

**Question for written answer E-015439/2015
to the Commission**
Rule 130
Andrejs Mamikins (S&D)

Subject: 'End' of energy isolation in the Baltics

In mid-October 2015 the Governments of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland, along with the Commission, reached an agreement on the possible construction of the Gas Interconnection Poland-Lithuania (GIPL) by the end of 2019.

With the total construction costs amounting to approximately EUR 558 million, the overall goal is to end the Baltics' energy isolation, to diversify gas sources, routes and counterparts, and to increase the security of gas supply.

1. While energy diversification is undoubtedly a worthy goal per se, who – according to the Commission's prognosis – could become the main original gas supplier for the GIPL apart from Russia?
2. Given that Russian gas is by far the cheapest and most prevalent in the Central and Eastern Europe region, what is the point of constructing an interconnector that will deal in essentially the same gas as its neighbouring infrastructure systems, meaning that the project is essentially political in nature rather than economic?
3. Bearing in mind that the EUR 558 million will come mostly from European taxpayers, and that the cost of the GIPL will affect the final gas price for consumers, how can the Commission reasonably justify the construction of such infrastructure on these grounds?