

**THE WORLD BANK GROUP ARCHIVES**

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED**

**Folder Title:** Energy - European Energy Charter - 1v

**Folder ID:** 1262952

**Series:** Operational support and ESMAP project management

**Dates:** 01/01/1991 - 01/01/1991

**Fonds:** Records of the Energy Sector

**ISAD Reference Code:** WB IBRD/IDA ENGY-03

**Digitized:** 04/04/2023

To cite materials from this archival folder, please follow the following format:  
[Descriptive name of item], [Folder Title], Folder ID [Folder ID], ISAD(G) Reference Code [Reference Code], [Each Level Label as applicable], World Bank Group Archives, Washington, D.C., United States.

The records in this folder were created or received by The World Bank in the course of its business.

The records that were created by the staff of The World Bank are subject to the Bank's copyright.

Please refer to <http://www.worldbank.org/terms-of-use-earchives> for full copyright terms of use and disclaimers.



THE WORLD BANK

Washington, D.C.

© International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / International Development Association or

The World Bank

1818 H Street NW

Washington DC 20433

Telephone: 202-473-1000

Internet: [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED**

ENERGY - European Energy Charter



1262952

R1995-003 Other #. 6 Box # 84544B

Energy - European Energy Charter - 1v

**DECLASSIFIED  
WITH RESTRICTIONS**  
WBG Archives





# Record Removal Notice

<b>File Title</b> Energy - European Energy Charter - 1v		<b>Barcode No.</b>  1262952		
<b>Document Date</b> July 2, 1991	<b>Document Type</b> Note w/attachment			
<b>Correspondents / Participants</b> To: Ms. Mashayekhi From: Eveline Herfkens, Executive Director				
<b>Subject / Title</b> Invitation from the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs to attend a Preparatory Committee Meeting on European Energy Regulations				
<b>Exception(s)</b>				
<b>Additional Comments</b> Declassification review of this record may be initiated upon request.		<p>The item(s) identified above has/have been removed in accordance with The World Bank Policy on Access to Information or other disclosure policies of the World Bank Group.</p> <table border="1"><tr><td><b>Withdrawn by</b> Shiri Alon</td><td><b>Date</b> March 28, 2023</td></tr></table>	<b>Withdrawn by</b> Shiri Alon	<b>Date</b> March 28, 2023
<b>Withdrawn by</b> Shiri Alon	<b>Date</b> March 28, 2023			

# Les Echos

27 JUIN 1991

ENERGIE ♦ Baisse de la consommation mondiale

## Le PDG de BP favorable au dialogue entre producteurs et consommateurs

Robert Horton, le président de BP, souhaite le succès de la rencontre entre producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole, qui doit débiter lundi prochain à Paris.

De notre envoyé spécial à Londres.

♦ A l'occasion de la présentation, hier à Londres, de la nouvelle édition — la 35<sup>e</sup> — de l'annuaire statistique BP de l'énergie dans le monde, Robert Horton, le président de la compagnie pétrolière britannique, s'est déclaré favorable au dialogue entre Etats producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole, qui doit s'ouvrir, lundi, à Paris.

Selon lui, « le contenu des discussions entre producteurs et consommateurs devrait concerner les conditions du commerce, l'accès aux marchés et aux approvisionnements, la sécurité des investissements à l'étranger, la protection des transferts commerciaux de technologie et une coopération plus structurée pour répondre aux ruptures d'approvisionnement ». Néan-

moins, pour le président de BP, toute tentative gouvernementale de fixer des prix ou des quantités serait inéluctablement vouée à l'échec.

Selon les statisticiens de BP, la consommation énergétique mondiale a atteint 8.033,3 millions de tonnes équivalent/pétrole l'an dernier. Elle a ainsi augmenté de 0,4 % par rapport à 1989, soit la plus faible progression enregistrée depuis 1982. Si la consommation de gaz s'est accrue de 2 %, la demande de pétrole, sous le double effet du renchérissement du baril dans la seconde partie de l'année et du ralentissement économique, a reculé pour la première fois en cinq ans. Elle s'est établie à 3.101,4 millions de tonnes, une baisse de 0,2 % sur 1989. La chute a été de 2 % aux Etats-Unis et de 7,1 % en URSS. Seule l'Asie a vu sa consommation progresser (+ 5,8 %). La production mondiale s'est cependant légèrement accrue (+ 1,4 %), à 3.148,9 millions de tonnes. L'ajustement avec la demande se faisant par une augmentation des stocks.

