	Titelliste
1.	GAS : EU AND RUSSIA STICK TO THEIR POSITIONS Europolitics Energy (English), June 13, 2012, 304 words, Marie-Martine Buckens

2.	MORE GAS FOR EU Europolitics Energy (English), May 30, 2012, 222 words

3.	Nouveau bras de fer gazier en vue entre la Russie et l'Ukraine La Tribune, Mercredi 28 Décembre 2011, ÉCONOMIE | INTERNATIONAL; Pg. 4, 446 mots

4.	So could the West be about to face life without petrol?; LEADER The Express, February 24, 2011 Thursday, LEADER; 12, 842 words, Ronald Payne

5.	GAS : GAS DISPUTE ENDED BETWEEN RUSSIA AND BELARUS Europolitics Energy (English), July 7, 2010, 373 words, Dafydd ab Iago

6.	ENERGY : BELARUS CUTTING GAS EXPORTS TO EU Europolitics new neighbours (English), June 28, 2010, 295 words, Dafydd ab Iago

7.	ENERGY : RUSSIA WARNS EU OF BELARUS GAS CUTS Europolitics new neighbours (English), June 28, 2010, 490 words, Dafydd ab Iago

8.	Russia cuts Belarus's gas supply - and fuels EU fears: Moscow claims unpaid gas bill amounts to £128m Gazprom to fulfil Europe's needs via Ukraine pipeline The Guardian (London) - Final Edition, June 22, 2010 Tuesday, GUARDIAN FINANCIAL PAGES; Pg. 26, 734 words, David Teather and agencies

9.	RUSSIA AND BULGARIA FAILED TO SOLVE THE GAS PROBLEM The Russian Oil and Gas Report (Russia), May 4, 2009 Monday, CONTRACTS AND CONCESSIONS;, 524 words

10.	La crise russe, une bonne affaire pour les gaziers européens Les Echos, jeudi 22 janvier 2009, ARTICLE; Pg. 19, 523 mots, EMMANUEL GRASLAND

11.	International: Russian gas begins to flow into wary Europe The Guardian (London) - Final Edition, January 21, 2009 Wednesday, GUARDIAN INTERNATIONAL PAGES; Pg. 26, 537 words, Ian Traynor, Brussels

12.	Russian gas flow resumes to wary EU The Irish Times, January 21, 2009 Wednesday, WORLD; Other World Stories; Pg. 11, 494 words, IAN TRAYNOR in Brussels

13.	Deal to end gas dispute in sight, says Putin The Irish Times, January 17, 2009 Saturday, WORLD; Pg. 12, 472

	words, DEREK SCALLY in Berlin

14.	Russian and Ukrainian leaders to meet on gas The Irish Times, January 16, 2009 Friday, WORLD; Other World Stories; Pg. 12, 359 words, DANIEL McLAUGHLIN

15.	Old Russian ally is left out in the cold; Russia pledges to restore gas flows, EU says; Bulgarians go without heat after Moscow cuts gas deliveries The International Herald Tribune, January 13, 2009 Tuesday, NEWS; Pg. 2, 937 words, Dan Bilefsky - The New York Times Media Group

16.	Russian natural gas company cuts off Ukraine's supply The International Herald Tribune, January 2, 2009 Friday, FINANCE; Pg. 14, 624 words, Andrew E. Kramer - The New York Times Media Group

17.	Focus on Russia-Ukraine gas dispute misses bigger picture The Business, February 16, 2008, 899 words, Christopher Granville

18.	L'Union européenne veut démanteler les positions dominantes dans l'énergie; GAZ ET ELECTRICITE. La Commission européenne propose un train de mesures pour favoriser la concurrence et les consommateurs. Le Temps, 20 septembre 2007, Economie, 574 mots

19.	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MINISTRY GUARANTEES SAFETY OF RUSSIAN GAS DELIVERIES The Russian Oil and Gas Report (Russia), August 23, 2006 Wednesday, INDUSTRY EVENTS;, 762 words

20.	A REPEAT OF LAST WINTER: YANUKOVICH WON'T SOLVE THE GAS PROBLEM What the Papers Say Part A (Russia), August 9, 2006 Wednesday, PRESS EXTRACTS;, 1907 words, Sergei Zhiltsov

21.	Énergie: les pays du G8 en rangs dispersés Le Figaro, 12 juillet 2006, L'actualité économique, 596 mots, GEORGES QUIOC

22.	Ukraine faces new talks on gas deal with Russia The International Herald Tribune, June 15, 2006 Thursday, FINANCE; Pg. 16, 454 words, Judy Dempsey

23.	Energy: Alternatives: Four elements in struggle for world power: Will the future of energy be fossil fuels, solar panels, wave power, or nuclear? Observer writers weigh up the merits of the competing technologies: Nuclear The Observer (England), June 11, 2006, OBSERVER SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT; Pg. 4, 1193 words, Oliver Morgan, Industrial Editor

24.	Questions about Russia (folo); Georgia's gas flow partly restored The International Herald Tribune, January 24, 2006 Tuesday, NEWS; Pg. 1, 435 words, C.J. Chivers

25.	Pipeline blasts cut Georgia gas supply; Tbilisi's leader blames the Russians The International Herald Tribune, January 23, 2006 Monday, NEWS; Pg. 1, 814 words, C.J. Chivers

26.	GAZPROM REDUCES GAS SUPPLIES TO EUROPE DUE TO UNPRECEDENTED FROSTS The Russian Oil and Gas Report (Russia), January 20, 2006 Friday, INDUSTRY EVENTS;, 508 words

Zur Liste zurückkehren

Europolitics Energy (English)

June 13, 2012

GAS : EU AND RUSSIA STICK TO THEIR POSITIONS

BYLINE: Marie-Martine Buckens

SECTION: No. 0824

LENGTH: 304 words

Although Moscow does not - yet? - seem to have obtained a relaxing of the EU rules governing the **supply** of gas in the Union from third countries, Russian President Vladimir Putin confirmed at the EU-Russia summit, held on 4-5 June in St Petersburg, that the Russian gas pipeline South Stream will go ahead. Putin said that construction was to start in December 2012, lasting between 18-24 months.

In his meeting with European Commission President José Manuel Barroso and Energy Commissioner Günther Oettinger, the Russian president reiterated his request for a relaxing of the rules of the EU's third energy package, which lays down the separation of energy production and transport activities. This provision does not sit well with the Russian gas giant **Gazprom**, nor does the third country' clause, which provides for the certification of transport operators that are controlled by foreign investors. This clause is known by the Russians as the anti-**Gazprom**' clause.

The question has several times been the subject of bitter discussions between Russians and Europeans. In February 2011, during his meeting with Barroso, Putin had already started to threaten that "the mechanical implementation of this legislation could lead to an increase of prices on the European market". Barroso replied that the EU has "understood Russia's concerns about the third package on the liberalisation of the energy market and hopes to find a mutually acceptable solution". The South Stream gas pipeline is to transport Russian gas from the EU via the Black Sea - in order to avoid Ukraine, habitually the main transit country, but a country where price disputes with Moscow have led to temporary **interruptions** in the gas **supply** to EU countries. With this new gas pipeline, Moscow hopes to secure its position as the EU's main gas supplier.

LOAD-DATE: June 14, 2012

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

JOURNAL-CODE: NRGE

Zur Liste zurückkehren

Europolitics Energy (English)

May 30, 2012

MORE GAS FOR EU

SECTION: No. 0823

LENGTH: 222 words

The consortium in charge of the Nord Stream gas pipeline, which links Russia to Europe via the Baltic Sea, is considering building up to two potential additional pipelines to increase the volume of gas delivered to the EU, it stated on 11 May. The Nord Stream communique reads as follows: "The shareholders of Nord Stream AG [**Gazprom,** BASF, EON, Gasunie and GDF Suez] have asked the company to conduct a feasibility study of possible options to further increase the capacities to transport natural gas from Russia to the EU through the Baltic Sea. Over the next eight months, Nord Stream will make an assessment of various criteria of up to two potential additional pipelines, including technical solutions, route alternatives, environment and financing".

According to Nord Stream AG, "the EU's gas import requirements will continue to grow in the long term due to the economic and environmental advantages of natural gas and the decline of indigenous production in the North Sea".

In November 2011, Nord Stream (approximately 1,220 km) started supplying Europe with Russian gas without going over land. The rationale behind this choice was to avoid the **supply interruptions** caused, in particular by disputes between Moscow and Ukraine. Russian gas **supplies** currently account for over a quarter of the 27 member states' gas needs.

LOAD-DATE: June 5, 2012

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

JOURNAL-CODE: NRGE

Zur Liste zurückkehren

La Tribune

Mercredi 28 Décembre 2011

Nouveau bras de fer gazier en vue entre la Russie et l'Ukraine

RUBRIQUE: ÉCONOMIE | INTERNATIONAL; Pg. 4

LONGUEUR: 446 mots

ENCART: ÉNERGIE

Le spectre du conflit gazier russo- ukrainien se rappelle au souvenir des européens... comme chaque hiver depuis 2006. Les deux pays n'ont toujours pas réussi à se mettre d'accord sur le prix que l'Ukraine devra payer, l'année prochaine, pour le gaz qu'elle achète au géant russe **Gazprom.** À deux reprises depuis 2006, ce conflit tarifaire a provoqué des **interruptions** de livraisons pour l'Europe, qui achète un quart de son gaz à Moscou. Car les deux tiers du gaz russe exporté par **Gazprom** vers l'Europe transitent via l'Ukraine.

Les derniers pourparlers, le 20 décembre entre Vladimir Poutine et son homologue ukrainien Mykola Azarov, n'ont rien donné. **Gazprom** demande entre 400 et 485 dollars pour mille mètres cubes, tandis que Kiev ne veut pas payer plus de 250 dollars. Or l'Allemagne achète le gaz russe livré par gazoduc à 433 dollars, tandis que le gaz naturel liquéfié se négocie autour de 300 dollars sur le marché spot européen, après l'effondrement des prix du gaz aux États-Unis. Les négociations entre les deux pays doivent reprendre le 15 janvier, et nul ne menace pour l'instant de fermer le robinet sur le chemin de l'Europe. Mais la tension monte, alors que Moscou presse Kiev de lui céder la moitié de son réseau de gazoducs. Inefficacités énergétiquesLe déficit budgétaire ukrainien se creuse au-dessus de 205 dollars les mille mètres cubes, car le pays importe plus de 50 milliards de mètres cubes et affiche l'une des pires inefficacités énergétiques du monde. Des sources dans l'industrie gazière affirment que **Gazprom** est prêt à abaisser son prix jusqu'à 210 dollars pour l'Ukraine, à condition que cette dernière lui cède ses très stratégiques gazoducs. Ce schéma a déjà mis en place avec la Biélorussie. Mardi, le PDG de **Gazprom** Alexeï Miller a pour la première fois admis que South Stream, un projet de gazoduc contournant l'Ukraine, pourrait être retardé voire carrément abandonné si Kiev renonçait à son morceau de souveraineté. Pour faire céder ses anciennes provinces de l'époque soviétique, Moscou se hâte de construire une infrastructure de gazoducs les contournant. **Gazprom** a déjà convaincu ses partenaires européens E.ON, Wintershall et Gasunie de construire Nord Stream, un gazoduc reliant directement depuis novembre la Russie avec l'Allemagne via la Baltique. South Stream, devra parallèlement permettre à **Gazprom** et ses partenaires EDF, Wintershall et ENI d'alimenter l'Europe à partir de 2015 via la mer Noire, moyennant un coût de 30 milliards de dollars. Ces deux dispositifs doivent permettre à **Gazprom** d'augmenter sa capacité d'exportation vers l'Europe. Emmanuel Grynszpan, à Moscou

DATE-CHARGEMENT: 28 Décembre 2011

LANGUE: FRENCH; FRANÇAIS

TYPE-PUBLICATION: Journal

CODE-REVUE: TRIBNE

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Express

February 24, 2011 Thursday
U.K. 1st Edition

So could the West be about to face life without petrol?; LEADER

BYLINE: Ronald Payne

SECTION: LEADER; 12

LENGTH: 842 words

EARTHLY rulers falter from Arab North Africa to the Persian Gulf as their downtrodden people cry out for freedom and democracy.

