The KAS Energy Security Fellowship Programme

The Konrad-Adenauer-Foundation funds a 12 months research stay for a European Union (EU) resident research Fellow at the European Centre for Energy and Resource Security (EUCERS) at King’s College London. The Fellowship includes a stipend of €25,200 (€2,100 per month) for the fellow, a conference subsistence of €1,257 and will pay for University fees.

The topic of this year’s Fellowship is “The Arab Spring and its impact on supply and production in global markets.”

Application deadline is on 15 June 2012. After reviewing applications, several candidates will be invited for interviews. The location may vary depending on availability of members of the selection committee and are either held in Berlin or London. The decision of the committee will be communicated to the successful applicant in writing by 1 July 2012. The scholarship starts on 1 September 2012. The Fellow will be expected to draft a confidential report, available to KAS and EUCERS. Furthermore, the Fellow will be required to write a 35-50 page research paper (in German or English), for which KAS and EUCERS get the (publishing) rights. A publication can be in print or online. The opportunity to present the results of the research in conferences by KAS or EUCERS may develop within this framework. Cooperation beyond this between the scholar, KAS and EUCERS are subject to mutual agreement and encouraged.

To apply please send your application to carola.gegenbauer@kcl.ac.uk and cc’d to kas-uk@kas.de including:

a) A cover letter
b) A description of the research project together with a time schedule
c) A motivation letter explaining why a research stay in London is suitable for the candidate’s research project as well as key areas of the planned research
d) A curriculum vitae with detailed explanations regarding personal and academic background, dated and signed
e) A short personal data sheet
f) A copy of transcript of record (a certified copy will have to be brought to the interview)
g) At least one reference from a Professor
h) Proof of very good knowledge of English (TOEFL, IELTS)

For further information please contact Carola Gegenbauer on +44 (0)20 7848 1912 or carola.gegenbauer@kcl.ac.uk.
The Beginning and End of the Oil Curse?

By Michael L. Ross

Why does oil wealth so often become a curse for developing states? In the developing world, oil-producing states are fifty percent more likely to be ruled by autocrats, and more than twice as likely to have civil wars, as non-oil states. They are also more secretive, more financially volatile, and provide women with fewer economic and political opportunities. For the last 30 years, good geology has led to bad politics.

Not all states with oil are susceptible to the curse: countries like Norway, Canada, and Great Britain, that have high incomes, diversified economies, and strong democratic institutions, have extracted lots of oil and had few ill effects. Petroleum wealth is overwhelmingly a problem for low and middle-income countries, not rich ones.

Even in the developing world, geology is not destiny. Nigeria and Mexico have made transitions to democracy; Mexico and Angola have drawn large numbers of women into the economy and government; Ecuador and Kazakhstan have avoided civil wars; and Oman and Malaysia have had fast, steady, and equitable economic growth. The better we understand why oil can be a curse, the more and offer appropriate remedies.

Where does it come from?

Most of the political and economic problems of the oil states can be traced to the unusual properties of petroleum revenues, which have four distinctive qualities: their scale, their source, their stability, and their secrecy.

Their scale can be massive. After Azerbaijan began to ramp up oil and gas production in the early 2000s, government expenditures rose by 600 percent over just eight years. After Equatorial Guinea began to exploit its oil in 2001, government spending rose by 800 percent over the next eight years. The sheer volume of these revenues makes it easier for undemocratic governments to silence dissent. It is also an important reason why so many oil-producing countries have violent insurrections: people who live in a country’s oil-rich regions often want a larger share of the immense revenues collected by the central government.

The size of these revenues alone cannot account for the oil curse: many peaceful, democratic European countries have bigger governments than many conflict-ridden, autocratic oil producers. The source of these revenues also matters: oil-funded governments are not financed by taxes on their citizens, but by the sale of state-owned assets – that is, their country’s petroleum wealth. This helps explain why so many oil-producing countries are undemocratic: when governments are funded through taxes, they become more constrained by their citizens; when funded by oil, they become less susceptible to public
pressure. Other problems can be traced to the stability — or rather, the instability — of oil revenues, which is hard for governments to manage, and helps explain why they frequently squander their resource wealth. Revenue instability also aggravates regional conflicts, making it harder for governments and rebels to settle their differences.