Pour Robert Horton, les années qui viennent devraient être marquées par un accroissement de la demande pétrolière mondiale, qui s'adressera en priorité aux pays de l'OPEP. Cette situation devrait avoir pour corollaire un nouveau renchérissement du baril. Cependant, le président de BP estime qu'« une augmentation progressive des prix du brut

*bénéficiera finalement aux consommateurs, pourvu qu'elle conduise à un accroissement des investissements de production. Ceci, en retour, réduirait les risques des futurs chocs des prix et contribuerait à la stabilité économique ».*

Jean-François Polo

• Jeudi 27 juin 1991



# Les Echos

28.6.81

## ◆ Pas de ministre américain ni britannique Le séminaire pétrolier de Paris réunira 23 pays

Le séminaire pétrolier qui s'ouvre lundi à Paris réunira 23 pays producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole, mais les Etats-Unis ne seront pas représentés au niveau ministériel, ni la Grande-Bretagne et le Japon.

◆ Dominique Strauss-Kahn, le ministre de l'Industrie, a indiqué hier que onze pays producteurs et douze pays consommateurs de pétrole seront représentés au séminaire qui doit se dérouler lundi et mardi à Paris à l'initiative de la France et du Venezuela. Les principaux Etats de l'OPEP (Arabie Saoudite, Iran, Emirats arabes unis, Algérie, Nigeria...) ont dé-

légué leurs ministres chargés des affaires pétrolières, tout comme l'URSS. De même, l'Allemagne, l'Italie, la Norvège et l'Espagne seront représentées au niveau ministériel.

En revanche, les Etats-Unis, le Japon, la Grande-Bretagne et les Pays-Bas se contenteront d'envoyer à Paris de hauts-fonctionnaires. Ces pays demeurent en effet réticents face à l'initiative franco-vénézuélienne, dont ils craignent qu'elle ne débouche à terme sur une remise en cause du libre fonctionnement du marché pétrolier, à travers une intervention gouvernementale sur les prix.

Dominique Strauss-Kahn a cependant pris soin de réaffirmer que si le séminaire de Paris peut « permettre de faire quelque chose pour stabiliser le marché », cette concertation n'inclura aucune discussion sur le prix du brut.

Ouverte par les deux ministres des Affaires étrangères des pays invitants, la France et le Venezuela, la réunion de la semaine prochaine sera découpée en quatre demi-journées, consacrées respectivement à l'évolution du marché pétrolier, aux coopérations industrielles, aux marchés à terme et à l'environnement.

J.-F. P.

# FINANCIAL TIMES

11/7/91

## Oil producers to confer with consumers in Paris

REPRESENTATIVES of 26 nations meet in Paris today and tomorrow for the first high-level conference between oil producers and oil consumers since 1975. George Graham reports.

Sixteen years ago, in the wake of the 1973-74 Arab oil embargo, a similar meeting in Paris failed dismally. This time France and Venezuela, the conference's two organisers, have

limited the meeting's scope to avoid it turning into a confrontation over oil prices.

Mr Dominique Strauss-Kahn, France's minister for industry and foreign trade, says: "It is more like a scientific seminar than a trade union bargaining session." Even though the French government denies any desire to interfere with the oil market, it clearly believes the market can be made to func-

tion more smoothly with more guidance from governments.

Mr Strauss-Kahn cites the example of the Group of Seven industrial countries, which help to set a framework for exchange and interest-rate movements without preventing the currency market's free working.

He appears to believe a more open exchange of information could help smooth many

unnecessary fluctuations in the market. But the French minister insists he has no intention of proposing the sort of market intervention that the O7 undertakes in the foreign exchange market.

France's and Venezuela's claims that the Paris conference is not an attempt to fix oil prices have reassured oil producers more than consumers. All the producing countries

Invited to the conference from Saudi Arabia and Iran to Indonesia and the Soviet Union are to be represented at ministerial level.

Mr Giñanjar Kartasasmita, Indonesian minister of mines and energy, says: "The consultation is necessary, not for dictating a certain level of price, but for stabilising prices and preventing fluctuations which can cause loss to both sides."



