon oil spill were combusted it would create approximately six million tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions annually. That's about the same as that produced by a typical large coal-fired power station such as those in the Hunter and Latrobe valleys.

To provide for all Australia's electricity and transport energy needs with oil, the equivalent of about 50 Deepwaters may be required. The images of raw crude oil erupting from the ocean floor and polluting the marine environment are a tangible proxy for the less visible greenhouse gases that contaminate our atmosphere. Australia's networks of power stations and millions of petrol-driven vehicles are the equivalent of 50 Deepwater Horizon-scale pipes aimed at the sky, discharging 300 million tonnes of greenhouse gas combustion products year-round, 15 in NSW, 14 in Queensland, 10 in Victoria and so on.

Unlike in the Gulf of Mexico, the environmental damage from greenhouse gases is not immediately apparent. The gases are invisible, the atmosphere capacious and ecosystems adjust, to a point. But decades of high-volume emissions shift the climate balance. Without diminishing the gravity of the environmental catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico, history suggests that clean-up and recovery processes will succeed, albeit at considerable cost, within one to two decades. In contrast, greenhouse gases accumulate in the atmosphere for centuries. And as concentration increases, global warming will produce more climate volatility and many other familiar problems.

Our fossil-fuel energy systems extract carbon-rich resources from the top 10km of the earth's surface and, after combustion, dump carbon dioxide (and water vapour), two to three times the mass of the original fuel, in the troposphere and stratosphere to altitudes of about 50km, where they concentrate for long periods and exacerbate global warming. As we observe the technical difficulty of capping the Deepwater oil flow, we also get a sense of the enormous challenges confronting carbon capture and storage technologies: attempts to collect hot combustion gases

flowing with a similar mass to the Deepwater oil torrent, and then cooling, compressing, liquefying, transporting and storing them safely in subterranean cavities.

Of course, geosequestration is not just an Australian issue. More coal and gas fired energy capacity continues to be added globally than any other form, notwithstanding rhetoric in support of renewable energy. Until Australia accepts the advantages of nuclear power for baseload electricity production, carbon capture and storage must remain a national priority. But the scale of the challenge is awesome, the probability that it will be successful less than certain and the financial cost very high.

Deepwater Horizon dramatically reveals the hazards of oil exploration in hostile environments. But it also hints at the magnitude of the global climate challenge: the enormous volume of fuel required by our energy hungry society and the mass of emissions that is produced. We may be devastated by the environmental damage of a deep-sea oil spill, but our atmospheric pollution is longer lasting and more consequential.

Ziggy Switkowski is chairman of the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation.

3. The heat is on for change: coal

OPINION: David Shearman, The Australian July 10, 2010 12:00AM

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/health-science/the-heat-is-on-for-change-coal/story-e6frg8y6-1225889568496>

JAMES Hansen, the respected NASA scientist, said: "Coal-fired power stations are death factories. Close them." The medical profession has failed to address this serious health message. An urgent transition from coal to renewable energy will provide important health and economic benefits. Research in the US has shown coal pollutants affect all body organ systems and contribute to four of the five leading causes of mortality in the US: heart disease, cancer, stroke and chronic respiratory disease.

Each step of the coal life cycle -- mining, transportation, washing, combustion and disposing of post-combustion wastes -- affects human health. In Australia, research is lacking but there is no reason to believe similar effects are not occurring in coal communities here. To deny it would be akin to holding smoking causes lung cancer in the US but doesn't in Australia. The health burden of coal in Australia is estimated conservatively at \$2.6 billion a year. There are also economic losses due to land pollution and degradation and the open mining of good agricultural land in the face of the projected world food crisis.

The main health impact of coal is caused through climate change. The World Health Organisation ranks climate change as one of the greatest threats to public health. Morbidity and mortality are increasing in the developing world as the effects of climate change take hold of the environment. As the world's fourth largest producer of hard coal and the world's biggest exporter, from which we garner \$20bn each year, our contribution to this pollution is far greater than our culpability as the world's greatest domestic per capita producer of greenhouse emissions.