The West begins to fret and worry about oil, the lifeblood of its economy.

Once again the ghosts of oil dramas past haunt our governments and somewhere ration books are no doubt being prepared. Such coupons were issued within living memory after the Arab-Israeli six-day war in 1967. That was when the oil barons of Arabia, working through Opec, first deployed what the sheikhs called the "oil weapon" to punish the West for supporting Israel.

At an historic meeting in Vienna, Carlos the Jackal kidnapped 11 Opec oil ministers then commandeered an airliner and took them to Libya where he was warmly received by Gaddafi, his paymaster.

Every conflict in the Middle East since then, and there have been many, has unleashed the same old demons.

It is an irony of history that a new drama of oil is upon us because their own people are now overthrowing the same tyrants who control the oil wells. Gaddafi's last chance saloon is a shootout with the oil weapon.

A S THE cost of a barrel of oil soars way above the $100 mark a new fear grips Europe and America.

An oil crisis exists on the doorstep of the EU. Italy, which relies heavily on the black stuff from Libya, only has enough oil for 90 days. Now that natural gas from Libyan fields is cut off, the government in Rome has warned that it has reserves for just one month In Britain we are more fortunate. Our North Sea oil reserves are still substantial enough to cushion us from the worst of the crisis. And so long as the Arab awakening does not spread to Saudi Arabia the monarchy there will continue to stabilise the world market.

Winston Churchill was the first world statesman to understand the importance of oil.

Early in the 20th century he helped to set up the Anglo Iranian Oil Company, which later became BP. The government bought shares from an eccentric prospector who had struck lucky. The aim was to secure **supplies** of fuel for warships of the Royal Navy.

That was the beginning of our Middle East involvement.

Mohammad Mosaddegh, prime minister of Iran, brought about the great post-Second World War upheaval by nationalising the Iranian oil industry, which had been under British control since 1913. This caused a huge panic both in London and in Washington. How dare these people take over oil fields in their own country?

The Royal Navy sent frigates to the Gulf. The CIA removed Mosaddegh from power by organising a coup in August 1953, at the request of the British MI6 intelligence agency.

Things were so much simpler in those days!

An Iranian General, Fazlollah Zahedi, was chosen to succeed Mosaddegh who was imprisoned for three years, then put under house arrest until his death.

From then on the oil industry was no longer entirely controlled by Western giants that moved in mysterious ways its wonders to perform. The reserves do not belong to us now.

Shell, Texaco, BP and Total find then distil the oil into the petrol to quench the thirst of car and truck drivers in the West. But he who controls the wells is master. The alarming thing is that the biggest reserves of black gold are under the desert sands in a region of perpetual conflict.

Saudi Aramco, the stateowned Saudi Arabian national producer, is still holder of the top spot among the big beasts.

It continues to solidify its supremacy with significant investment in both upstream and downstream oil and gas operations.

But we now have to reckon with new and hostile kids on the block like the Russian gas giant **Gazprom,** which continues to forge ahead toward the top 10. China too is an up and coming oil power.

So much for the pessimists who predict the world is rapidly exhausting its reserves of crude oil. They are unlikely to see a half-hoped-for return to the world of the horse and cart.

There is plenty of the stuf f there but the catch is that most of the untapped reserves are located in highly unstable parts of the world. Therein lies the real threat.

Geopolitically speaking the best thing to do is to follow the British example and to see k out undersea oil. Exploitation there may worry the environmentalists but at least oil rigs are safe from angry men with Kalashnikovs.

L ET us think the unthinkable and imagine Libyan revolution spreading to Algeria, the other North African oil power, then engulfing the Gulf states and finally Saudi Arabia. In such a scenario we really would be in trouble.

Our woes and those of Europe could be compounded if Russia or China decided to be nasty and cut their natural gas **supplies.** Is it possible to imagine what life would be like in a Britain deprived of oil for heating and starved of petrol by a series of devastating events?

We only need think back to the fuel protest of autumn 2000 to remember how greatly we rely on the regular flow o f petrol. The slightest **interruption** can wreak havoc.

We live in dangerous times.

Queues for petrol at the fillin g stations may form quicker than you think; and if queues form, can the ration book be far behind?

LOAD-DATE: February 24, 2011

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

GRAPHIC: END OF THE ROAD: Upheaval in the Middle East may jeopardise fuel **supplies**

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

Europolitics Energy (English)

July 7, 2010

GAS : GAS DISPUTE ENDED BETWEEN RUSSIA AND BELARUS

BYLINE: Dafydd ab Iago

SECTION: No. 0782

LENGTH: 373 words

Gazprom and Beltransgaz signed, on 2 July, an agreement on payments for gas as well as gas transit. Russia agreed to pay almost 30% more for transit whilst Belarus will pay around USD 194 per 1000 cubic meters. Previously, Belarus had argued that Gazprom owed it US$260 million for transit. On the other hand, Russia's Gazprom had reduced gas flows to 60% of normal levels by 23 June. Gazprom claimed debts owed by Belarus of US$192 million. Both parties to the dispute on payment between Belarus and Russia now claim a complete end to the so-called gas war' between the two countries. This followed payment of its outstanding debts to Gazprom by Belarus, on 24 June - thanks to a US$200 million loan by Azerbaijan.

The Belarus president has become increasingly critical of Moscow. "Russia is casting covetous eyes on our public sector, which is not privatised in Belarus. They want to buy it on the cheap," Aexander Lukashenko told Euronews late in June. He talked of an imperialist position intended to keep Belarus in Russia's sphere of influence.

Speaking to both the Russian energy minister and Belarus' deputy prime minister, Energy Commissioner Günther Oettinger earlier stated Europe must not be taken "hostage". Oettinger also told his Belarus and Russian counterparts that the issue was one between Belarus and Russia even if the Commission stood ready to ensure that "factual" information was provided and exchanged between the two sides.

Around one-fifth of Russian gas supplies to Europe pass through Belarus with the rest currently transiting Ukraine. In total, Russian gas supplies to Europe represent some 25% of total EU consumption. Of the three European countries receiving Russian gas via Belarus, Poland and Germany can be supplied via Ukraine. Lithuania can be provisioned through Latvia if there were an interruption for more than one week. "With the current warm weather the pipelines are not overloaded and such rerouting should be easily done," noted Gazprom at the time. Lithuania, however, is currently wholly dependent on Russian gas deliveries via Belarus. Following the closure of the Ignalina nuclear power plant, in December 2009, the country's energy dependency on Russia has also increased markedly.

LOAD-DATE: July 7, 2010

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

JOURNAL-CODE: NRGE

Zur Liste zurückkehren

Europolitics new neighbours (English)

June 28, 2010

ENERGY : BELARUS CUTTING GAS EXPORTS TO EU

BYLINE: Dafydd ab Iago

SECTION: No. 0236

LENGTH: 295 words

Belarus has decided to cut Russian gas exports passing through its territory to the EU. This is a direct response to a second 15% cut, on 22 June, in gas **supplies** from Russia. Receiving 30% lower gas **supplies,** Belarus President Alexander Lukashenko ordered gas transport through to the EU to be cut. Russia's state-owned gas giant **Gazprom** claims gas debts owed by Belarus of the order of US$194 million.

Likewise, Lukashenko is now demanding payment by Russia of transit payments of the order of US$260 million. One-fifth of Russian gas **supplies** to Europe pass through Belarus with the rest transiting Ukraine. In total, Russian gas **supplies** to Europe represent some 25% of total EU consumption.

Moscow notified the EU of gas cuts to Belarus, on 21 June, under the so-called early warning mechanism'. Earlier that day, **Gazprom** cut **supplies** by 15%, with a threat to further reduce flows up to 85%. Coming in the summer months, the cuts, however, represent less of a serious threat even if **supplies** are being used to boost gas storage in Europe. Lithuania, wholly dependent on Russian gas deliveries via Belarus, could also be supplied via Latvia if **interruptions** lasted more than one week.

Gazprom spokesperson Sergei Kupriyanov accused Beltrangaz of systematically violating its contract conditions with **Gazprom**. He noted that Belarus is taking gas destined for the EU market to service Belarus customers. The **Gazprom** spokesperson further argued that Belarus' claims with respect to transit debts owed by **Gazprom** are a separate issue. Kupriyanov noted that there is the possibility of increasing volumes transited via Ukraine to Europe. Earlier on 22 June, Ukrainian Prime Minister Mykola Azarov confirmed that the country is willing to transit additional **supplies.**

LOAD-DATE: June 30, 2010

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

JOURNAL-CODE: ESTE

Zur Liste zurückkehren

Europolitics new neighbours (English)

June 28, 2010

ENERGY : RUSSIA WARNS EU OF BELARUS GAS CUTS

BYLINE: Dafydd ab Iago

SECTION: No. 0236

LENGTH: 490 words

Moscow notified the EU of gas cuts to Belarus, on 21 June, under the so-called early warning mechanism'. Russia's state-owned gas company **Gazprom** is seeking payment of almost US$200 billion from Minsk. Facing budgetary and economic difficulties, Belarus' embattled leader, Alexander Lukashenko, has refused to pay increased prices for gas. At 10:00 on 21 June, Russia cut **supplies** by 15%, with a threat to further reduce flows up to 85%.

A spokesperson for Energy Commissioner Günther Oettinger stated, on 21 June, that the EU executive is "closely" following the situation, with DG TREN officials meeting with Russian Embassy energy experts. "We expect that gas transit flows to the EU from Belarus will not be disrupted by the dispute. We also expect that all the contractual obligations will be respected." The official, however, had no information as to whether gas **supplies** to the EU had also been cut in response by Belarus. "It is not sure whether or not we are being affected."

"We have not started talks with the Russian or Belarus side," added Oettinger's spokesperson. The EU received notification by Russia that there would be a disruption. Notification, however, came at the same time as **supplies** were being cut despite the EU having worked out an early' warning system with Russia.

Oettinger's spokesperson played down the significance of the cuts. "A cut in the gas **supply** to Belarus does not mean that we will be affected," she said. Some 20% of Russian gas is transported via Belarus to the EU through the (unaffected) Jamal pipeline. Only a small fraction of Russian gas delivered to the EU, albeit not via Jamal, comes through the Belarus pipeline system.

During the summer period, **supplies** are also used to boost gas storage in Europe. Despite the small overall significance of the gas cuts to Belarus, three EU countries might be effected. Lithuania, for instance, is wholly dependent on Russian gas deliveries via Belarus. Following the closure of the Ignalina nuclear power plant, in December 2009, the country's energy dependency on Russia has also increased markedly. Other countries that could, to a much lesser degree, be affected are Poland and Germany. The Commission points out that Lithuania could be supplied via Latvia if there were an **interruption** for more than one week.

Officially, the EU is maintaining that the discord is a price' dispute. "The Russians are asking for a higher price than Belarus wants to pay," stated Oettinger's spokesperson. Nonetheless, Lukashenko has fallen out very publicly with Russia's hierarchy. He has also refused to join a customs union with Russia and Kazakhstan unless it pays lower energy prices. Some experts thus consider this new gas dispute as a Russian attempt to weaken Lukashenko in the run-up to elections. In theory, Belarus should hold presidential elections before February 2011. However, observers expect elections to fall much earlier than that date.

LOAD-DATE: June 30, 2010

JOURNAL-CODE: ESTE

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Guardian (London) - Final Edition

June 22, 2010 Tuesday

Russia cuts Belarus's gas supply - and fuels EU fears: Moscow claims unpaid gas bill amounts to £128m Gazprom to fulfil Europe's needs via Ukraine pipeline

BYLINE: David Teather and agencies

SECTION: GUARDIAN FINANCIAL PAGES; Pg. 26

LENGTH: 734 words

Russia cut natural gas **supplies** to neighbouring Belarus yesterday in a dispute over what Moscow claims are escalating debts, raising fresh fears about **supplies** to the rest of Europe.

The dispute comes amid strained relations between the two countries and again demonstrates Russia's willingness to turn off the tap, whether it be for commercial or political means.

Russia said it had reduced **supplies** to Belarus by 15% and warned that flows would be cut by as much as 85% if Minsk failed to agree to repay it $190m (£128m). Belarus, however, claims that Russia owes it $217m in transit fees, for transporting gas through its pipelines to Europe.