# Les Echos

1 JUL. 1991

ENERGIE ♦ Réunis pour deux jours à Paris

## Producteurs et consommateurs veulent stabiliser le marché du pétrole

La rencontre qui s'ouvre aujourd'hui à Paris illustre la spectaculaire amélioration des rapports entre producteurs et consommateurs. Mais le séminaire n'abordera que des sujets techniques, sans toucher directement au sujet brûlant des prix.

♦ Le séminaire rassemblant vingt-trois Etats producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole qui s'ouvre ce matin pour deux jours à Paris, succédant à une première rencontre qui s'est déroulée fin mai à Ispahan, en Iran, illustre la spectaculaire évolution des relations depuis un an. Alors que les crises pétrolières de 1973-1974 et 1979-1980 s'étaient traduites par un affrontement ouvert entre l'OPEP et les pays industrialisés, l'invasion du Koweït par l'Irak en août dernier a eu pour effet d'améliorer sensiblement les relations entre les producteurs de l'OPEP, à commencer par l'Arabie Saoudite et les Occidentaux.

En acceptant d'augmenter sa production pendant toute la durée de la crise du Golfe, l'OPEP, sous l'influence de ses membres les plus modérés, a en effet largement contribué à écarter le péril d'un emballement des cours du brut qui aurait gravement menacé les économies industrialisées. Depuis la mi-janvier, les prix du brut ont retrouvé leur niveau d'avant la crise, oscillant entre 18 et 20 dollars le baril.

L'accroissement prévu de la demande pétrolière dans les années à venir, qui s'adressera en priorité aux pays de l'OPEP, est cependant porteur de nouvelles menaces sur la stabilité du marché pétrolier, au cas où les gigan-

tesques investissements nécessaires dans la production et le raffinage ne seraient pas consentis à temps. Il apparaît donc tentant de profiter de la détente actuelle des relations entre producteurs et utilisateurs pour entamer un dialogue sur l'avenir du marché pétrolier.

### Réticences américaines

Pourtant, les obstacles à une véritable coopération entre les deux camps sont loin d'être tous levés. Premiers consommateurs mondiaux de pétrole et deuxièmes producteurs (derrière l'URSS), les Etats-Unis demeurent extrêmement réticents. Même si, paradoxalement, c'est plus à la relation privilégiée établie entre Washington et Ryad qu'à un équilibre spontanément assuré entre l'offre et la demande que l'Occident a dû la sauvegarde de ses approvisionnements durant la crise du Golfe.

Les Américains ont tenu à réaffirmer la semaine dernière, par l'intermédiaire du département d'Etat, leur « conviction selon laquelle la stabilité du marché pétrolier résulte du jeu efficace des forces du marché et non des interventions de gouvernements ou de cartels ». Ils ont décidé, en dépit de l'insistance de la France et du Venezuela, les deux

zuela ont opté pour un objectif modeste, consistant, comme l'a souligné Pierre Bérégovoy, à « essayer de trouver un langage commun » et à « examiner la situation du marché du pétrole afin d'obtenir une meilleure stabilité ». Les participants au séminaire de Paris échangeront ainsi des informations techniques et débattront de l'organisation des marchés et des approvisionnements, des questions d'environnement et des besoins d'investissement du secteur au cours des années qui viennent. Autant de dossiers qui évitent soigneusement le sujet le plus sensible : les prix du pétrole.

Cette autocensure marque toutes les limites de la rencontre de Paris, non

sans laisser planer une ambiguïté au vu des arrière-pensées de chacun. Les pays producteurs n'ont en effet pour la plupart accepté de faire preuve de modération pendant la crise du Golfe que dans l'espoir de préserver la capacité de demande des économies consommatrices, et donc, à terme, d'assurer la meilleure valorisation possible de leurs ressources pétrolières.

Pour leur part, les Etats industriels souhaitent éviter à tout prix le renouvellement des mouvements incontrôlés des cours du brut qui ont causé dans le passé tant de ravages à leur économie.

Jean-François Polo

puissances coinvoitantes, de ne pas envoyer de représentant à niveau ministériel à la rencontre de Paris, se contentant de dépêcher un haut fonctionnaire.