Let us approach this as a medical problem. The climate change moral challenge referred to by former prime minister Kevin Rudd is even more compelling for the medical implications. For a wealthy country to fail to take necessary measures and to wait for others to do so can be seen as amoral. Communities in many mining regions are worried about pollution. They write to us expressing concern about their children's asthma. There are a number of pollutants released from fossil fuel combustion. These include nitrous oxide and sulphur dioxide, and fine particles measuring 2.5 micrometres or less, which penetrate more deeply into lung tissue than larger particles and are considered particularly hazardous to health.

In the US, exposure to these particles has been shown to reduce life expectancy. Their

monitoring in Australia, especially in the areas where pollution is generated, is patchy or non-existent. Environmental injustice can be defined as the disproportionate exposure of socially vulnerable groups to pollution and its associated effects on health and the environment, as well as the unequal environmental protection provided through laws, regulations and their enforcement. However, incomes in some coal and electricity generation townships are higher than the national average and the injustice relates not to poverty but to health inequality caused by government inaction.

For state governments to disregard pleas for action by parents whose children are suffering from pollution is a denial of their fundamental obligations to public welfare. Many in the medical profession have expressed support for the federal government's intent to improve and reorganise medical services. The government has extolled preventive health and taken action on smoking. Pollution is an area of abject failure that government can attack. It is one of injustice and neglect, with state governments and corporations reaping the economic benefits of coal production and export. Where states have failed to deliver on improved standards and delivery, federal intervention is needed. The Upper Hunter region in NSW has been identified as an area where residents, civil society and local government groups struggle with corporations and state government over the burden of ill-health caused by air pollution. There is ample evidence of inaction by state authorities. There is regulatory inertia and denial of public requested air monitoring, which has extended to mines where air pollution is of concern to local communities. At one such site, an air quality panel is finally being established after many years.

Mines cannot be closed precipitously, for unemployment has personal and family health impacts. However, Doctors for the Environment Australia, in its energy policy (available at www.dea.org.au; click on Policy on main menu) opposes any new mines, particularly those ravaging good food-producing land. For existing mines we recognise the inevitable in terms of our future national and international commitments, and urge planning for the rapid introduction of renewable energy industries into coal mining regions.

Renewable energy industries create more jobs than coalmining; they are generally safer and much healthier for workers and communities. They will offer sustainable economic development in an area where Australia already trails other developed nations. The federal government's proposed resource super-profits tax -- now recast and rebadged as the minerals resource rent tax -- will aid this transition. We ask why, in a wealthy, developed country like Australia, which reaps billions of dollars from the export of coal, are we neglecting the health and wellbeing of entire mining communities? Where are the health impact studies?

This is environmental injustice, with inhabitants being disproportionately exposed to pollution and its associated effects on health and their environment.

David Shearman is emeritus professor of medicine, a practising physician and honorary secretary of Doctors for the Environment Australia.
www.dea.org.au

4. **Silex Systems opts for solar exposure**

Tim Boreham, The Australian July 17, 2010 12:00AM

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/silex-systems-opts-for-solar-exposure/story-e6frg8zx-1225892963603>

WITH the climate-change debate winding its way back on the political agenda, the Lucas Heights-based Silex Systems is hedging its bets. It has dual exposure to cutting-edge uranium processing technology as well as the mass market. The potential of Silex's patented laser uranium enrichment -- a cheaper and much more efficient atomic energy process -- drove Silex shares to \$12 in mid-2007, valuing the company at \$1.7 billion. But a subdued uranium price and

a dearth of information on Silex's nuclear progress has weighed heavily on the stock, now valued at \$650 million.

"Investors are asking: where's the next news flow," says one Silex watcher. Under licence from Silex, a consortium of heavy-hitting atomic energy companies has been trialling the technology at a test facility in Wilmington, North Carolina. The consortium, Global Laser Enrichment (GLE), in April reported the so-called test loop was successful, paving the way for a full-scale plant. Since then, the information curtain has descended as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) undertakes a 30-month approval process. But only Silex investors who are keen readers of the Wilmington Star-News Online would have picked up last month's news that the plant had received environmental approval -- no mean feat for an atomic plant.