Finally, the secrecy of petroleum revenues compounds these problems. Governments often collude with international oil companies to conceal their transactions, and use their own national oil companies to hide both revenues and expenditures. When Saddam Hussein was Iraq’s President, more than half of his government’s expenditures were channeled through the Iraqi National Oil Company, whose budget was secret. Other countries have similar practices. Secrecy is a key reason why oil revenues are so commonly lost to corruption; why oil-fueled dictators can remain in power, by concealing evidence of their greed and incompetence; and why insurgents are often reluctant to lay down their arms, because they distrust offers by the government to share their country’s oil revenues more equitably.

Petroleum has other troublesome qualities: for example, the extraction process typically creates few direct benefits, but many social and environmental problems, for the surrounding communities. But the most important political fact about oil — and the reason it leads to so much trouble in so many developing countries — is that the revenues it bestows on governments are unusually large, do not come from taxes, fluctuate unpredictably, and can be easily hidden.

The Beginning of the Curse

Oil revenues have not always had these properties, and oil wealth has not always been a curse. Until the 1970s, the oil-producing countries looked much like the rest of the world. But in the 1970s, a wave of nationalizations swept the developing world. In some ways, nationalization was a giant step forward for oil-producing countries: they gained greater control over their national assets; they began to capture a much larger share of the industry’s profits; and in the 1970s they were able to raise world prices to record levels, causing an unprecedented transfer of wealth from oil-importing states to oil-exporting ones.

The revolution in energy markets gave the oil-rich governments greater influence than they could have imagined. But for their citizens, the results were often disastrous.

The revolution in energy markets gave the oil-rich governments greater influence than they could have imagined. But for their citizens, the results were often disastrous: the powers once held by foreign corporations passed into the hands of their governments, making it easier for rulers to silence dissent and hold off democratic pressures; ethnic minorities in oil-producing regions took up arms to fight for a larger share of the government’s revenues; and in many states, the tidal wave of revenues produced new jobs for men but not women. While citizens enjoyed booming economic growth in the 1970s, most of these gains disappeared after prices collapsed in the 1980s.
The Petroleum Frontier

According to the US Energy Information Administration, in the next 25 years global demand for oil and other liquid fuels will rise by an estimated 28 percent, and the demand for natural gas will rise by about 44 percent. To meet this rising demand, companies are increasingly drilling in low-income countries.

Historically, oil has been found in countries that are already well-off. Since the price of oil began to rise around 1999, this has begun to change: the petroleum frontier has moved to ever-poorer countries. Thanks to booming oil prices, international companies have found that the risks of working in poor, remote, and often badly-governed countries are increasing outweighed by the benefits of finding new reserves. Since 2004, Belize, Brazil, Chad, East Timor, Mauritania and Mozambique have all become oil and gas exporters. In the next few years, perhaps 15 new countries – all of them relatively poor, and most of them in Africa – are likely to join the list.

This means that a flood of new revenues is just beginning to hit some of the world’s poorest countries. If there were no resource curse, this would be spectacularly good news – a historically-unique opportunity to escape from poverty. Yet the low-income countries that most desperately need money are also the most likely to be struck by the resource curse. Unless something is done, these windfalls will hurt, not help, people who live on the petroleum frontier.

Fortunately, much can be done to alleviate the oil curse – first and foremost, by changing the troublesome qualities of their oil revenues. There is no ‘one size fits all solution’ that can be applied to all countries; but in my book, The Oil Curse (Princeton University Press 2012) I describe an array of strategies to alter the size, source, stability, and secrecy of oil revenues. Countries can better manage the size and source of their revenues by, for example, extracting their mineral wealth more slowly, giving citizens a regular cash ‘dividend’ from their oil revenues (like Alaska), using barter contracts, or partially privatizing their national oil companies (like Brazil). To improve the stability of their revenues, they can use traditional stabilization funds, or – better still – oil-denominated loans.

There is one remedy that can help everywhere: greater transparency in how governments collect, manage, and spend their oil revenues. Improved transparency could force governments to become more accountable to their citizens, reduce the danger of violent conflict, and shrink the economic losses caused by corruption. Transparency reforms in the oil-importing countries – whose voracious demand for fossil fuels is at the root of the resource curse – could also have a powerful effect.

Reforms are most urgent for countries on the cusp of petroleum booms. Every few months, new oil and gas deposits are discovered somewhere in Africa, Latin America, the Middle East or Asia. If the oil curse had a beginning, perhaps it can also have an end – so that the citizens of oil-rich developing countries can truly benefit from their riches beneath their soil.