### L'Arlésienne des prix

Londres et Tokyo ont fait le même choix. De même, l'Agence internationale de l'énergie, où l'influence de Washington reste prépondérante, ne sera pas représentée par son directeur général Olga Steeg, mais par Quincey Lumsden, le directeur de la division marché pétrolier.

Dans leur désir de ne pas effaroucher les ultralibéraux, la France et le Vene-



## PRODUCTEURS-CONSOMMATEURS

# Pétrole : réunion anti-Yo-yo à Paris

A l'initiative de la France et du Venezuela, douze pays producteurs et treize consommateurs tentent de se mettre d'accord sur un prix d'équilibre.

**L**e jeu consiste à parler d'une chose dont on ne doit jamais prononcer le nom. Il va durer deux jours à Paris, où vingt-trois pays producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole seront pour discuter du prix du baril sans avoir le droit de le dire. Au nom du libéralisme et de la sacrosainte règle du libre jeu de l'offre et de la demande pour déterminer le prix d'un produit, le marché pétrolier ne saurait en effet souffrir qu'on lui fixe des barrières, voire des objectifs. Au nom de la souveraineté sur la plus stratégique des matières premières, personne ne veut se laisser enfermer dans un rôle subalterne.

Ceci posé en axiome de départ, les principaux acteurs du marché pétrolier vont se retrouver face à face au niveau ministériel pour la première fois depuis 1975, car la guerre du Golfe est passée par-là. Un gros producteur, l'Irak, a envahi un autre producteur, le Koweït, parce qu'il l'accusait de faire volontairement baisser les prix. Les cours ont réagi excessivement à la tension politique, à la hausse comme à la baisse, ne satisfaisant finalement ni les pays producteurs, ni les pays consommateurs.

Après avoir grimpé de 20 à 40 dollars au cours de l'été, provoquant les prévisions les plus sinistres de nouveau choc pétrolier et de récession planétaire, ils ont fait vivre aux opérateurs pétroliers une journée de cauchemar, le 17 janvier, jour du déclenchement de l'opération Tempête du Désert. Au premier indice de victoire des forces alliées contre l'Irak, le baril a perdu 10 dollars sur les marchés à terme de Londres et de New York : en quelques heures, la cargaison d'un supertanker de 300 000 tonnes perdait le tiers de sa valeur, 21 millions de dollars partis en fumée.

Le dialogue qui va s'engager à Paris vise, pour les producteurs, à s'assurer à long terme d'un prix du brut assez élevé pour financer leur développement, sans encourager d'autres productions concurrentes ou des économies d'énergie dans les pays consommateurs. Pour ces derniers, il s'agit d'accepter un prix du brut n'entravant pas la croissance et préservant la stabilité politique internationale. Car ils savent bien que, d'ici à la fin du siècle, le monde industrialisé sera de plus en plus dépendant du pétrole du Moyen-Orient, qui dispose de plus des deux tiers des réserves mondiales.

On va donc discuter, sans parler de prix d'équilibre, de tous les éléments qui concourent à la formation de ce prix. On abordera par exemple le thème du fonctionnement des marchés à terme pétroliers, à partir du rapport commandé au Français Paul Mentré par le ministère des Finances. On parlera aussi de la coopération technologique et industrielle nécessaire pour une vision à long terme du marché : il faut sept ans minimum pour démarrer une production de pétrole, et les compagnies qui réalisent ces lourds investissements ont besoin d'un minimum de stabilité des prix pour les engager. On parlera également consommation de pétrole et environnement.

Deux pays ont pris l'initiative d'un dialogue et organisé la conférence d'aujourd'hui. La France a joué les médiateurs pour les consommateurs : Pierre Bérégovoy avait réclamé des mesures pour éviter les fluctuations excessives du prix du pétrole, l'automne dernier à Washington, et la France a bénéficié du fait qu'elle a longtemps été un des rares pays industrialisés non membres de l'Agence internationale de l'énergie — patronnée par les Américains — pour jouer

les médiateurs. Le Venezuela, membre fondateur de l'Opep mais hors du Golfe, a de son côté rallié les producteurs à la négociation.

On retrouvera donc à Paris douze producteurs : sept des treize membres de l'Opep — le Venezuela, l'Arabie Saoudite, les Emirats arabes unis, l'Iran, l'Indonésie, l'Algérie, et le Nigeria — plus l'URSS, premier producteur mondial, le Mexique, la Norvège, Oman, et l'Égypte.