Russia **supplies** about a quarter of Europe's gas, and commentators have for some time been warning against an increasing reliance on it for the continent's energy needs. Previous standoffs with both Belarus and Ukraine have resulted in **supply interruptions** that have been felt in Poland and Germany. The most serious, with Ukraine, lasted for almost two weeks in January 2009 during a bitterly cold winter.

The order to begin reducing **supplies** to Belarus came from President Dmitry Medvedev, in order to "protect the interest of the Russian state", Alexei Miller, the chief of the state-controlled monopoly **Gazprom**, said on television.

Miller attempted to assuage concerns that the quarrel would affect other parts of Europe and said the company can channel gas **supplies** normally running through Belarus to the transit pipeline crossing Ukraine. Russian gas transit via Belarus amounts to 10% of Europe's needs, much less than the transit via Ukraine. Miller added that gas consumption during the summer months was relatively low and that pipelines were not filled to capacity.

A European commission spokesman said Brussels was closely following the situation but expected "all the contractual obligations" for gas to be supplied in Europe "to be fulfilled".

The relationship between Russia and Belarus soured after Minsk gave refuge to the ousted Kyrgyz president Kurmanbek Bakiyev, despite Moscow's support for the new leadership. Bakiyev has been accused of stirring up the ethnic unrest in Kyrgyzstan that has killed up to 2,000 people, charges he has denied.

There have also been difficulties in agreeing a customs union between Russia and Belarus that was supposed to come into force in July. "**Gazprom** is a hostage to politics and has to do what it is told to do," Valery Nesterov, a gas analyst at Troika Dialog in Moscow, told Bloomberg News.

Russia is demanding that Belarus pay $187 per 1,000 cubic metres of gas but Belarus is challenging recent price increases and claiming it should be charged just $150. Moscow said Belarus could be $500m in the red by the end of the year at the current rate.

Belarus's President Alexander Lukashenko insisted last week that his country owed Russia nothing, saying it was "unacceptable to treat an allied state like that".

But in his televised address, Miller said Belarus admitted it was in debt to Russia and had proposed to pay "with machinery, equipment and other products", an offer Medvedev said was unacceptable. "**Gazprom** cannot accept debt repayments in anything, be it pies, butter, cheese or any other means of payment," the Russian president said.

At a press conference Belarus's first deputy prime minister, Vladimir Semashko, said the stand-off would be resolved within two weeks and that Minsk might have to borrow to cover the payment. "We will pay, maybe not today, may be during two weeks we will find the possibility. We will borrow, but we will pay."

Belarus relies heavily on Russia for its energy needs and Moscow threatened to cut **supplies** at the start of 2007, only averted by an eleventh-hour agreement more than doubling the fuel price.

There are plans to build new pipelines to Europe with partners including E.ON and EDF that would bypass Ukraine and Belarus.

Alexander Burgansky, of Renaissance Capital, said the dispute could become a wider problem if it dragged on but that was an unlikely outcome.

"We do not anticipate major **supply** disruptions over the summer months," he said, "as a result of reduced European demand and available spare **supply** capacity through Ukraine."

Captions:

With gas costly and in short **supply,** many Belarussians rely on wood-burning stoves Photograph: Alexey Gromov/AFP/Getty

'**Gazprom** cannot accept payments in anything, be it pies, butter, cheese'

President Dmitry Medvedev

LOAD-DATE: June 22, 2010

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Russian Oil and Gas Report (Russia)

May 4, 2009 Monday

RUSSIA AND BULGARIA FAILED TO SOLVE THE GAS PROBLEM

SECTION: CONTRACTS AND CONCESSIONS; No. 44

LENGTH: 524 words

On the one hand, Bulgarian authorities are interested in the soonest legalization of the agreements on South Steam until aggravation of the political situation before the parliamentary elections in the country at the beginning of July. On the other hand, Sofia cannot afford such gesture in relations with **Gazprom** until the next summit dedicated to the competing gas pipeline project Nabucco actively lobbied by the European Commission in Prague on May 8.

The last day of the visit of Bulgarian Prime Minister Sergei Stanishev to Moscow was very tense. **Gazprom** and Bulgarian Energy Holding initialed but did not sign the agreement on cooperation in project research related to South Stream. The Russian party ignored the demand of Sofia to connect the document with making of amendments to the existing contracts on gas transit and **supply** to Bulgaria, for instance, exclusion of the intermediary in the form of Overgas Inc. from the scheme. According to Prime Minister Vladimir Putin, the text of the agreement on South Stream coordinated on April 28 of 2009 will be signed in two weeks. **Gazprom** was more cautious and used the formulation "in the near future" in its official press release.Overall, the three-day visit of Stanishev did not pass as smoothly as it had been planned. Last week, Putin unexpectedly abolished the visit to the gas summit in Sofia, as it turned out later, due to refusal of the Bulgarian government to authorize signing of the document about South Stream and claims of Bulgarian Energy Holding regarding revision of existing contracts on gas **supply** and transit. Sofia demanded inclusion into the agreement base of the obligation of **Gazprom** to compensate for **supply** to the Bulgarian market in case of its **interruption,** to provide discounts for gas and to remove Overgas (parity joint venture of **Gazprom** with private Overgas Holding) from the market.

About 40% of gas come to the market of the country through this entity. Along with this, the intermediary resells the major part of gas to state-run Bulgarian Energy Holding.

Putin commented on the Bulgarian initiatives in a very reserved manner. According to him, **Gazprom** will stringently observe long-term contracts. After the negotiations the Prime Minister announced, "An agreement has been signed until 2030 for the volume of transit, these conditions will be observed and nobody is going to give them up. Everything dealing with big volumes is a subject of separate negotiations." Stanishev had to recognize such a state of affairs, "We should understand that the terms of the transit agreement will be observed in accordance with the text of the agreement singed in 2006 until 2030."

Speaking about intermediaries, Putin pointed out that the Russian party was represented by **Gazprom** in the intermediary company. He said, "This is not a political but a financial, economic and legal issue." Putin emphasized that it was necessary to understand what were the terms of this direct **supply** to prevent appearance of legal problems for **Gazprom** and, respectively, losses related to fulfillment of the current contracts. The Russian Prime Minister summed up, "This issue does not require any political will" and moved the topic to the corporate level. In any case, it is clear to anyone that like in case of the intermediary on the Ukrainian market there is a need for a political decision but in current conditions Sofia obviously cannot count on the agreement of Moscow.

After his meeting with Stanishev, Putin announced that Russia would observe its obligations of gas **supply** to Bulgaria and additional volumes of gas were a matter of negotiations. According to Stanishev, the Bulgarian party would like to transit to direct **supply from Gazprom** without participation of intermediaries to have clear principles of relations in the gas sector.

Source: Vremya Novostey, April 29, 2009

Translated by InterContact

LOAD-DATE: May 4, 2009

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

ORIGINAL-LANGUAGE: RUSSIA; RUSSIAN

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

Les Echos

Les Echos

jeudi **22** janvier 2009

La crise russe, une bonne affaire pour les gaziers européens

AUTEUR: EMMANUEL GRASLAND

RUBRIQUE: ARTICLE; Pg. 19 N°. 20347

LONGUEUR: 523 mots

ENCART: Le conflit entre l'Ukraine et la Russie a permis aux géants européens de s'approvisionner sur les marchés « spot » à des prix inférieurs à ceux prévus dans les contrats avec **Gazprom.**

Le gaz russe est de retour en Europe. Après la Hongrie, la Bulgarie ou la Slovaquie, les grands pays d'Europe de l'Ouest comme la France ou l'Allemagne ont recommencé à recevoir du gaz. Au point d'entrée d'Obergailbach, en Moselle, le débit s'élevait hier matin à 350 gigawattheure, un niveau similaire à celui enregistré avant le début de la crise.

Quel bilan tirer de ces deux semaines d'**interruption** de livraison ? Pour les opérateurs gaziers, la crise n'a pas forcément été une mauvaise affaire sur un plan financier. Le prix du gaz vendu par **Gazprom** est en effet indexé sur les cours du pétrole avec un décalage d'environ six mois. Il était donc haut au moment de la rupture des approvisionnements. Selon les estimations de l'Institut français du pétrole (IFP), le prix des contrats long terme approchait les 40 euros le mégawattheure en Europe au mois de décembre, contre un peu plus de 20 euros en moyenne sur le marché « spot » anglais (NBP). Cet écart important n'a pas disparu durant la crise, alors même que le continent européen connaissait des jours de grand froid. A contrario des événements de 2006, les prix « spot » du gaz ne se sont pas envolés. Ils sont même restés largement en dessous des prix des contrats à long terme.

Ce phénomène résulte de plusieurs facteurs. Tout d'abord, la demande de gaz naturel a été assez faible en fin d'année, du fait du ralentissement de l'activité économique et de la douceur de l'automne. *« Avec 48,5 milliards de mètres cubes, les stocks européens de gaz étaient supérieurs à la moyenne d'environ 10 % à la fin décembre»,* souligne Merril Lynch dans une note. La crise russe s'est ensuite déroulée dans un environnement marqué par une chute du prix des matières premières. L'**interruption** des livraisons de gaz russe n'a eu qu'un effet limité sur cette tendance de fond. Enfin, *« personne n'imaginait que cette situation allait durer aussi longtemps »,* souligne un observateur.

Perte de confiance

Du coup, les marchés « spot » sont restés assez sereins et les E.ON, GDF Suez et autres ENI ont pu combler leurs besoins en gaz à un prix intéressant. Contacté, GDF Suez n'a pas souhaité faire de commentaire sur ce point. *« Pour les grands groupes gaziers, l'impact de la crise a été neutre ou positif,* estime un analyste financier. *Mais ces opérateurs ne souhaitent pas accréditer l'idée que la crise leur a permis de faire des bénéfices. »*

Par contre, le choc a été non négligeable sur un plan psychologique. A l'issue de plus de trente ans de relations avec **Gazprom,** GDF Suez ne s'attendait pas du tout à une rupture totale des livraisons. En 2006, la société avait enregistré une baisse des débits de 10 % à 15 % pendant un jour et demi. *« La crise de 2009 a été une première à la fois par sa durée et par sa violence»,* souligne le groupe français. Elle a déclenché un sentiment de perte de confiance chez tous les opérateurs européens. Reste à voir si cette crise leur permettra de trouver à la fois les fonds et les soutiens politiques pour diversifier leurs approvisionnements. Le projet Nabucco, qui vise à approvisionner l'Europe en gaz de la mer Caspienne, attend toujours sa relance.

TYPE-PUBLICATION: Journal

DATE-CHARGEMENT: 22 janvier 2009

LANGUE: FRENCH; FRANÇAIS

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Guardian (London) - Final Edition

January 21, 2009 Wednesday

International: Russian gas begins to flow into wary Europe

BYLINE: Ian Traynor, Brussels

SECTION: GUARDIAN INTERNATIONAL PAGES; Pg. 26

LENGTH: 537 words

Siberian gas started flowing into the EU yesterday, ending the bitter dispute between Russia and Ukraine that shredded both countries' reputations as fuel suppliers and left Europe desperately seeking to shift its energy policies away from dependence on Russian monopolies.

A new 10-year deal on gas pricing and transit between the Russian and Ukrainian state gas firms, **Gazprom** and Naftogaz, saw Russia pumping the gas through Ukraine's pipelines to Slovakia in the EU while Kiev allowed the fuel to flow without **interruption.**

The resumption of **supplies** appeared to end the worst, so far, of a series of disputes of distinctly political hue between Russia and its former Soviet underling, Ukraine.

After an agreement between the Russian prime minister, Vladimir Putin, and his Ukrainian counterpart, Yuliya Tymoshenko, European leaders congratulated themselves on their mediation efforts but gave warning that the three-week gas dispute served as a rude awakening.

"This has been a team effort and an effective unified voice," said Jose Manuel Barroso, president of the European commission. "It is difficult to welcome something that should not have happened in the first place. It was utterly unacceptable that European gas consumers were held hostage."

In addition to aggrieving European consumers, the dispute has cost **Gazprom** more than $1bn in lost revenue at a time of acute economic distress.