Michael L. Ross is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), and Director of the Center for Southeast Asian Studies.


Ross currently serves on the advisory boards of the Revenue Watch Institute, the Natural Resource Charter, and Clean Trade.
The Deepening Crisis of Europe’s Climate Policy

By Benny Peiser

Unilateral climate policies face a deepening crisis

Climate policy is no longer a big item on the EU’s agenda and the climate mania is gradually coming to an end after almost 20 years. Poland is vigorously blocking any new CO2 emission targets at EU level. There is growing support among Eastern European governments to block any new unilateral climate targets permanently.

In the past, Poland’s intractable hostility to green unilateralism was greeted by universal protestation in capitals around Europe. Today, it is hardly noticed by the media while green campaigners have become elderly and limp. Other and more pressing concerns are taking precedence and are completely overriding the green agenda.

As a result of the deadlock in Brussels, climate and green energy policies are facing a severe and deepening crisis. There is a growing risk that the EU’s unilateral strategy is hampering the economic recovery and, consequently, the future of European competitiveness.

Across Europe, the green agenda is becoming increasingly unpopular. Voters and energy intensive industries are ever more hostile to climate policies because they are inflating energy bills and heating costs. In light of global disagreement over the future of climate policy, hardly any European government is clamouring for green leadership. Even Germany and France no longer want to go it alone. Many European governments simply refuse to go beyond the 20 per cent emissions target. It is becoming ever more evident that currently favoured solutions to climate change are not in themselves economically viable. What is more, the whole green agenda is confronted by rising doubt and criticism.

The Emissions Trading Scheme and other unilateral schemes have become a growing threat to Europe’s competitiveness and economic recovery. It puts European businesses and, in particular, energy-intensive users at a disadvantage with regards to cost and international competitiveness. It does not make any sense to make industry and manufacturing, in particular, increasingly uncompetitive — or to drive it out of the continent. Nor does it make sense to weaken Europe’s crisis-ridden economies by driving up energy costs and increasing fuel poverty.

The international deadlock and the public backlash against green taxes show that conventional climate and green energy policies have no future.

It might be possible to make a case for decarbonisation if it were undertaken on a worldwide basis. But recent UN climate summits show that there is no prospect of this. After the failure of the last UN summits, there is now an indefinite moratorium on international climate legislation. After Durban, the chances for a binding successor of the Kyoto Protocol are close to zero – despite the agreement to continue negotiating.

The international deadlock and the public backlash against green taxes show that conventional climate and green energy policies have no future. No wonder then that even the European Commission is seriously considering whether to discontinue its unilateral decarbonization strategy in the absence of a global agreement. In the draft of its Energy Roadmap 2050, the commission warns that “if co-ordinated action on climate among the main global players fails to strengthen in the next few years, the question arises how far the EU should continue with an energy-system transition oriented to decarbonization.”
The threat of a global trade war

Europe is also facing the threat of a global trade war over its unilateral climate policies. A group of nearly 30 nations are considering possible retaliation against the European Union's new emissions trading law - which obliges international airlines, regardless of nationality, to pay for CO2 emissions when using European airports. Airlines have until April 2013 to submit carbon allowances to cover their 2012 emissions, before facing possible fines or bans under the new EU law.

The emissions trading scheme is the main vehicle of the EU's climate policy. Its unilateral cap on emissions remains a huge and growing burden on European economies and industries because all other major trading nations have rejected similar measures. European consumers are facing up to the reality that their political leaders have already squandered more than €200bn on a completely inane and ineffective project. A recent report by Swiss bank UBS revealed that the ETS has cost European consumers a staggering €210 billion - for "almost zero impact" on cutting emissions.

For more than 15 years, the EU has failed to reach a global agreement on greenhouse gas emissions. Now, the EU's unilateralism is turning into a risky game of protectionism. When the union added aviation to the ETS on January 1, it forced all global airlines that use European airports to join up. Carriers that refuse to participate will be subject to fines of €100 per ton of carbon dioxide that exceeds the ETS limits, and they could be banned from operating in Europe altogether.