Silex chief executive Michael Goldsworthy says the company prefers to stay mute out of deference to the NRC. He defends the lack of disclosure on the grounds the environmental assent is only one part of the approval process (a safety review comes next). "We can only say what we can say," he says. "Until that licensing process is finalised we can't pre-empt the NRC." But he says the GLE project is "very much" tracking to plan as further testing continues. "The focus now is on data for engineering and construction," he says.

"There's no shortcuts. You just have to go through the test sequences and build up the reliability data." At stake is a share of the \$US8bn global market, currently dominated by two outdated methods (mechanical centrifuge and gas diffusion) that date back to the 1940s. GLE is owned by GE (51 per cent), with Hitachi and Cameco accounting for all but 1 per cent of the rest. GLE's deal with Silex is simple enough: a 7 per cent base royalty plus a 5 per cent variable component and milestone payments of \$US55m (\$62.8m).

Southern Cross Equities analyst Hamish Perks notes that the NRC licensing process is a consultative process with ongoing communication between the GLE and NRC: in other words, the regulator is working hand in hand with the applicant, which lessens the risk of the sort of nasty surprise a few local drug developers have received when fronting the US Food & Drug Administration. Perks says: "It's unlikely you will get to the end of the (30-month time frame) and the NRC says sorry that's the end of it."

GLE envisages its initial plant would have the capacity of 3-6 million separate work units (SWUs, a measure of energy). Put in context, the current global supply of enriched uranium is about 50 million SWUs annually. GLE expects its plant to cost about \$US1bn. In comparison, rival USEC plans to spend about \$US3.5bn building the American Centrifuge Plant, based on the centrifuge method used by half the world's reactors (one-third use gas diffusion).

Another advantage is that the laser technology is not able to be patented, but rather is classified, which means its royalty is protected effectively into perpetuity. However, any investor who survived the tech boom and bust of the late 1990s would be wary of grandiose technology claims. It is therefore mollifying that Silex's local solar operations are also on a growth path, albeit with only a fraction of the nuclear side's dazzling potential. To fill the investor information void, management's recent commentary has focused on the solar side, which investors view as not so sexy but which offers short-term earnings potential.

Silex is the only local maker of solar panels, having acquired BP's Homebush-based facility last year for a bargain \$6.5m. The plant, which is in the process of being ramped up to annual output of 10 megawatts equivalent to 35MW, is running at full capacity. Silex followed up with this year's purchase of the failed Solar Systems for \$20m (mainly in shares). Investors including TruEnergy had sunk \$150m into Solar Systems, which planned to build a 150MW facility near sun-kissed Mildura. Despite the promise of government assistance, management ran out of funds before it could commercialise the process.

"The opportunity came not once but twice to get into the market very cheaply," Goldsworthy says.

In the first half, Silex reported an \$8.3m loss on revenue of \$3.24m. Southern Cross expects the solar division to be break even in 2009-10. Once the plant's ramp-up to 35MW is complete, however, Perks expects the division may generate EBIT of about \$15m on \$100m of revenue. Goldsworthy refuses to see the solar side as the poor cousin to the nuclear business. He's resolutely proud that Silex retained Australia as a leading solar innovator when the industry struck trouble during Kevin Rudd's prevarications on renewable energy policy.

"We are a technology company in uranium and solar," he says. "We have very high hopes and very aggressive plans to make a success of both of them". These plans include greenfields expansion in the US or Asia. RBS Morgans analyst Scott Power says solar accounts for less than 10 per cent of the firm's Silex valuation. "But they are pretty excited about the solar business," he says. "They could generate good revenues, but we are interested to see what sort of profit they can chalk up (given cheap imports from India and China). Let's see how it unfolds, but so far so good." Perks says Silex has suffered the general migration of risk-averse investors to safer income-producing stocks during the recent pull-back.