Ukraine, however, has arguably suffered more. The deal struck doubles the price Ukraine pays for its Russian gas. Kiev's reputation has taken a hammering and its aspirations for integration with Europe and the west have been set back.

In the vicious power struggle raging in Ukraine, Tymoshenko has outdone the country's pro-western president, Viktor Yushchenko, whom she wants to replace. The gas dispute has enabled Putin to score points against Yushchenko, too.

Some 20 countries in Europe have been without Russian gas for a fortnight at the height of winter. This has caused traditionally pro-Moscow countries to reconsider allegiances and pushed Europe to revitalise attempts to shore up energy security, lessening its exposure to Russia.

Central to those plans is a pipeline bypassing Russia and transporting Caspian gas to Europe. That project, however, was also set back on Monday when Turkey threatened to paralyse the scheme.

Recep Tayyip Erdogan, the Turkish prime minister, said in Brussels that he would review Ankara's involvement in the Nabucco pipeline if negotiations for EU membership remained on hold.

Turkey is pivotal as it will host a big stretch of the 2,000-mile pipeline from Azerbaijan to Austria.

Erdogan also questioned the concept behind Nabucco, stating that there was not enough gas available to make the project feasible. Construction of Nabucco by a consortium of six national gas companies is supposed to begin next year.

"We have to stop simply talking about energy security in Europe and start doing something," said Barroso.

He pledged to take the issue to an EU summit in March. The Czechs, holders of the EU presidency, want to stage a special summit on the pipeline project in May.

10

The length, in years, of the gas pricing and transit deal agreed between **Gazprom** of Russia and Ukraine's Naftogaz

LOAD-DATE: January 21, 2009

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

The Irish Times

January 21, 2009 Wednesday

Russian gas flow resumes to wary EU

BYLINE: IAN TRAYNOR in Brussels

SECTION: WORLD; Other World Stories; Pg. 11

LENGTH: 494 words

SIBERIAN GAS started flowing into the EU yesterday, ending the bitter dispute between Russia and Ukraine that shredded both countries reputations as fuel suppliers and left the European Union desperately seeking to shift its energy policies away from dependence on Russian monopolies.

A new 10-year deal on gas pricing and transit between the Russian and Ukrainian state gas firms, **Gazprom** and Naftogaz, saw Russia pumping the gas through Ukraine s pipelines to Slovakia in the EU while Kiev allowed the fuel to flow without **interruption.**

The resumption of **supplies** appeared to end the worst, so far, of a series of disputes of distinctly political hue between Russia and its former Soviet underling, Ukraine.

After an agreement between Russian prime minister Vladimir Putin and his Ukrainian counterpart Yuliya Tymoshenko, European leaders congratulated themselves on their mediation efforts but gave warning that the three-week gas dispute served as a rude awakening.

This has been a team effort and an effective unified voice, said José Manuel Barroso, president of the European commission. It is difficult to welcome something that should not have happened in the first place. It was utterly unacceptable that European gas consumers were held hostage.

In addition to aggrieving European consumers, the dispute has cost **Gazprom** more than $1 billion in lost revenue at a time of acute economic distress.

Ukraine, however, has arguably suffered more. The deal struck doubles the price Ukraine pays for its Russian gas. Kiev s reputation has taken a hammering and its aspirations for integration with Europe and the West have been set back.

In the vicious power struggle raging in Ukraine, Ms Tymoshenko has outdone the country s pro-western president, Viktor Yushchenko, whom she wants to replace. The gas dispute has enabled Mr Putin to score points against Ms Yushchenko, too.

Some 20 countries in Europe have been without Russian gas for a fortnight. This has caused traditionally pro-Moscow countries to reconsider allegiances and pushed Europe to revitalise attempts to shore up energy security, lessening its exposure to Russia. Central to those plans is a pipeline bypassing Russia and transporting Caspian gas to Europe. That project, however, was also set back on Monday when Turkey threatened to paralyse the scheme.

Recep Tayyip Erdogan, the Turkish prime minister, said in Brussels that he would review Ankara s involvement in the Nabucco pipeline if negotiations for EU membership remained on hold.

Turkey is pivotal as it will host a big stretch of the 2,000-mile pipeline from Azerbaijan to Austria.

Mr Erdogan questioned the concept behind Nabucco, stating that there was not enough gas available to make the project feasible. Construction of Nabucco by a consortium of six national gas companies is supposed to begin next year.

We have to stop simply talking about energy security in Europe and start doing something, said Mr Barroso. (Guardian service)

LOAD-DATE: January 21, 2009

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Irish Times

January 17, 2009 Saturday

Deal to end gas dispute in sight, says Putin

BYLINE: DEREK SCALLY in Berlin

SECTION: WORLD; Pg. 12

LENGTH: 472 words

RUSSIAN PRIME minister Vladimir Putin pushed the idea of a consortium to underwrite gas exports through Ukraine during talks in Berlin yesterday with German chancellor Angela Merkel and energy company bosses.

Mr Putin said he was hopeful its dispute with Ukraine could be resolved at a summit in Moscow this morning; the European Commission called the meeting the last chance before it reviews relations with Russia and Ukraine.

I don t think we should look for who is to blame, we should look at the situation from the practical, economic and technical viewpoints and think about people who are suffering today, said Mr Putin.

Frustration is growing around Europe for gas to start flowing again as promised by a deal signed on Tuesday. But to build sufficient pipeline pressure to get pumping stations working again, Kiev has called for a **supply** of so-called technical gas .

Russia wants to be paid for this gas and Mr Putin said he was confident a consortium to share risks and **supply** technical gas could be put together reasonably quickly .

An executive from Russian gas giant **Gazprom** told the Berlin meeting that it was prepared to sell the technical gas at market rates of $450 per 1,000 cubic metres. It was calculated that the consortium would have to invest $162 million in January and $270 million each in February and March.

Italian gas company ENI said it would examine the proposal with European counterparts as European leaders piled on the diplomatic pressure.

Ms Merkel spoke to Ukrainian politicians on Thursday ahead of her meeting with Mr Putin, making clear that Berlin views both sides as being in breach of contract.

There is a danger that Russia to a certain extent loses its reliability if we see very long **interruptions** in gas deliveries, said Dr Merkel.

In Brussels, the spokesman for European Commission president Jose Manuel Barroso described today s summit as a test case .

The European Commission believes that meetings in the coming days offer the last and best chance for Russia and Ukraine to demonstrate they are serious about resolving this dispute, said Mr Johannes Laitenberger.

The gas must flow. We will regard this period as a test case for judging whether or not they are credible partners. The European Union imports a quarter of its gas from Russia, 80 per cent of which passes through Ukraine.

Mr Putin said the stand-off underlined the case for the planned pipeline under the Baltic Sea that will connect Germany and Russia directly. Without the Nord Stream pipeline, Mr Putin said, there will be less gas and it will be more expensive .

After talks in Berlin, Mr Putin was given an honorary state award in Dresden. On his last visit to the Saxon state capital 18 months ago, days after the murder of journalist Anna Politkovskaya, Mr Putin was greeted by crowds chanting murderer !

LOAD-DATE: January 20, 2009

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Irish Times

January 16, 2009 Friday

Russian and Ukrainian leaders to meet on gas

BYLINE: DANIEL McLAUGHLIN

SECTION: WORLD; Other World Stories; Pg. 12

LENGTH: 359 words

THE PRIME ministers of Russia and Ukraine have agreed to meet tomorrow to discuss their gas dispute, as top international officials warn Moscow that its reputation as a reliable energy supplier is in grave danger.

Prime Minister Vladimir Putin will host Yulia Tymoshenko in Moscow, amid European Union demands for an end to a crisis that has left hundreds of thousands of Balkan homes without gas heating and forced industry across eastern Europe to scale back production.

Senior EU energy officials are also expected to attend the Moscow meeting, after a cool response across the continent to the Kremlin s suggestion of a weekend summit involving heads of state of European gas-consuming nations and transit countries.

Moscow and Kiev continued to blame each other for the crisis yesterday, with Russian energy giant **Gazprom** accusing Ukraine of closing its export pipelines.

Kiev claimed that Moscow had sent gas with too little pressure down a route that would have led to many domestic customers being cut off. The neighbours also disagree about who should pay for the technical gas that powers pumping stations along the pipelines.

Ukraine is ready to transit Russian gas to European consumers, even without a contract, if the total volume is provided, Ukrainian president Viktor Yushchenko said in a telephone conversation with German chancellor Angela Merkel. Dr Merkel said she would discuss the matter with Mr Putin during his visit to Germany today, and warned of a danger that Russia will also lose part of its credibility because of these **interruptions of supplies** . . . It is absolutely essential for us to see both Russia and Ukraine sit down at the negotiating table and resolve their issues, she added.

European leaders believed they had broken the impasse when Moscow and Kiev agreed last weekend to resume gas transit to the EU once international monitors were in place to ensure its smooth passage to the bloc. **Gazprom** stopped pumping within hours of the resumption, however, and blamed Ukraine for blocking exports. The EU relies on Russia for one-quarter of its gas, and 80 per cent of that fuel arrives in member states via Ukraine.

LOAD-DATE: January 16, 2009

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The International Herald Tribune

January 13, 2009 Tuesday

Old Russian ally is left out in the cold; Russia pledges to restore gas flows, EU says; Bulgarians go without heat after Moscow cuts gas deliveries

BYLINE: Dan Bilefsky - The New York Times Media Group

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 2

LENGTH: 937 words

DATELINE: SOFIA

Maria Pavlova, 70, a retired nurse and widow, has been shivering in her cramped apartment for a good part of the past week, standing over the small electric oven in her kitchen to warm her arthritic bones.

With a monthly pension equivalent to about $74, she cannot afford an electric heater. She despairs at the prospect of facing another cold shower.

"This is a war without weapons in which Russia has used its control of energy **supply** to flex its muscles in front of the world," she said, pointing to an indoor thermometer showing a temperature of 6 degrees Celsius (43 Fahrenheit). "I am cold and angry. We have always been dependent on Russia, and this crisis shows that the situation hasn't changed. Instead of bombs or missiles, they want us to freeze to death."

People across this poor, snow-covered Balkan country accused Russia of instigating a new Cold War in which depriving millions of Europeans of heat and hot water had become the latest political weapon against the West.

Since Russia cut off gas deliveries through Ukraine on Wednesday in a dispute over pricing, millions of Bulgarians have been without heat during a bitter January cold snap. Russia and Ukraine were working on Sunday to resolve the dispute, after signing an agreement with the European Union to establish independent monitors of pipelines. But even if **Gazprom,** the Russian state-owned gas company, turns the valves back on under the terms of a deal announced Monday, experts said it could take three days for **supplies** to reach consumers here.

At a time of increasingly acrimonious relations between Russia and the West, the crisis has underscored how Russia can use its energy might to hold Europe hostage. Moscow has characterized the crisis as a bilateral economic dispute with Ukraine. But the human impact has been felt far beyond Moscow and Kiev.

Here in Bulgaria - a member of the EU and NATO that has spent more than a decade trying to shrug off its Communist past - the vulnerability to Russia, once a steadfast ally, has been acutely felt. Bulgaria, the EU's poorest country, relies almost entirely on Russia for its gas **supplies.** That has left many of the country's nearly 7.3 million inhabitants braving chilly homes, hospitals, factories and schools.

"The situation is reminiscent of the siege of Stalingrad," Vlado Todorov Panayotov, a Bulgarian member of the European Parliament, said at an emergency hearing Thursday in Brussels, referring to the misery endured in World War II when the Nazis tried to take the Russian city now known as Volgograd.

Bulgarians said they felt betrayed by their own government for making them defenseless victims of Russia's pipeline politics, by the EU for its impotence in rescuing them from the cold, and by the Kremlin for forcing Bulgaria to suffer because of a faraway geopolitical spat.

At a Sofia maternity ward where mothers cradled their newborns in front of space heaters, Amelia Mladenova, 24, said it was hard to believe that a disagreement over energy prices was putting the lives of children at risk.

"Moscow has put economic interests ahead of human rights," she said, rocking her 4-day-old son, Miroslav, in her arms.