Les Etats-Unis, troisième producteur mais aussi premier consommateur mondial, se retrouvent avec la Grande-Bretagne dans le clan mené par la France. Avec eux, le Japon, l'Allemagne, l'Italie, les Pays-Bas, le Canada, la Corée, le Brésil, l'Inde, la Tchécoslovaquie et l'Espagne. Plusieurs organisations internationales ont également envoyé leurs représentants à Paris, dont l'Opep, l'AIE, la CEE, le FMI et une organisation regroupant les compagnies pétrolières européennes, Europaia.

Les atermoiements des Etats-Unis, qui n'enverront, malgré les supplices de la France, qu'un fonctionnaire « de rang moyen » comme observateur, ont révélé les limites du dialogue économique. Washington préfère les relations bilatérales et refuse tout interventionnisme sur le marché. Mais les considérations politiques ne seront pas loin, et c'est bien ce que les organisateurs ont tenté d'éviter. Alors qu'un des problèmes à plus court terme du marché pétrolier est la possibilité d'une baisse des prix lorsque l'Irak et le Koweït recommenceront à exporter, ces deux pays ne seront pas présents. Selon une source proche de l'Opep, c'est cette organisation elle-même qui leur a refusé un fauteuil à Paris pour ne pas crispier les dé. ats.

Marie-Angé RODEAUD



# **LA TRIBUNE**

de l'Expansion

1 - JUIL. 1991

## **PETROLE**

**Les consommateurs de pétrole doivent investir chez les producteurs.** - Le ministre du Pétrole de l'Etat des Emirats arabes unis a appelé dimanche les pays industrialisés à investir dans le secteur pétrolier des pays membres de l'Opep pour parer à une éventuelle augmentation de la demande mondiale de pétrole. Selon le ministre qui partait assister à la rencontre pétrolière de Paris promouvant le dialogue entre les deux camps, « *cette conférence revêt une importance particulière* ».

GAAAAA

3LGL  
ECF0392 4 F 0249 EXT /AFP-KN35  
Eco.-Energie-Int. flt1  
Pétrole: producteurs et consommateurs tentent de renouer le dialogue

PARIS, 1er juil (AFP) - Vingt-cinq pays producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole se sont efforcés lundi à Paris de jeter les bases d'un dialogue permanent afin d'encourager une plus grande stabilité du marché pétrolier, dont ils ont unanimement reconnu que les brutales fluctuations étaient néfastes pour leurs économies.

"Les flambées des cours du pétrole n'apportent aux producteurs que des gains à court terme" tandis que "l'effondrement du marché n'apporte qu'un confort illusoire aux consommateurs", a déclaré d'entrée de jeu M. Roland Dumas, ministre des affaires étrangères de la France, qui a organisé ce séminaire conjointement avec le Venezuela.

"La crise du Golfe a été un révélateur: ce dont l'économie mondiale a besoin dans le domaine du pétrole (...) c'est d'une meilleure visibilité de l'évolution future des prix", a souligné M. Pierre Bérégovoy, ministre français de l'Economie.

A l'issue d'une première séance de travail, le ministre vénézuélien des affaires étrangères, M. Armando Duran, a estimé que tous les participants étaient "d'accord sur la nécessité d'établir des mécanismes de coopération".

Les Etats-Unis, premier consommateur mondial et deuxième producteur derrière l'URSS, traditionnellement hostiles à toute intervention sur les marchés par la fixation de niveaux de prix ou de production, se sont toutefois contentés d'envoyer un observateur.

suivra

AFP 011729 JUL 91

GAAAAA F ECO.-ENERGIE-INT.

3LGL  
ECF0393 4 F 0251 /AFP-KN37  
Eco.-Energie-Int. flt2  
Pétrole: producteurs et consommateurs...

PARIS - Les participants se sont attachés à dissiper tout malentendu sur l'objectif de cette réunion, qualifiée côté français de "reprise de contact".

"Notre objectif est non pas de fixer des prix ou des niveaux de production mais d'envoyer un signal de confiance politique, d'échanger des informations et des points de vue dans une discussion ouverte et informelle", a ainsi déclaré le ministre norvégien des affaires étrangères, M. Thorvald Stoltenberg.