But he adds some investors perceive Silex as a case of management "trust me": given the security implications, analysts and the media are not exactly invited to Wilmington, even though Goldsworthy would love to show off the facility. While light-on for local institutions, Silex's share register is tightly held, with the selling reflecting only modest daily turnover. For the faithful, there's the potential of sky-high returns should laser enrichment become the global industry's gold standard. But in the short term, it is a case of looking at the stars while trying to avoid tripping over the red ink.

5. Siemens announces technology blueprint to solve energy issues

— filed under: Energy Markets, Commodities, Low-emissions Coal/Fuel, Geothermal, Renewable Energy

by Paula Wallace — created Mar 24, 2010 11:46 AM

Siemens recommends Australia invests \$60 billion over the next 10 years in renewable and low CO2 generation technologies, to meet its greenhouse gas abatement targets.

http://www.theajmonline.com.au/mining_news/news/2010/march/march-25-10/top-stories/siemens-announces-technology-blueprint-to-solve-energy-issues

The provider of global technology-based solutions released the findings of a comprehensive research project and presented a technology blueprint for energy and water sustainability in Australia by 2030. The research, titled Picture the Future: Australia – Energy and Water (PTF), is the first research in Australia focussing on technology as the enabler for a sustainable future. It is the culmination of work done in Australia and Germany involving numerous Siemens researchers and a validation process with 22 of Australia's leading industry bodies including the CSIRO, ABARE, the Bureau of Meteorology, The Clean Energy Council, as well as numerous universities and learned institutions.

Siemens Australia representatives led by its chairman and managing director, Albert Goller, presented the research findings at an event in Melbourne, together with Paul Graham from the CSIRO and Chris Davis from the University of Technology Sydney. Goller explained how Australia's challenges can be overcome by technology: "We have many enviable opportunities in Australia such as our abundance of natural resources, and Australia has the potential to be at the forefront of technology.

Even the possibility of being a net exporter of clean electricity is realistic for Australia. Implementing technologies will not only help create a sustainable future, but also new skills and job opportunities in remote regions, whilst providing economic growth." He has a vision for Australia's energy future, where Australians use and export clean electricity due to the integration

of the electricity grid in Australia and possibly even South East Asia. "I also picture a future where Australians are committed to energy efficiency as a way of life, even in the way we travel," said Goller. "Australia has always had the choice to pursue an economically and environmentally sustainable future – and, even in the midst of global and local challenges...these choices are still available for us to fulfil immediately." Commenting on the significance of the research, Paul Graham from the CSIRO said: "Siemens' Picture the Future research provides valuable targets for using Australian-based greenhouse gas abatement options in the energy and transport sectors that simultaneously enhance our industrial base while addressing climate change. It helps us imagine how we can transform our electricity sector in a way that enhances its role in the economy as well as its contribution to greenhouse gas reduction."

Key Findings for Energy: In order to achieve the 2020 target of 5 per cent below 2000 greenhouse gas emissions, Siemens recommends that Australia needs to invest AUD\$60 billion over the next 10 years in renewable and low CO2 generation technologies while simultaneously undertaking aggressive energy efficiency measures. The key issue for Australia in coming decades is the achievement of greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. The 2020 target of a reduction of 5% below the 2000 greenhouse gas emission level actually equates to a 47% reduction below the level of emissions that will occur by 2020 if no action is taken to mitigate emissions - this presents a significant technical and financial challenge.

In order to achieve the 2020 target of 5% below 2000 greenhouse gas emissions, Siemens recommends that Australia needs to invest AUD\$60 billion over the next 10 years in renewable and low CO2 generation technologies while simultaneously undertaking aggressive energy efficiency measures. Siemens' PTF technology blueprint for energy includes: - Efficient and low emission power generation - Renewables (solar, wind, geothermal) - Advanced transmission and distribution including smart grid technologies - Electrified transportation - Efficient energy use.