Since the crisis began, dozens of kindergartens and 68 schools have closed, while some local hospitals were forced to put off planned operations and focus on improving first-aid stocks in case of emergencies. The African monkeys at Sofia's zoo were being fed warm herbal tea to prevent them from falling ill, while commuters traveled in trams and buses in which drivers had been ordered to turn off the heat.

"The only animals happy with the current temperatures are the Siberian tigers," said Ivan Ivanov, director of the zoo.

In Bulgaria, the halt in gas **supplies** also sent shudders through an economy already reeling from the global financial crisis.

The state gas monopoly, Bulgargaz, cut **supplies** completely to 72 big industrial companies and forced dozens of producers of glass, metals and beer to shut down. Economy Minister Petar Dimitrov said 152 companies had reported losses totaling 4.3 million, or $5.8 million, per day because of the **interruptions** in **supply.**

The cut in gas **supplies** also forced many bakeries to raise the price of bread 10 percent, leaving thousands of poor families to make do without their staple food.

Vassil Yanachkov, president of a large metalworkers' union, said the energy-intensive steel industry, which accounts for 10 percent of Bulgaria's gross domestic product, had been pulverized by the gas shutdown. He said that Kremikovtsi, the country's largest steel exporter, had been forced to leave its factories idle and had ordered 3,000 of its 5,300 workers to take unpaid vacations. It has also defaulted on dozens of contracts with foreign customers.

"We were already suffering from the drop in steel prices when the gas was shut down, and this has created a catastrophe," Yanachkov said.

Ludmil Lazarov, managing director of OK Supertrans, Sofia's largest taxi company, said it had been obliged to take 500 of its 1,500 cabs off the road after it was forced to switch to more expensive gasoline instead of methane gas.

"Russia says its quarrel is with Ukraine, but they punished all of Europe," Lazarov said. "We can no longer look at Russia as our ally."

Analysts said Moscow might have underestimated the extent to which shutting off the gas could foment an anti-Russian backlash, even among staunch European allies like Bulgaria.

Paradoxically, the western Balkans, which have deep historic ties to Moscow, have been hardest hit by the crisis because few countries in the region have offset their energy dependence.

LOAD-DATE: April 7, 2009

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The International Herald Tribune

January 2, 2009 Friday

Russian natural gas company cuts off Ukraine's supply

BYLINE: Andrew E. Kramer - The New York Times Media Group

SECTION: FINANCE; Pg. 14

LENGTH: 624 words

DATELINE: MOSCOW

Gazprom, the Russian energy monopoly, shut off the entire flow of natural gas intended for domestic consumption in Ukraine on Thursday, after negotiations over prices and transit fees unraveled the day before.

"Gas deliveries in the Ukrainian direction were reduced by 90 million cubic meters per day," Gazprom said in a statement carried by the Interfax news agency.

The amount is approximately the average daily consumption of the country of 46 million people, which is at the peak of the winter heating season.

Ukraine's national energy company confirmed that pressure in the Ukrainian natural gas pipeline system had begun to drop Thursday morning, Reuters reported.

If the interruption continues, customers in Western Europe are likely to experience shortages, since the same pipelines in Ukraine that are used for internal distribution are also used for export. That is a problem that has bedeviled European energy supplies from Russia for years.

About 80 percent of natural gas exports from Russia to Europe go through Ukraine. In the statement Thursday, Gazprom said it was continuing to ship natural gas to Ukraine that was intended for re-export to Europe.

The transit of Russian natural gas across former Soviet states to customers in Western Europe is a pivotal economic and security interest for the Russian government: Taxes on exports of oil and natural gas account for about 60 percent of its budget.

How quickly a shortage of natural gas might begin to affect consumers in Western Europe was unclear. While the European Union as a bloc depends on Russia for about a quarter of its natural gas imports, some countries are more vulnerable.

Bulgaria, for example, gets all of its gas from Gazprom, while Ireland imports no Russian gas. The effect on Western Europe will depend on the scale and duration of the supply cutoff.

The conflict could sharply increase tensions between Ukraine and Russia, the two largest successor states of the former Soviet Union.

In comments broadcast Wednesday evening on Russian state television, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin of Russia said that any interference with Russia's gas exports to Europe would carry "serious consequences for the transit country itself." He did not elaborate.

Underlying the gas dispute are long-running tensions between Russia and Ukraine. In 2004, after the street protests known as the Orange Revolution resulted in a pro-Western government in Ukraine, talks about supply of natural gas and its transit became strained.

In 2006, Russia halted supplies to Ukraine for three days, in an ostensible dispute over pricing and transit fees. A drop in pressure in the integrated European pipeline system led to shortages as far away as Italy, as Ukraine withdrew gas from its export shipments to meet internal demand. This year, the Ukrainian authorities say they have sufficient reserves of gas to meet internal demand for three months.

Ukraine said it paid $1.5 billion Tuesday to RosUkrEnergo, the Swiss-based gas trader that **Gazprom** uses to **supply** Ukraine.

President Viktor Yushchenko issued a statement saying that Ukraine had settled for all deliveries in 2008. **Gazprom** maintains that Ukraine must also pay $600 million in late fees.

By Wednesday evening, the sides had not settled on the price for 2009 deliveries or the tariff that Ukraine would charge for shipping Russian natural gas to customers in Western Europe.

Putin said that **Gazprom** was asking Ukraine to pay $250 per 1,000 cubic meters in 2009, up from $179 for the same volume in 2008. He characterized the 2009 fee as a subsidized rate.

Bohdan Sokolovsky, Yushchenko's energy adviser, said Wednesday that Ukraine would not accept that price unless Russia offset the increase by paying Ukraine more to export gas to Europe.

LOAD-DATE: January 2, 2009

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Business

February 16, 2008

Focus on Russia-Ukraine gas dispute misses bigger picture

BYLINE: Christopher Granville

LENGTH: 899 words

To A detached observer of the torrid disputes between Russia and Ukraine about natural gas, this week s latest flare-up may seem like another round in a long-running game of chicken with both sides playing with strong hands for high stakes. Ukraine depends on Russian gas imports to power its main industries and keep its people warm, while Russia is dependent on the pipeline crossing Ukraine for over two-thirds of its gas exports to Europe a market that generates all of **Gazprom** s profits and which, accordingly, is vital for Russia s economy as a whole.

As in previous rounds of this dispute, there is no way of knowing how far the two sides will go. At the time of writing, the latest encounter has reached the point of Russia threatening a new **interruption** of gas **supplies,** coinciding with a visit of President Viktor Yushchenko of Ukraine to Moscow. By the time you read this, events will have taken further but most likely inconclusive turns.

One thing only can be predicted with confidence: gallons of ink will have been used to assess the rights and wrongs of the situation, with a heavy bias against Russia. Rarely can so much commentary have fallen so wide of the mark. The problem with the consensus in the European chattering classes is not so much that most of the standard criticism of Russia is unfounded, but that it misses the important points about the European gas market and global energy security.

The present dispute is simply about non-payment by Ukraine for gas delivered in contracted volumes and at a contracted price during 2007. Russia began pressing for these arrears to be cleared immediately after the September 2007 Ukrainian parliamentary election was over and done with. A letter dated 31 January 2008 addressed to senior **Gazprom** managers and signed by the deputy head of Naftohaz (Ukraine s state-owned gas utility) acknowledges arrears of $1.04bn (£530.4m, e713m) and speaks of an imminent bridge loan from Deutsche Bank to clear the debt.

So there is not much sign here of Russia s supposed iniquitous use of energy **supplies** as a tool of political blackmail to resubjugate feisty pro-Western Ukraine. To be sure, the timing of Russia s 2005 announcement on ending gas subsidies to Ukraine was linked to the so-called Orange Revolution, which set a political seal on the divorce between Russia and Ukraine that had been in legal force since 1991. But that decision to introduce commercial gas pricing for Ukraine would have been taken sooner or later in any case.

Russia has a sound argument in principle that far from politicising energy markets as its critics in the US and EU claim, charging the market price for gas is the best way to depoliticise the energy trade.

The problem with this position in practice is that there is no such thing as a single market price. In fact, the European gas market must be one of the world s least transparent energy markets. The gas price is determined by a formula linked to the price of crude oil and fuel (heating) oil. The rationale here is that the gas price should vary along with the cost to consumers of substituting gas for alternative fuels. Applying that formula in the real world gives **Gazprom** varying powers of leverage depending on its customers 'ability to substitute one fuel for another.

As a result, the price formulae for long-term contracts differ quite materially even between close neighbours such as Germany, Austria and Hungary. In the former Soviet Union, **Gazprom** now charges up to half the price for gas at the German border (fluctuating in the range of $350-$400/thousand cubic metres (mcm)), with variations apparently reflecting the extent to which different countries are prepared to give **Gazprom** a stake in their domestic gas pipelines and in the lucrative mark-ups enjoyed by their domestic gas distribution businesses.

The import gas price for Ukraine is at the upper end of this range (with a 2008 price of $179/mcm agreed by the country s previous government). This reflects Ukraine s understandable reluctance to give more than a toehold in domestic distribution and on no account give up any equity in the main pipeline to Europe, which is now in poor repair and unreliable due to years of underinvestment in maintenance. That toehold is held by an intermediary, which is in turn a subsidiary in the main intermediary RosUkrEnergo, jointly owned by **Gazprom** and the Ukrainian entrepreneur Dmitro Firtash.

The existence of RosUkrEnergo should be a concern to **Gazprom** s minority shareholders, but not really to Ukraine, for which it sources gas in Turkmenistan for shipment through Russia. But Ukraine s demand to do away with untransparent intermediaries allows it to claim some high ground in the latest dispute over non-payments.

The reality is that Russia uses its pipeline monopoly in relation to Turkmenistan and other Central Asian gas producers in exactly the same way as Ukraine exploits its near-monopoly of gas transit form Russia to Europe and that is, to force price concessions. All players turn out to be in the same game, no better or worse than each other. Utopian EU demands to break up pipeline monopolies are hopeless in Russia, Ukraine and anywhere else.

The real need lies elsewhere: to establish a basis for stable, transparent and consistent long-term gas pricing. Significantly, China is holding out for precisely this before contracting for any gas imports from Russia.

LOAD-DATE: February 18, 2008

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

Le Temps

20 septembre 2007

L'Union européenne veut démanteler les positions dominantes dans l'énergie; GAZ ET ELECTRICITE. La Commission européenne propose un train de mesures pour favoriser la concurrence et les consommateurs.

RUBRIQUE: Economie

LONGUEUR: 574 mots

Objectif «unbundling», littéralement «séparation». Pour la Commission européenne, qui présentait mercredi son troisième paquet de propositions législatives pour le marché de l'énergie, la dissociation de la production et de la distribution d'énergie au sein des Vingt-Sept est la seule façon de faire conjointement baisser les tarifs, sécuriser l'accès au marché, et attirer les investissements dans ce secteur stratégique. «Nous avons beaucoup avancé depuis dix ans, a déclaré le commissaire compétent Andris Piebalgs. L'heure est venue de permettre aux consommateurs européens de choisir leur fournisseur, et d'obtenir la meilleure offre.»

Propositions radicales

Prises à la lettre, les propositions de Bruxelles sont radicales. Plus question, à terme, qu'un groupe industriel possède centrales et réseau de lignes à haute tension. La Commission préconise ainsi que les géants de l'électricité existants «louent leurs moyens de distribution à un opérateur indépendant». Dans le cas d'entreprises publiques, la gestion de celles-ci devra être opérée par deux ministères différents.

Trois autres mesures sont recommandées: la création d'une autorité européenne de régulation, la constitution d'un mécanisme de solidarité entre Etats membres (pour compenser les inégalités de ressources ou les risques d'**interruption** d'approvisionnement) et l'imposition de conditions «sévères» à tout opérateur non communautaire désireux d'entrer sur le marché européen. Seuls les groupes étrangers originaires d'un pays ayant signé un accord bilatéral avec l'UE seraient éligibles.

