Closing the Coordination Gap:

A Bridging Architecture for the European Energy Transition

1. THE PROBLEM

European electricity systems are entering a structural timing mismatch. Electrification of transport, heating, and industry is increasing demand on a three-to-five-year cycle, while generation and transmission infrastructure require ten to fifteen years to deliver. The generation and transmission infrastructure needed to serve that demand requires ten to fifteen years from planning to operation. The gap between these two timelines is not an administrative inconvenience. It is the primary source of transition risk.

The European energy transition is not constrained primarily by generation capacity. It is constrained by a coordination gap: the failure to align demand behaviour, deployment speed, and system integration within the window before long-lead infrastructure arrives. Grid connection queues in the EU average one to two years. Permitting timelines run to six to twenty-four months. Cross-border coordination adds a further six to twelve months. The result is that instability emerges before capacity does.

Without deliberate intervention, the period between 2028 and 2032 is the critical window in which electrification demand outpaces both the decommissioning of fossil capacity and the commissioning of its intended replacements. Managing that window is the immediate policy task.

2. THE CORE INSIGHT

Demand has traditionally been treated as the output of an energy planning process: forecast it, then build enough generation to meet it. That model is no longer sufficient under current transition conditions. Demand must now be treated as a system input — a managed variable, shaped to align with available supply and constrained infrastructure, not simply projected and served.

A system that improves its load factor — the ratio of average to peak demand — by fifteen percentage points requires roughly twenty-five percent less installed peak generation capacity for the same total energy delivered. Coordination does not reduce consumption. It redistributes it in ways that reduce the infrastructure cost of serving it. The gap between a coordinated and an uncoordinated grid, in capital expenditure terms, is measured in hundreds of billions of euros over a fifteen-year horizon.

3. THE SOLUTION

Three integrated elements constitute the proposed policy architecture.

The Bridging Stack is a layered deployment framework organised by timescale. Immediate assets — solar, short-duration battery storage, demand response programmes — can be deployed within twenty-four months and are designed with ten-to-twenty-year lifespans, treating them as options rather than commitments. Mid-term assets extend flexibility through long-duration storage and coordinated industrial load management. Anchor assets — nuclear, large hydro, major transmission — arrive in the six-to-fifteen-year window and provide long-run system stability. The function of the earlier layers is to buy time for the later ones.

Demand coordination as infrastructure reframes demand-side management as a missing infrastructure layer. Industrial, commercial, and residential flexibility — collectively spanning fifteen to thirty-five percent of total EU demand within an eight-hour window — represents a deployable resource that reduces required installed generation capacity by twenty to forty percent at a fraction of the capital cost of equivalent new-build. This is not behavioural optimisation. It is system architecture.

The EU implementation layer provides the regulatory instruments. Temporary Energy Security Permits (TESP) create a streamlined eighteen-month permitting track for bridging assets, drawing on existing emergency energy provisions and RED III acceleration clauses. Pan-European Seasonal Energy Credits (PESEC) address seasonal mismatch through an inter-temporal credit mechanism coordinated by ENTSO-E and overseen by ACER. The Energy Resilience Corps (ERC), aligned with the European Pillar of Social Rights and the Just Transition Mechanism, provides a trained, pre-authorised workforce for maintenance, safeguarding, and automation fallback during periods of system stress.

4. WHY IT MATTERS

Indicative fifteen-year cost modelling positions the Bridging Stack approach at approximately €185 billion — compared with €435 billion for a conventional nuclear-and-gas build-out and €364 billion for a solar overbuild strategy. This differential arises primarily from reduced peak capacity requirements and avoidance of overbuild under uncertainty. The cost differential reflects the avoidance of stranded capital in long-lead assets commissioned against uncertain future demand. Beyond cost, the approach directly addresses timeline risk: long-lead assets commissioned today will not be operational until the mid-2030s. The deficit window is open now. And without the coordination layer, grid instability in the 2028–2032 period carries systemic economic risk that no amount of future capacity can retrospectively prevent.

5. POLICY FIT

This framework is fully compatible with the Clean Energy Package, the Renewable Energy Directive (RED III), and the EU Climate Law. It draws on Article 194 TFEU, existing emergency energy provisions under Regulation (EU) 2022/1854, and established co-financing mechanisms under the Recovery and Resilience Facility, the Connecting Europe Facility, and the Just Transition Fund. It does not require Treaty amendment. TESP is structured for ACER and Member State administration. PESEC builds on ENTSO-E's existing transparency and settlement infrastructure. ERC is designed for delivery through national public employment services with ESF+ co-financing. The framework accelerates commitments already made; it does not replace them.

6. CLOSING

The European energy system already has the technology, financing instruments, and institutional structures required to manage the transition, the financing instruments, and the institutional architecture to manage the transition. What it currently lacks is coordination across the deployment timeline. The Bridging Stack provides that coordination layer — reducing capital risk, closing the deficit window, and preserving system stability while long-lead infrastructure arrives.

> ***The constraint is temporal, not technological.***

John F. Ryder — Drive-In s.r.o. — john@driveinsolution.com	*Based on: Ryder (2025) — CC BY-NC 4.0*