According to Siemens' PTF, many of the technologies required are already available. For example, a solar power station sized at 30 x 30 km in central Australia would meet the national electricity demand during daylight hours. Use of such technology would allow Australia to become an exporter of clean electricity. By 2030 around 20 percent of vehicles will be electric or hydrogen-based, fuelled by electricity generated from renewable sources. Carbon capture technology will be proven by 2020. The construction of new high efficiency coal and gas fired power plants, combined with carbon capture and storage technologies will provide a strong future for fossil power generation.

6. Finnish parliament approves new nuclear reactors

Friday, July 2, 2010

HELSINKI - Agence France-Presse

Finland's Prime Minister Mari Kiviniemi.

Finland's parliament on Thursday approved the building of two new nuclear reactors in a move the government said would help fight climate change and create jobs but that was widely denounced by environmentalists. "This is one of the most important decisions my government is going to make, because it really improves Finland's competitiveness and will create new jobs, and thus also increase the economic growth," Finnish Prime Minister Mari Kiviniemi told Agence France-Presse after the vote.

In the non-partisan vote, 121 members of parliament cast their ballot to allow utility group Fennovoima build a new reactor, 71 voted against and two abstained, while Teollisuuden Voima, TVO, received 120 votes in favour of building another reactor, 72 against and two abstaining. The difference in votes between the two projects was due to the fact that some members of parliament had wanted just one new nuclear reactor to be built. All Green League deputies meanwhile voted against the bill proposed in April by the center-right government of Matti Vanhanen, who recently resigned and handed the reins to Kiviniemi.

Labour Minister Anni Sinnemaeki of the Green League said she was not surprised but "very disappointed" by the vote. "Among the Finnish decision makers there is clearly a majority for nuclear power (but) as for the Finnish people... the majority is not for nuclear power," she said, lamenting "a clear gap between the people and the decision makers."

Environmental concerns

Several hundred demonstrators also gathered outside the parliament and a few activists with environmental group Greenpeace briefly protested the voted inside parliament before they were led out. The government decided in April to award the construction permits, arguing that the new reactors would help cut greenhouse gas emissions and make the Nordic country self-sufficient in electricity production.

Finland's four existing nuclear reactors were built in the 1970s, and a fifth unit, a 1,600-megawatt third-generation reactor, is being built on TVO's site in southwestern Finland by France's Areva and Germany's Siemens in a project plagued by delays and ballooning costs.

"Parliament's decision to give permission for two more reactors is an economic disaster," Greenpeace said in a statement Thursday, adding the Olkiluoto 3 reactor showed that "not only does nuclear energy block investments in renewable energies, but it is also a bottomless pit financially." Once an opponent to more nuclear power, Kiviniemi said Thursday she was now convinced building more reactors was necessary. "We're obliged to reach a level of 38 percent renewable resources. We're struggling against climate change and we also need to use nuclear power. We have to look at the energy policy not only in details but as a whole," she said. Jarmo Tanhua, the head of TVO which already operates two nuclear power reactors in Olkiluoto and has commissioned the building of Olkiluoto 3, agreed.

"The decision made today is an important milestone towards the EU vision of CO2 neutral energy production," he said in an email responding to questions from AFP. Fennovoima, whose owners include numerous Finnish companies and the Nordic arm of German electricity group E.ON, is a newcomer to Finland's nuclear landscape and wants to build its plant either in Simo or Pyhaejoki on Finland's western coast.

"The next step will be in 2011, when the location for the nuclear power plant is chosen between the two greenfield sites being developed in Pyhaejoki and Simo," Fennovoima chief executive Tapio Saarenpaae said in an email to AFP. Construction of the new power plant would begin in 2014 and it was expected to begin generating electricity in 2020, he added.