Attendue, cette offensive énergétique de la Commission est un pavé dans la mare de plusieurs grands Etats, comme la France, l'Italie ou l'Allemagne, tous tentés par un protectionnisme énergétique au service de leurs géants Suez-GDF, E.ON ou ENI. Elle ruine aussi les espoirs du géant gazier russe **Gazprom** d'accéder vite au marché européen. Le président de la Commission, José Manuel Barroso, n'a d'ailleurs pas caché s'attendre «à de longues et âpres négociations» avec le Parlement européen et les Etats membres.

Encadré: Trois questions sur la faisabilité du projet

Par Richard Werly

AnalyseU Les Etats suivront-ils?

Bruxelles va obliger les Vingt-Sept à tomber le masque. Fait révélateur: la commissaire à la Concurrence a annoncé mercredi l'ouverture d'une procédure d'infraction contre EDF pour abus de position dominante. Paris est dans le collimateur, l'Allemagne, l'Italie et l'Espagne aussi. Au nord de l'UE et au Royaume-Uni, la libéralisation est en revanche beaucoup plus avancée. La bataille, vu les enjeux socio-économiques, sera rude.

U La sécurité énergétique est-elle prise en compte?

Les défenseurs de grands groupes disent que non. Ils affirment que seuls des «géants» soutenus par l'Etat pourront négocier en position de force avec la

Russie, l'Asie centrale ou l'Iran. Autre argument: en l'absence d'un régulateur européen capable d'imposer des réserves et de pénaliser les opérateurs privés défaillants, le risque de black-out sera accru. L'impératif de sécurité nationale est aussi évoqué. A ces critiques, la Commission oppose des solutions supranationales, évidemment rejetées. Le poker menteur énergétique bat son plein.

U Quels rapports avec la Russie?

L'Europe a besoin que la Russie honore ses contrats, signe le pacte énergétique avec l'UE, et ouvre son propre marché. **Gazprom** pourrait alors obtenir en échange un accès au marché de l'UE. Poker menteur, là aussi...

DATE-CHARGEMENT: 20 septembre 2007

LANGUE: FRENCH; FRANÇAIS

TYPE-PUBLICATION: Journal

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Russian Oil and Gas Report (Russia)

August 23, 2006 Wednesday

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MINISTRY GUARANTEES SAFETY OF RUSSIAN GAS DELIVERIES

SECTION: INDUSTRY EVENTS; No. 81

LENGTH: 762 words

Purchasers of Russian gas should not be worried about possible **interruptions** in deliveries, Russian Economic Development ministry assures. In spite of the fact that output volumes grow slower than internal consumption, there will be no gas shortages in the next three years, officials say. According to their estimations, in the worst case shortages will make just 1 percent of output. Experts agree with the estimation and add that minor shortages in gas **supplies** would be profitable both for **Gazprom** and independent gas producers.

During the last G8 summit, head of International energy agency, Claude Mandil, handed the Russian government a report in which he strongly criticized Russia's policy in the gas sector. The IEA report noted that **Gazprom**, holder of 60 percent of Russia's gas reserves (while Russia owns 26 percent of world gas reserves), conducts bad investment policies. Instead of investment in developing new gas deposits and updating existing pipelines and gas distribution networks, which currently lose 70 billion cubic meters of gas a year, **Gazprom** buys oil assets and builds a new pipeline. To secure gas **supplies,** the agency recommended slowing down internal consumption growth, development of energy-saving technologies and increasing internal prices up to market level.

Head of the Economic development ministry, German Gref, confirmed the apprehensions. At the last government meeting, where a prognosis of socio-economic development for the next three years was discussed, Gref mentioned low output rates among the factors that "may hinder economic growth". Moreover, in the near future a misbalance between gas output and consumption will be brought to the foreground for the first time, the minister said. However, his conclusions sounded rather benign: despite the menacing trends, the ministry does not expect serious shortages in gas **supplies.** In the worst case, the gas deficit will reach 6 billion cubic meters in 2008, 8 billion cubic meters in 2009, the ministry forecasts.

These are not critical figures, and the misbalance can be covered by putting on stream one deposit, analyst with Aton investment company, Dmitry Lukashov confirms. For example, Itera owns Beregovoye deposit, which has not yet been operated because the company could not agree about access to a pipeline. **Gazprom** spokespersons also said that the company has all the possibilities for meeting its commitments both in Russia and abroad. **Gazprom** works according to market demand, and its extraction volumes depend on market demand. "Output is only limited with effected demand at reasonable prices," a company spokesman said.

Within the last five years commercial consumption (it will be 390 billion cubic meters in 2006) grew around 1.85 percent a year, analyst for Troika Dialog, Valery Nesterov said. In future, according to estimations made by the Economic development ministry, this rate will reach 2.5 percent. It is not dangerous for export deliveries, they will also take priority. Minor deficit on the internal market will do no harm, the expert believes. **Gazprom** will get another argument for increasing internal tariffs, independent producers will be treated more politely in talks about pipeline access and purchasing prices, and consumers will be more interested in energy saving.

However, according to estimations made by the Energy policy institute, the deficit will be much higher: it will reach 30 billion cubic meters by 2010. "And this is a minimal rate," president of the institute, Vladimir Milov stressed. If several factors add, such as decline in Turkmenia's gas production, erecting a pipeline to China, growing rates of internal consumption (at 3 percent), the deficit may grow up to 100 billion cubic meters. Normally, consumers will not feel the gas shortage, Milov believes, but in peak periods **Gazprom** will have to cut off gas for the electric power industry.

According to a report of the Economic development ministry, gas output will only grow 0.9 percent in 2007, the growth will be still less in 2008, 0.6 percent, and in 2009, output will grow 2.1 percent. This is a pessimistic scenario, when gas will mostly be extracted from deposits already under operation, and only small new satellite deposits will be put on stream. Average yearly consumption growth will make 1.5-1.6 percent to 470 billion cubic meters from 449 billion cubic meters in 2006. Export will reduce 3.5 percent in 2007, and will grow during the two following years, 3.1 percent and 4.5 percent accordingly, owing mostly to non-CIS countries.

Source: Vedomosti, 21/08/06

LOAD-DATE: August 23, 2006

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

ORIGINAL-LANGUAGE: RUSSIA; RUSSIAN

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

What the Papers Say Part A (Russia)

August 9, 2006 Wednesday

A REPEAT OF LAST WINTER: YANUKOVICH WON'T SOLVE THE GAS PROBLEM

BYLINE: Sergei Zhiltsov

SECTION: PRESS EXTRACTS; No. 144

LENGTH: 1907 words

HIGHLIGHT: Will installing gas counters help regulate the gas **supply** situation and reassure the Europeans?; Even before the winter season begins, Ukraine and European countries may encounter natural gas shortages. The absence of a gas **supply** agreement with Turkmenistan could prompt the Ukrainian authorities to resume the practice they call "technical withdrawal."

Even before the winter season begins, Ukraine and European countries may encounter natural gas shortages. Ukraine has a gap of at least 11 billion cubic meters in its gas balance, and the absence of a gas **supply** agreement with Turkmenistan could prompt the Ukrainian authorities to resume the practice they call "technical withdrawal."

The current situation is a sequel to the gas saga that reached its peak late last year. In December of 2005, it was agreed that Turkmenistan would **supply** 36 billion cubic meters of gas to Ukraine at $60 per thousand cubic meters. But Turkmengaz stopped deliveries to Naftogaz Ukrainy as of January 1, 2006, despite the signed contract, and those deliveries still haven't resumed.

In effect, Ukraine was rescued by the agreement that **Gazprom** concluded with Turkmenistan: to buy 30 billion cubic meters of gas in 2006 at $65 per thousand cubic meters. At the same time, Russia agreed to **supply** Ukrainian consumers with gas in 2006 at $95 per thousand cubic meters, acting via RosUkrEnergo and the Ukrgaz-Energo joint venture. But this contract will expire in late September. Alexander Ryazanov, deputy chief executive at **Gazprom**, has said that the contract will be completed between September 23 and 27.

The Ukrainian government's steps aimed at concluding a new agreement with Turkmenistan for the fourth quarter of 2006, at the old price, have been unsuccessful. Turkmenistan is only prepared to **supply** additional gas at $100 per thousand cubic meters. Ryazanov notes that Turkmenistan has sufficient reason to suspend gas **supplies** to Naftogaz Ukrainy: Ukraine is still in debt to Turkmenistan for gas supplied in 2003-05. As at the start of June, Ukraine owned Turkmenistan $64.2 million.

The unregulated situation regarding gas **supplies** to Ukraine is making the Europeans nervous, and leading to some sharp statements. Italy has even mentioned the possibility of legal action against both **Gazprom** and Ukraine. **Gazprom** has a strong position regarding force majeure circumstances. Rostislav Ishchenko, vice president of the Corporate Relations Research Center, points out that the European Union has already offered to assist Ukraine with installing gas counters, in order to determine how much gas is entering and exiting the system.

At present, neither Ukraine nor European countries are capable of significantly reducing their dependence on Russian gas. Former German chancellor Gerhard Schroeder recently acknowledged that European countries are destined to cooperate with Russia, noting that Europe has no alternative to Russia as an energy partner - especially since progress on alternative natural gas **supply** is much slower than European countries would like. Nabucco, an American project, involves transporting gas from Caspian states to Central Europe via Turkey, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, and Austria (bypassing Russia), but this project is unlikely to start soon. Neither can Europe consider independent **supplies** from Azerbaijan's Shah-Deniz field to Turkey as an alternative to **supplies** from Russia, because the volumes are far too low.

Turkmenistan's hard-line stance could force the Ukrainian government to seek reconciliation with **Gazprom**. As Rostislav Ishchenko points out, this is due to the fact that the Ukrainian government can't solve the gas price problem on its own. The only way that Ukraine can count on maintaining the current gas price is by reaching agreement with Russia. Thus, it is not in Ukraine's interests to exacerbate relations with Russia. The chief supplier of Russian gas is RosUkrEnergo. The presence of this company enables Ukraine to buy gas at an acceptable price. If RosUkrEnergo is expelled from Ukraine, gas prices would be raised: Ukraine would have to buy gas directly from **Gazprom** at $230 per thousand cubic meters.

The Ukrainian authorities may agree to resume negotiations with Russia on establishing a gas transport consortium. This generally-accepted practice could stabilize prices for natural gas delivered from Russia to Ukraine. This step would help make the gas price issue less pressing, for a while - especially since **Gazprom** still has an interest in Ukraine's gas transport system.

To date, however, Ukraine's unpredictability has impelled Russia to seek ways of bypassing Ukrainian territory. Last January's events, when Russian-Ukrainian gas agreements were negotiated in an atmosphere of unprecedented emotion, prompted Russia to speed up work on the North European Gas Pipeline. In June, Russia managed to open up an opportunity for **Gazprom** to invest in Italy's domestic energy market. **Gazprom** has reached agreement with Hungary on extending the Blue Stream gas pipeline to Eastern Europe. Russia's goal is evident. Economic contacts in the energy sector will be more valuable than any political declarations. Joint gas **supply** projects with Europe will strengthen Russia's positions.

Although Ukraine continues to make a show of optimism regarding its ability to resolve the question of gas **supplies** from Turkmenistan and Russia, there are no real grounds for rejoicing. Kiev cannot receive direct deliveries from Turkmenistan; neither does it have any leverage for putting pressure on Russia. This is why negotiations between Ukraine and Turkmenistan are bound to be difficult. The situation is exacerbated by continual statements from certain Ukrainian politicians about revising prices for Russian gas. **Gazprom** CEO Alexei Miller has said that this could lead to another serious gas crisis; he noted that Ukraine is "the weak link in **supplies** of Russian gas to Europe."

Ukraine still fails to understand that in future, alternative gas **supply** routes will reduce the Ukrainian gas transport system's role in delivering gas to Europe - and consequently reduce Ukraine's gas transit revenues. At present, around 80% of Russia's natural gas is exported via Ukraine. In future, Ukraine's share in Russian gas transit will decline.

At present, the question of who will **supply** natural gas to Ukraine in the fourth quarter of 2006, and on what terms, remains undecided. If Turkmenistan raises its price, this would automatically lead to a change in the price RosUkrEnergo charges Ukraine. If the Ukrainian government is unable to reach agreement with Turkmenistan by the end of September, the likelihood of **interruptions** in gas **supplies** to European countries would rise substantially; and the need to ensure gas **supplies** for Ukrainian industry would prompt the Ukrainian authorities to engage in unsanctioned withdrawal.