A growing number of airlines and governments outside the EU are, of course, opposed to this kind of protectionism and regard the new rules as illegal - not least, because carriers are also charged for emissions that happen outside of Europe. City analysts estimate that the cost for airlines of joining the ETS will be around £1bn this year and £10.4bn in total between now and the end of 2020. By then, it will cost airlines some £3bn annually. The new green taxes will inevitably increase the cost for airlines and much of this will be passed on to passengers. Opposing countries - including India, China and the United States - are known as the 'coalition of the unwilling' and have agreed to retaliate with the stated aim of getting the EU’s measures either cancelled or postponed.

Unless the EU reconsiders and allows for an international agreement, these threats are likely to escalate into the first full-blown green trade war.

The US House of Representatives has passed a bill, which prohibits American airlines from participating in the ETS. It is estimated that the ETS would cost US airlines $3.1bn from 2012 to 2020. China too has banned airlines from taking part in the scheme, saying it violates international rules. India has asked carriers not to give emissions data to the EU. The Indian government has warned that the EST for aviation is "a deal-breaker" for any global climate change agreement. Meanwhile, Russia is considering restricting European flights over Siberia.

The world's most powerful nations are not bluffing. Unless the EU reconsiders and allows for an international agreement, these threats are likely to escalate into the first full-blown green trade war. The EU leadership would be well advised to pull back from the brink.

Germany: Nuclear phase out and the return to fossil fuels

As a result of Germany’s green energy transition, nuclear power is on its way out, but coal, Germany's dirtiest resource, has become the most important energy source again. Brown coal (lignite) in particular
is experiencing a renaissance in Germany. Last year, about a quarter of the electricity generated used this most environmentally adverse resource. Its consumption grew by 3.3 per cent. This has made ignite the number one energy supplier.

According to a recent study by the German Economic Research Institute, the Emissions Trading Scheme has had the unintended consequence of encouraging investments in fossil fuel electricity generation.

“Despite political activities to foster a low-carbon energy transition, Germany currently sees a considerable number of new coal power plants being added to its power mix. There are several possible drivers for this “dash for coal”, but it is widely accepted that windfall profits gained through free allocation of ETS certificates play an important role....”

As a result of its nuclear phase-out, Germany is set for the conversion of its energy mix towards gas and coal. Presently, more than 30 new gas-fired power stations (plus 11 coal power plants) are being built in Germany to fill to looming gap caused by its nuclear phase-out.

At the same time, governments across the EU are cutting back on green energy subsidies or reneging on guaranteed feed-in tariffs for renewables. Government guarantees are no longer safe – this will make green investments ever more dicey. Tens of thousands of solar investors face bankruptcy while 5000 solar companies have gone bust in Germany alone.

The Shale Gas Revolution

The financial crisis is forcing European governments to cut subsidies and incentives for green energy programmes that are not sustainable, let alone during a prolonged period of austerity. Companies too are reducing their green energy investments as natural gas is becoming ever more attractive, increasingly shifting investment away from renewables.

Shale gas promises the start of a new era of cheap, abundant and relatively clean energy. In a growing number of European countries, energy companies have begun to drill rigs to explore potential shale deposits and its commercial extraction. Advocates of renewable, coal and nuclear power sources are increasingly concerned about this new competitor.

A potential shale gas revolution promises to shake up the EU’s green energy and climate policies. Recent studies estimate that there are huge deposits of shale gas in Europe too. Poland, France and the Ukraine alone may have supplies sufficient to last for 200 or 300 years. Energy crisis? What energy crisis?

No wonder then that many European countries see shale as a golden opportunity to generate cheap energy as well as reduce their reliance on imports from Russia and the Middle East.

In sharp contrast to extremely costly green energy policies, the shale revolution has progressed without any taxpayer-funded subsidies, government targets or tariffs. It is driven exclusively by new technologies that make shale exploration profitable.
A new report commissioned by the UK government has given the green light to the extraction of shale gas. The impact of the government’s endorsement is likely to have significant effects for Britain’s and Europe’s energy policy.

According to estimates of the International Energy Agency, globally there is enough natural gas for the next 120 years at current rates of consumption. Supplies of unconventional gas could provide us with this cheap and relatively clean energy for another 250 years or more.

The EU would gain significantly from a shale gas revolution: cheaper energy would make EU manufacturing more competitive, gas and electricity bills would fall and the rising trend in fuel poverty could be reversed.

Because of the potential scale of EU shale drilling, significant levels of employment would be created or supported across a broad range of job sectors. Energy-intensive industries and manufacturers now considering relocating their operations abroad due to increasing energy costs will also be more likely to stay.