7. Bloomberg

China to Build 28 More Nuclear Power Reactors by 2020 (Update2)

March 23, 2010, 3:20 AM EDT

MORE FROM BUSINESSWEEK

<http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-03-23/china-to-build-28-more-nuclear-power-reactors-by-2020-update1-.html>

March 23 (Bloomberg) -- China, the world's second-biggest energy user, approved the construction of 28 more nuclear power reactors under a revised target for 2020 to meet rising demand for clean energy and accelerate development of the industry. Each of the one-gigawatt reactors will cost as much as 14 billion yuan (\$2.1 billion), Mu Zhanying, general manager of the state-run China Nuclear Engineering Group, said in an interview in Beijing today. One gigawatt is enough to power 800,000 average U.S. homes.

Under the original plan announced in 2005, China was to spend 400 billion yuan to add 40 gigawatts of nuclear capacity by 2020 to help reduce reliance on more polluting coal and oil. The capacity will exceed 70 gigawatts by then under the revised plan, Wang Binghua, chairman of the

State Nuclear Power Technology Corp., said on March 20. "China will be the world's nuclear industry leader in terms of technology and also in terms of planning for long term 30, 40 years," Tony De Vuono, senior vice president and chief technology officer at Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd., said in a separate interview in Beijing. "It's pretty close to that right now. The Chinese government is very committed to nuclear."

Construction of 20 of the 28 reactors has already begun, Sun Youqi, vice president of China National Nuclear Corp., said at an industry exhibition in the Chinese capital today. It would take 50 months to build one reactor, according to Mu. The country currently has 9 gigawatts of nuclear capacity in operation, the China Electricity Council said on Aug. 14. Details of the government's revised plan will be announced this year, China National Nuclear's President Sun Qin said on March 5.

Exporting Nuclear Technology

About 200 gigawatts of nuclear capacity is planned or being built worldwide as governments turn to non-fossil fuels to fight global warming, Nomura International said in a report in January. Currently, 372 gigawatts of nuclear power capacity is in operation, according to the World Nuclear Association. China is urging nuclear equipment makers to partner with foreign firms to build reactors abroad, Sun said on March 5. The country's emergence as an exporter of nuclear power equipment would increase competition for Areva SA and General Electric Co., who were beaten in December to a \$20 billion order in the Middle East by a group led by Korea Electric Power Corp.

--Wang Ying. Editors: Ryan Woo, Ang Bee Lin.

8. Climate Change Scepticism Could Soon Be a Criminal Offence in the EU

By JR on 7/20/2010 12:35:00 AM

<http://awesternheart.blogspot.com/2010/07/climate-change-scepticism-could-soon-be.html>

People who are sceptical of climate change could soon be facing criminal charges in the European Court of Justice, British National Party leader and MEP Nick Griffin MEP has said. Speaking in an exclusive Radio Red, White and Blue interview on this week's "Eurofile" report, Mr Griffin told interviewer John Walker about a recent sitting of the European Parliament's subcommittee dealing with the matter, which had passed a ruling which in effect placed legal sanction against anyone who dared question the origin, cause or effect of "climate change."

Mr Griffin revealed how he could not get a straight answer out of the committee while it was in session, but that afterwards it was admitted to him that that intention of the rule was to criminalise dissension on the topic of "climate change."

Listen to the full Radio RWB report by clicking [here](#), choosing the RWB player launch icon and clicking on "Nick Griffin 14 July Brussels" in the pop-up menu.

Posted by John J. Ray (M.A.; Ph.D.).

9. Dire climate change warning to Australia

June 25, 2010, Brisbane Times.com,.au

Environment

Climate Change

<http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/environment/climate-change/dire-climate-change-warning-to-australia-20100625-z911.html>

A dire warning will be delivered to Australia when almost 1000 delegates from around the world arrive on the Gold Coast next week for the country's first international conference on the science of climate change, and how to adapt to it. Co-chair of the three-day conference and director of the National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility, Professor Jean Palutikof, warns Australia will be one of the hardest hit developed countries in the world when climate change starts to bite.

"The science tells us climate change is happening faster than we thought and that the window for us to adapt and prepare is smaller than we thought," Professor Palutikof said.