Although the situation regarding gas deliveries to Ukraine and Europe is difficult, experts say it should not be over-dramatized. To all appearances, Ukraine will be forced to agree to Turkmenistan's terms: $100 per thousand cubic meters. Political analyst Vyacheslav Kovtun maintains that Ukrainian industry can cope with this price, since its profitability threshold is $170-180 per thousand cubic meters.

* * *

Natural gas supplied via GazEksport in January-May 2005 and January-May (in billions of cubic meters)

Destination: 2005, 2006

Total exports: 74.96, 94.81

Non-CIS countries: 68.89, 70.75

Estonia: 0.10, 0.10

RosUkrEnergo: 1.72, 20.96

Moldova: 0.64

Armenia: 0.75, 0.74

Georgia: 0.68, 0.68

Azerbaijan: 2.18, 1.57

Western Europe: 49.58, 50.76

Austria: 2.76, 2.88

Germany: 17.89, 19.03

Italy: 10.06, 10.58

France: 4.92, 5.02

Switzerland: 0.16, 0.16

Finland: 2.17, 2.28

Turkey: 8.04, 8.00

Greece: 0.94, 0.93

Belgium: 0.16, 0.16

Eastern Europe: 19.31, 19.99

Czech Republic: 3.56, 3.39

Slovakia: 3.46, 3.40

Poland: 3.18, 3.47

Bulgaria: 1.32, 1.43

Hungary: 3.78, 3.66

Romania: 2.07, 2.68

Serbia and Montenegro: 0.93, 0.97

Bosnia: 0.18, 0.19

Croatia: 0.50, 0.48

Slovenia: 0.29, 0.28

Macedonia: 0.04, 0.04

Source: Nezavisimaya Gazeta, No. 165, August 9, 2006, EV

Translated by Elena Leonova

LOAD-DATE: August 9, 2006

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

ORIGINAL-LANGUAGE: RUSSIA; RUSSIAN

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

LE FIGARO

Le Figaro

12 juillet 2006

Énergie : les pays du G 8 en rangs dispersés

AUTEUR: GEORGES QUIOC

RUBRIQUE: L'actualité économique

LONGUEUR: 596 mots

MÊME aux pires moments de la guerre froide l'Europe n'a jamais connu une telle crainte pour ses approvisionnements d'hydrocarbures russes. La question dominera donc l'agenda du G 8 (1) qui réunit ce week-end à Saint-Pétersbourg les chefs d'État des sept pays les plus industrialisés, ainsi que Vladimir Poutine. Les pays du G 8 représentent 42 % de la consommation mondiale d'hydrocarbures et la Russie, premier exportateur de gaz et deuxième de pétrole, est actuellement incontournable pour leur alimentation. La dépendance des trois pays Baltes, de la Slovaquie et de la Finlande vis-à-vis du géant russe **Gazprom** atteint 100 %. Elle est de 87 % pour la Grèce et de 73 % pour l'Autriche.

La peur de manquer de gaz a donc déclenché cet hiver une floraison d'accords bilatéraux. Les deux géants allemand E.ON et BASF ont suscité une controverse en lançant, en coopération avec **Gazprom,** la construction d'un gazoduc sous la Baltique pour alimenter le marché allemand. L'Europe démunie D'autres accords ont suivi. Le groupe public danois Dong Energy a négocié avec **Gazprom** un contrat d'approvisionnement de vingt ans, qui entrera en vigueur en 2011. Dans la foulée, **Gazprom** a signé un accord avec la compagnie hongroise MOL pour la construction d'un gazoduc et d'installations de stockage en Hongrie. Enfin le nouveau premier ministre italien Romano Prodi vient de signer un accord avec Vladimir Poutine, visant à promouvoir les échanges d'actifs entre les deux pays. Le groupe énergétique ENI l'a concrétisé en ouvrant le marché italien à **Gazprom** en échange d'un accès pour ENI aux gisements russes. Faute de pouvoir défendre une politique énergétique commune, la Commission de Bruxelles observe impuissante ces accords bilatéraux. « La question de l'énergie ne concerne pas tel ou tel pays mais tous les pays européens », plaide dans le désert le commissaire européen à l'Énergie, Andris Piebalgs, tandis que le président de la Commission José Manuel Barroso appelle en vain la Russie à ratifier le traité sur la Charte de l'énergie (2) qu'elle a pourtant déjà signée. Moscou fait la sourde oreille, en verrouillant son secteur des hydrocarbures. Le Kremlin veut finaliser une loi qui devrait réserver les licences d'exploitation des gisements « stratégiques » aux seules entreprises à capitaux russes. Tandis que la Douma examine une loi qui doit consacrer le principe du monopole exclusif du transport et des exportations du gaz russe à **Gazprom.** Face à un tel verrouillage l'Union européenne dispose de peu de solutions. La priorité serait de mettre au moins un mécanisme permettant aux pays membres d'organiser leur solidarité en cas d'**interruption** des approvisionnements. Une seconde parade consiste à construire des gazoducs concurrents au réseau de **Gazprom** afin de désenclaver le gaz d'Asie centrale. Tel est l'objectif du projet Nabucco soutenu par l'Union européenne, qui alimentera la Bulgarie, la Roumanie et la Hongrie. Enfin, les pays membres devraient s'équiper massivement de terminaux de déliquéfaction de gaz. L'Europe pourrait alors mettre en concurrence la Russie avec les autres pays producteurs comme l'Iran et le Qatar. Une solution efficace, mais coûteuse. (1) États-Unis, Japon, France, Royaume-Uni, Allemagne, Italie, Canada.

(2) Après la chute du communisme, le Traité sur la charte de l'énergie de 1994 signé par une quarantaine d'États visait à donner des garanties aux étrangers, leur permettant d'investir dans l'ex-URSS et ainsi moderniser les installations pétrolières et gazières des anciens pays frères. La Russie a seulement signé cette charte.

DATE-CHARGEMENT: 11 juillet 2006

LANGUE: FRENCH; FRANÇAIS

TYPE-PUBLICATION: Publication internet

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The International Herald Tribune

June 15, 2006 Thursday

Ukraine faces new talks on gas deal with Russia

BYLINE: Judy Dempsey

SECTION: FINANCE; Pg. 16

LENGTH: 454 words

DATELINE: BERLIN

Ukraine, economically ill-prepared and without a government, faces a new demand from Russia to pay more for natural gas in a move that could bring another confrontation between Moscow and Kiev just six months after Russia stopped supplying gas to Ukraine in a dispute over pricing.

Gazprom, Russia's state-owned energy giant, said Tuesday that a new round of talks on gas prices would start in July but warned that the negotiations could be difficult.

"There is no government in Ukraine; there is no head of the gas sector," a **Gazprom** spokesman said. "Even more worrying, Ukraine is not putting enough gas into their underground storage facilities, which could affect gas **supplies** to Europe."

Ukrainian officials said Tuesday that they were more focused now on trying to form a coalition government, adding that they were waiting to see what kind of offer **Gazprom** would put on the table.

Ukraine has been without a government since March, when parliamentary elections failed to produce an outright winner. Since then, the former leaders of the Orange Revolution of December 2004, President Viktor Yushchenko and his Our Ukraine party, have been at loggerheads with a bloc led by the former prime minister Yulia Timoshenko over who would head the next government.

"Ukraine is completely unprepared for the negotiations with Russia," said Ivan Poltavets, an energy expert at the independent Institute for Economic Research and Policy Consulting in Kiev. The new round of price negotiations was covered in the agreement signed in January by Aleksei Miller, **Gazprom's** chief executive, and Oleksiy Ivchenko, chairman of Naftohaz Ukrayiny, Ukraine's state-owned gas company. The agreement was reached after the Kremlin pressed Ukraine to accept higher prices by curtailing the flow of gas to the country despite bitterly cold weather.

Ukraine made up some of the shortfall by siphoning off gas from the pipelines used to deliver Russian gas to Europe leading some West European countries to dip into their reserves.

Although the **interruption** lasted no more than a few days, it seriously damaged **Gazprom's** image in Europe. Some governments questioned **Gazprom's** reliability as a gas exporter. Russia **supplies** a quarter of Europe's gas requirements.

President Vladimir Putin of Russia was also accused of using the power of his country's energy sector as a political instrument to punish Ukraine for its pro-Western Orange Revolution.

The January accord stipulated that Ukraine would buy Russian gas at $95 per 1,000 cubic meters, or $2.69 per 1,000 cubic feet.

The price was to be renegotiated after six months. **Gazprom** did not say Tuesday what price increase it would seek from Ukraine, although its final goal is to reach market prices.

LOAD-DATE: June 15, 2006

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Ukraine faces new talks on gas deal with Russia The International Herald Tribune June 15, 2006 Thursday

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Observer

The Observer (England)

June 11, 2006

Energy: Alternatives: Four elements in struggle for world power: Will the future of energy be fossil fuels, solar panels, wave power, or nuclear? Observer writers weigh up the merits of the competing technologies: Nuclear

BYLINE: Oliver Morgan, Industrial Editor

SECTION: OBSERVER SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT; Pg. 4

LENGTH: 1193 words

LATER THIS SUMMER, one of the biggest pieces in the complicated jigsaw of future power **supply** will be put in place with the publication of the government's energy review.

The scope of the review, launched at the end of last year, was intentionally wide. It seeks to set the pattern of the UK's energy **supplies** in the coming decades, against the background of trying to reduce carbon emissions by 60 per cent by 2050 and simultaneously ensuring **supplies** are not disrupted, whether through the intermittence of technologies delivering them, the financial stability of the companies providing them or the reliability of nations supplying sources of power.

However, the intention to appear open-minded was scuppered in May, when Tony Blair declared that nuclear power was back on the energy agenda 'with a vengeance' and that it would be a 'dereliction of duty' to rule it out. Whichever way it is dressed up, the nuclear question will be the most controversial: there are so many unanswered questions, from the complexities of planning, to the finance question, to dealing with waste. Blair's predilection is likely only to make it more so.

Government figures show that nuclear currently **supplies** about 19 per cent of the UK's electricity. By 2020, this will have fallen to 7 per cent. At the same time, some coal plants will come offline due to a combination of age, European directives and the impact of environmental policies. Although attempts are being made to clean up coal to keep it part of the mix, nuclear supporters such as the Nuclear Industry Association (NIA) argue that atomic energy is indispensable, delivering carbon-free power without the intermittence associated with renewable sources or the threat of **interruptions** linked with gas.

Their argument was reinforced during the winter, when gas companies hiked prices while Russian giant **Gazprom** cut **supplies** to Ukraine, with knock-on effects throughout western Europe. With some estimates indicating that without substantial policy shifts gas could **supply** up to 80 per cent of UK energy needs by 2020 - with Russia the key provider - the nuclear lobby pressed home the point.

It appears to have done so effectively so far as the Prime Minister is concerned. But there are doubters. His reshuffle has delivered a new Trade and Industry Secretary, Alistair Darling, who is an ally of a more nuclear-sceptic Gordon Brown. However, the energy minister, Malcolm Wicks, who is in charge of the review - a draft of which Blair is said to have seen before making his 'with a vengeance' remarks - remains in place.

Wicks has maintained an 'agnostic' position in public. But he has addressed some issues which show that he believes there are ways of overcoming the obstacles to investment in atomic power.

The NIA is treading a fine line here - on the one hand arguing that Wicks needs to address these obstacles, while on the other saying new stations do not require public money.

The obstacles can be split into three types: upfront risks involving planning and building reactors on time and to budget; finance, involving the costs of providing electricity throughout the life of stations against the background of volatile prices; and back-end risks to do with disposing of nuclear waste.

The NIA indicates that the government must address upfront risk with a clear planning framework. It points to the six-year process for approving Sizewell B, the last station built in the UK, which opened in 1995. It believes there should be early review of designs, examining their 'licensability' and minimising the scope of future inquiries.

On plant construction, the NIA argues that modern reactors, such as French group Areva's EPR - one of which is currently under construction in Finland - and Westinghouse's AP1000, can be built for a fraction of former budgets.