Europe’s conventional climate and energy strategy now faces a huge challenge. Ultimately, it will be a matter of whether over-borrowed European governments, businesses and people will be able to resist such a hefty source of new revenue and a clean energy source requiring no subsidy.

**Conclusion**

Given the manifest reluctance of the world’s big emitters to accept any legally binding carbon targets and in face of our deepening economic crisis, Europe should undertake a comprehensive review of its economically damaging climate and renewables targets and — in the absence of an international agreement — should consider the suspension of all unilateral policies that threaten Europe’s economic recovery.

Dr Benny Peiser is the director of the Global Warming Policy Foundation, an all-party and non-party think tank and educational charity chaired by Lord Lawson. Benny is the founder and editor (since 1997) of CCNet, the world's leading climate policy network.
EUCERS ACTIVITIES

The European Centre for Energy and Resource Security (EUCERS) cordially invites you to the fourth of a series of six roundtable discussions on European energy security topics co-hosted by the European Commission Representation in the UK and Konrad Adenauer Foundation in London and in cooperation with the Centre for European Studies

EUCers Energy Talks:

Green Energy—Green Business in Europe

23 May 2012, 13.00 – 15.00
Council Room, Second Floor, King’s College London, Strand Campus, London WC2R 2LS

Welcome Address
Professor Dr Friedbert Pflüger, Director EUCERS, King’s College London
Claudia Crawford, Director London Office, Konrad Adenauer Foundation, London
Francesca Manchi, Political Officer, EU Commission Representation in the UK

Keynotes
A European perspective by Christian Kremer, Deputy Secretary General of the European People’s Party (EPP) and author of the EPP’s position on combating climate change

A British Perspective by Humphrey Douglas, Partner, SNR Denton

Launch of the EUCERS/CES Study on Green Energy—Green Business in Europe
written by Arash Duero, Research Associate, EUCERS and Sandu-Daniel Kopp, Researcher, Berlin Centre for Caspian Region Studies

Discussion

The workshop is followed by a reception

To attend please register with EUCERS on 020 7848 1912 or email carola.gegenbauer@kcl.ac.uk

We thank our partner
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## EUCERS ON THE ROAD

Our team represents EUCERS at various conferences and events all over the world. This section gives a regular update and overview of conferences and contributions by EUCERS Director Professor Dr Friedbert Pflüger, Associate Director Dr Frank Umbach and Research Director Dr Petra Dolata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>April 23rd, 2012</td>
<td>Friedbert gave a keynote at the launch of the CEE Energy Report 2012 ‘The Energy sector in Central Europe-challenges, opportunities and pitfalls’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>April 18th, 2012</td>
<td>Friedbert spoke on ‘Current renewable energy trends and investment opportunities in Germany’ at the British Chamber of Commerce in Germany - UK Region conference ‘Renewable Energy Opportunities – an UK and German Perspective’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul, South Korea</td>
<td>April 4th, 2012</td>
<td>Frank presented ‘The Modernization of the PLAN and its Regional Security Implications’ at the International Seminar: ‘Maritime Security – Challenges and Opportunities in 2012’; Co-Organized by: SLOC Study Group – Korea; Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung e.V. (KAS), Korea; Center for Maritime Studies, East West Center, Yonsei University; Yonsei-SERI EU Center, Yonsei University, Hotel The Shilla, Seoul.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EUCERS ANNOUNCEMENTS

**EUCERS partners with European Energy Review (EER)**

We are delighted to announce our new media partnership with the European Energy Review (EER). The EER is Europe's leading independent online energy journal. It features original reports, interviews, analyses, viewpoints and debates from across Europe. Registration to our newsletter, which is free and without obligations, gives you full and free access to the website. We are looking forward to a long and successful cooperation!

---

**Reminder: King’s College London Summer School: Global Energy Politics (2 – 20 July 2012) – REGISTRATIONS CLOSING AT THE END OF MAY!**

EUCERS has once more joined forces with the King’s College Summer School to offer a special course on international energy issues. The course Global Energy Politics will be taught alongside the more than 60 other courses at King’s central Strand Campus from 2 July – 10 August.

The course will be led by Sebastian Herbstreuth who has been teaching Summer School courses on International Relations Theory and Energy
Politics at King’s for several years. Sebastian is a doctoral researcher at the Department of Politics and International Studies at the University of Cambridge.