Construction costs are sensitive to a number of assumptions - for example, how many stations are built. The NIA uses these arguments to press for a series of plants. It points to a project in South Korea, where the cost of a fifth reactor in a series of newbuilds was only 69 per cent of the first. But licensing 'off the shelf' designs to fit local regulations is complicated; economic consultancy Oxera calculates that it can cause 20 per cent cost increases, as well as delays that affect the delivery of forward contracts.

History makes the point. Sizewell B was estimated at about £ 2bn. It cost nearly £ 4bn. It was completed late after the largest ever UK public inquiry. Problems were caused by adapting the design from US to UK standards - a process that the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate confirms would be followed with every new station.

Electricite de France, potentially a builder of new nuclear stations in the UK, says simply: 'In the absence of risk mitigation [associated with licensing, planning etc] by government, nuclear will not be built in the current market.'

There are reasons for scepticism about the financing of plants over their lives, too. Even without budget increases and delays, high construction costs and the inability to turn stations off when they are uneconomic - as can be done with fossil fuels - means that nuclear must run and sell at whatever price it can get in the market, which is liberalised in the UK. If revenue falls below operating costs, disaster can follow - as happened to British Energy, which had to be bailed out by the government in 2002.

Prices have increasingly been determined by the gas price, which is currently high, encouraging the view that nuclear is economic. This will not be enough for investors looking at the 40-year lifespan of a plant.

And then there is the issue of nuclear waste. The UK currently has a decommissioning liability of £ 70bn, which includes burying radioactive fuel and cleaning up facilities. Last year, the responsibility for dealing with the issue was transferred to the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority, a government agency that will appoint contractors to carry out the tasks.

However, the experience of funding these costs corporately is not good. The companies - state or private - that operated facilities were supposed to put aside funds. The amounts they saved were determined by the view of how much the fund would grow (the discount rate), and were therefore quite arbitrary. But they were not enough in the case of publicly owned BNFL or private British Energy.

Until April, policy on what to do with the spent fuel was undecided. Then the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management recommended burying it deep underground. The announcement was seen as vital in paving the way for the government to come down in favour of new stations. However, the committee's chairman, Professor Gordon MacKerron, said his recommendations, which are being considered by ministers until July, should not be taken as a green light for newbuilds.

In any case, as BNFL and BE show, decommissioning has a nasty habit of costing more than planned. Investors, already wary of construction-phase cost and time overruns and the volatility of energy prices, will want some kind of cap placed on their liabilities. They will not move until ministers have something to tell them.

LOAD-DATE: June 19, 2006

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The International Herald Tribune

January 24, 2006 Tuesday

Questions about Russia (folo); Georgia's gas flow partly restored

BYLINE: C.J. Chivers

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 1

LENGTH: 435 words

DATELINE: MOSCOW

C.J. Chivers of The New York Times reported earlier from Moscow:

*

The break in gas **supplies** to Georgia raised fresh questions about the reliability of Russia as an energy partner, and exposed anew the tensions between the Russia and Georgia.

Russian officials initially said the explosions appeared to be accidental, but later announced that a criminal investigation had been opened and that the blasts were acts of sabotage, perhaps by insurgents using makeshift bombs.

Saakashvili rejected the description, saying the incident seemed designed to put political and economic pressure on Georgia.

"We don't think it is accidental in any way," Saakashvili said by telephone from Tbilisi. "The places where it happened, the environment in which it happened, the history in which it happened this all looks like a policy decision."

No group immediately took responsibility, and Saakashvili noted that none of the guerrilla or terrorist bands in the region, which often act in coordination with Islamic separatists in nearby Chechnya, had threatened Georgia.

Rather, Saakashvili said, the **interruption** came as Russia has been pressing Georgia to sell its gas pipeline network to Moscow and officials on several levels of the Russian government have been issuing veiled threats.

A spokesman for President Vladimir Putin of Russia dismissed Saakashvili's characterization, suggesting that the notion that either the Kremlin or **Gazprom**, the Russian gas monopoly, would destroy sections of its own pipelines was absurd.

"If he is postulating that **Gazprom** or Moscow was standing behind these explosions, I don't think that there is any need for comment on this," said the spokesman, Dmitri Peskov.

Four explosions on the Russian side of the border created the disruption, Georgian and Russian officials said. The first two occurred roughly simultaneously before sunrise, severing both the main and reserve gas pipelines into Georgia. Later, two more explosions damaged a power transmission cable.

Aleko Khetaguri, the Georgian deputy energy minister, said that as a result of the explosions Georgia had lost all gas flow and roughly a quarter of its electricity, including that generated by domestic turbines powered by Russian gas.

Gas provides heat and cooking fuel in many urban Georgian households, he said, but in the countryside many homes are warmed with wood or kerosene.

Khetaguri said he expected that repairs to the main line would take three days and to the reserve line, one month. Repairs to the electric transmission line, which provides roughly 5 percent of Georgian electricity, would take about a week, he said.

LOAD-DATE: February 2, 2006

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Questions about Russia (folo); Georgia's gas flow partly restored The International Herald Tribune January 24, 2006 Tuesday

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The International Herald Tribune

January 23, 2006 Monday

Pipeline blasts cut Georgia gas supply; Tbilisi's leader blames the Russians

BYLINE: C.J. Chivers

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 1

LENGTH: 814 words

DATELINE: MOSCOW

Explosions in southern Russia early Sunday severed the country's natural gas pipelines to Georgia, swiftly plunging Russia's neighbor into heat and electricity shortages and causing a sharp diplomatic flare-up between the two nations.

Two more explosions hours later severed one of Russia's main electricity cables to Georgia, increasing the electricity shortage even as the gas supply in Georgia dwindled.

By late afternoon President Mikheil Saakashvili of Georgia said that gas flow had ceased and electricity would be shut off temporarily in different districts on the grid, rotating the shortages to consumers until the crisis was resolved. He ordered universities closed and said that Georgia was seeking fuel from Iran and Azerbaijan. Emergency propane and oil were being provided to hospitals, he said.

Aleko Khetaguri, Georgia's deputy energy minister, said in a telephone interview that as of Sunday night Georgia was still "supplying electricity to the entire country, but with interruptions."

The shortage was expected to last at least two or three days, while Russian technicians rushed to repair the severed main and reserve lines. Georgia has been experiencing a cold snap, with temperatures hovering just above freezing during the day and dropping below at night.

The break in supply which also led to shortages in Armenia, which receives gas from Russia after it passes through the Georgian pipeline network raised fresh questions about Russia's reliability as an energy partner, and exposed anew the tensions between the Russia and Georgia, a nation formerly under Soviet rule that has spurned Moscow in recent years.

Russian officials initially said the explosions appeared to be accidental, but later announced that a criminal investigation had been opened and that the blasts were acts of sabotage, perhaps by insurgents using makeshift bombs.

Saakashvili rejected the description, saying the incident seemed designed to put political and economic pressure on Georgia, which since 2003 has been pursuing a strongly pro-Western course.

"We don't think it is accidental in any way," Saakashvili said in a telephone interview from Tbilisi, the capital. "The places where it happened, the environment in which it happened, the history in which it happened this all looks like a policy decision."

No group immediately took responsibility for sabotage, and Saakashvili noted that none of the guerrilla or terrorist bands in the region, which often act in coordination with Islamic separatists in nearby Chechnya, had threatened Georgia.

Rather, Saakashvili said, the interruption came as Russia has been pressing Georgia to sell its gas pipeline network to Moscow and officials on several levels of the Russian government have been issuing veiled threats.

He compared the gas shortage to the recent pricing dispute between Russia and Ukraine, which led to Russia's briefly cutting flow for Ukraine, and widespread Western criticism of Russia's handling of the affair. "This is not civilized behavior," he said.

A spokesman for President Vladimir Putin of Russia dismissed Saakashvili's characterization, suggesting that the notion either the Kremlin or **Gazprom**, Russia's gas monopoly, would destroy sections of its own pipelines was absurd.

"If he is postulating that **Gazprom** or Moscow was standing behind these explosions, I don't think that there is any need for comment on this," said the spokesman, Dmitri Peskov.

Four explosions on Russia's side of the border created the disruption, Georgian and Russian officials said. The first two occurred roughly simultaneously before sunrise, severing both the main and reserve gas pipelines into Georgia. Later, two more explosions damaged a power transmission cable.

Khetaguri, the deputy energy minister, said that as a result of the explosions Georgia had lost all gas flow and roughly a quarter of its electricity, including that generated by domestic turbines powered by Russian gas.

Gas provides heat and cooking fuel in many of Georgia's urban households, he said, but in the countryside many homes are warmed with wood or kerosene.

Khetaguri said he expected that repairs to the main line would take three days and to the reserve line, one month. Repairs to the electric transmission line, which provides roughly 5 percent of Georgia's electricity, would take about a week, he said.

Georgia now depends entirely on gas **supplies** from Russia, but it is planning on importing gas from Azerbaijan and Central Asia late this year, when construction is completed on a new network from the Caspian Sea. It also has shifted its electricity **supply** to get more energy from Turkey and Armenia.

Officials in Armenia said that the situation was not as dire, as the country had fuel reserves. Still, the officials called for conservation and said some non-essential customers would have their electricity cut, according to news service reports.

LOAD-DATE: January 23, 2006

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper

Zur Liste zurückkehren

The Russian Oil and Gas Report (Russia)

January 20, 2006 Friday

GAZPROM REDUCES GAS SUPPLIES TO EUROPE DUE TO UNPRECEDENTED FROSTS

SECTION: INDUSTRY EVENTS; No. 3

LENGTH: 508 words

The Financial Times writes, "On January 18, Russian gas **supplies** to many European countries fell for the second time in a month - but because of an Arctic cold spell in Russia rather than another pricing dispute. Countries including Hungary, Italy, Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia said they were either seeing falls in Russian **supplies** or had been told to expect them as bitter weather moving west from Siberia brought the coldest temperatures to European Russia and eastern Ukraine since 1979."

The newspaper continues, "With the cold spell set to last another week or more, and western Europe also experiencing below-average temperatures, gas **supplies** will remain under pressure."

"The cuts in Russian gas to Europe reflected record domestic demand, and several European states said mid-winter **supply** falls were not unusual. But coming just two weeks after Russia cut gas to Ukraine in a quarrel over prices, reducing deliveries to Western Europe, the latest events may intensify Europe's debate over reliance on Russian gas."

"One former executive at Naftogaz, Ukraine's state oil and gas company, suggested shortfalls in European countries were an indirect result of this month's Russian-Ukrainian dispute. Huge underground storage reservoirs in Ukraine that can hold three months' worth of gas **supplies** to Europe were apparently depleted, he said."

According to The Financial Times, "The cold weather has also reduced Russian oil exports by 100,000-200,000 barrels a day - compounding worries over **supply interruptions** that have driven oil prices to three-month highs of about $66 a barrel. Traders fear Iran, a leading oil exporter, could use oil as a weapon in the dispute over its nuclear ambitions. **Supplies** have also fallen because of political violence in Nigeria and bad weather in Norway."

"**Gazprom**, Russia's giant gas monopoly, insisted it was meeting all its contractual commitments to domestic and European consumers. "Gas **supplies** to Russian customers have increased to 40% above plan, and European customers are receiving volumes 7% above contractual obligations," it said, adding that its production, storage and distribution activities were at maximum output."

The newspaper also writes, "**Gazprom** refused to confirm whether it had reduced **supplies** to Europe. But people familiar with the situation said that some customers were receiving less than they wanted."

"Ukraine said it had agreed with Russia to take extra gas from the transit pipeline across its territory to Europe during the cold spell. The shortfall was being compensated for from gas reservoirs owned by **Gazprom** in some European countries."

"Hungary said its Russian gas **supplies** fell 20% on January 18, though Janos Koka, Economy Minister, said the decline was not unusual. He has begun international talks aimed at reducing Hungary's long-term dependency on Russian gas and spoke by telephone to Samuel Bodman, US Energy Secretary."

"Italy said it had received 5.4% less Russian gas than it had ordered in the 24 hours to January 18 morning."

Source: inopressa.ru, January 19, 2006

LOAD-DATE: January 20, 2006

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

ORIGINAL-LANGUAGE: RUSSIA; RUSSIAN

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Newspaper