Global Energy Politics has been specifically designed to look at the big picture in energy by exploring the various links between issues such as energy geopolitics, energy security for importing and exporting countries, the political economy of energy interdependence, the curse of natural resources, and the politics of climate change. This unique course is offered at first year undergraduate level and is fully assessed. Students are awarded an academic transcript upon completion, which many use for transfer of credit back at their home university.

For further course details, application forms and deadlines, as well as general information on the King’s College Summer School 2012 please see: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/summerschool.

New Research Associate at EUCERS

We would like to welcome our new research associate Irina Kustova at EUCERS. Irina is a PhD candidate at the University of Trento, Italy and focuses in her research on EU-Russia energy relations, with a case study on the EU-Russia competition for energy resources in the Caspian region.

EUCERS on Twitter

Follow our monitoring of energy topics on Twitter: @EUCERS and our website for more information: www.eucers.eu

EUCERS on Facebook


Follow us to find updates, news, pictures of our events and more!
CONTACT EUCERS

If you have found our Newsletter interesting, wish to hear more about our activities, or, indeed, contribute with ideas or essays, please contact our EUCERS editor, Lorena Gutiérrez, at lorena.gutierrez_garcia@kcl.ac.uk

EUCERS ADVISORY BOARD

Since the beginning of the year we have developed our advisory board, chaired by Professor Mervyn Frost, the Head of the Department of War Studies, King’s College London. We would like to proudly present and thank the members of the board.

- **Professor Mervyn Frost**, Chairman of the Board, Head Department of War Studies, King's College London
- **Marco Arcelli**, Executive Vice President, Upstream Gas, Enel, Rome
- **Professor Dr Hüseyin Bağci**, Department Chair of International Relations, Middle East Technical University İnönü Bulvarı, Ankara
- **Andrew Bartlett**, Global Head Oil & Gas, Standard Chartered, London
- **Volker Beckers**, CEO RWE npower
- **Professor Dr Frank Behrendt**, Director of the Institute for Energytechnology at the Technische Universität Berlin
- **Professor Dr Albert Bressand**, Director of the Center for Energy, Marine Transportation and Public Policy (CEMTPP), School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University
- **Professor Dr Iulian Chifu**, Advisor to the Romanian President for Strategic Affairs, Security and Foreign Policy and President of the Center for Conflict Prevention and Early Warning, Bucharest
- **Dr John Chipman**, Director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), London
- **Professor Dr Dieter Helm**, University of Oxford
- **Professor Dr Karl Kaiser**, Director of the Program on Transatlantic Relations of the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School, Cambridge, USA
- **Frederick Kempe**, President and CEO, Atlantic Council, Washington, D.C., USA
- **Ilya Kochevkin**, Executive Director of Gazprom Export Ltd
- **Janusz Luks**, CEO Central Europe Energy Partners (CEEP), Brussels/Warsaw
- **Thierry de Montbrial**, Founder and President of the Institut Français des Relations Internationales (IFRI), Paris
- **Chris Mottershead**, Vice Principal, King's College London
- **Hildegard Müller**, Vorsitzende der BDEW-Hauptgeschäftsführung und Mitglied des Präsidiums
- **Dr Pierre Noël**, Director Energy Policy Forum, Judge Business School, University of Cambridge
- **Dr Ligia Noronha**, Director Resources, Regulation and Global Security, TERI, New Delhi
- Deepak Puri, Chairman & Managing Director, Moser Baer India Ltd., Delhi
- Janusz Reiter, Center for International Relations, Warsaw
- Professor Dr Karl Rose, Senior Fellow Scenarios, World Energy Council, Vienna/London
- Professor Dr Burkhard Schwenker, Chairman of the Supervisory Board, Roland Berger Strategy Consultants GmbH, Hamburg

European Centre for Energy and Resource Security (EUCERS)

May 2012
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank our Supporters 2011/2012:

Aclaria Capital  
An RWE company  
CEEP  
Central Europe Energy Partners  
Konrad Adenauer Stiftung  
bp  
Roland Berger Strategy Consultants  
Standard Chartered  
Enel  

And our Media Partners:

EUROPEAN ENERGY REVIEW

ENERGLOBE.DE/DAS ENERGIEPORTAL  
ICIS Heren  
EurActiv.de

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this Newsletter are strictly those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Centre for Energy and Resource Security (EUCERS), its affiliates or King’s College London.