De son côté, M. Bérégovoy a écarté toute réglementation stricte des marchés pétroliers pour en "limiter arbitrairement les fluctuations" et toute "politique systématique d'interventions coordonnées".

En revanche, il a souhaité une réflexion sur les "moyens de créer un environnement stable permettant au marché de trouver plus aisément son équilibre dans le moyen terme".

Selon le ministre vénézuélien du pétrole, M. Celestino Armas, un consensus s'est dégagé pour considérer qu'un "meilleur flux d'information sur les vues de chaque pays à propos de l'avenir énergétique donnera une plus grande transparence au marché, réduira les incertitudes qui pèsent sur les prix et contribuera à un meilleur fonctionnement du marché".

Le directeur général du FMI, M. Michel Camdessus, a ainsi estimé que les marchés pétroliers avaient encore "du chemin à parcourir avant d'atteindre la solidité (...) et le caractère universel des marchés financiers internationaux".

suivra

AFP 011730 JUL 91



FRFF

FRAD438 4 F 0196 EXT 7AFP-L927

Petrole-Algerie

L'Algerie se prononce pour une concertation entre producteurs et consommateurs sur les prix

PARIS, 1er juil (AFP) - Le nouveau ministre algérien de l'énergie Nordine Art Laoussine a estimé lundi soir qu'un "pas" avait été franchi avec la tenue du séminaire de Paris entre producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole mais que les "points de controverse", surtout sur les prix du brut devraient être abordés un jour.

"Nous nous sommes retrouvés à la même table ... mais je ne pense pas que les intérêts des consommateurs et producteurs soient toujours compatibles", a-t-il déclaré à quelques journalistes à l'issue de la première journée du séminaire.

"On nous a invité à venir et nous sommes venus mais on nous a dit qu'il ne fallait pas qu'on parle du prix et de la production ...il faudra bien qu'un jour on en parle", a-t-il dit, soulignant que cela ne pourrait se faire pendant cette réunion de deux jours convoquée à l'initiative de la France et du Venezuela.

Il a estimé "qu'il serait bon que consommateurs et producteurs tombent d'accord sur un objectif de prix situé dans une fourchette de 20 à 25 dollars le baril de pétrole.

mj. 109  
AFP 011914 JUL 91

GAAAAAAA F 200.700000

GLGL  
ECF0395 4 F 0268 /AFP-KN40  
Eco.-Energie-Int. flt3-der  
Pétrole: producteurs et consommateurs...

PARIS - M. Stoltenberg a pour sa part suggéré la mise en place d'un "réseau de coopération basé sur des contacts et des réunions entre exportateurs et importateurs de pétrole visant à établir un climat de confiance".

Outre une plus grande transparence du fonctionnement des marchés, d'autres champs s'ouvrent à une possible coopération producteurs/consommateurs, ont indiqué plusieurs participants.

M. Duran, comme M. Berégovoy ont souligné l'importance d'une concertation en matière d'investissements dans la production et le raffinage avec "l'appui effectif des institutions financières internationales".

Selon M. Duran, les quelque 70 milliards de dollars requis pour accroître de 5 millions de barils par jour la capacité de production des pays du Golfe, afin de faire face à la hausse de la demande dans les années 90, dépassent de loin les ressources financières des pays producteurs.

De son côté, M. Stoltenberg a relevé que "l'énergie est une source de problèmes graves pour l'environnement" qui ne peuvent être résolus que par une coopération internationale.

Les pays producteurs souhaitent toutefois s'assurer que le commerce pétrolier ne sera pas entravé par "des impôts discriminatoires" à l'égard de cette source d'énergie, a indiqué M. Duran qui a souhaité que cette question fasse l'objet d'une concertation.

Certains participants se montraient confiants dans la poursuite de ce dialogue. Selon des sources vénézuéliennes, une nouvelle réunion serait envisagée pour le mois de décembre à Caracas.

jh/vl  
AFP 011730 JUL 91

LONDRES-CLOTURE



*La*  
**Correspondance économique**  
*Quotidien d'Informations économiques et sociales*

2 - JUIL 1991

COLLOQUE PETROLIER DE PARIS M. PIERRE  
BEREGOVY SE PRONONCE EN FAVEUR D'UNE  
HARMONISATION FISCALE "POUR TENIR COMP-  
TE DES EFFETS SUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT"

Le ministre français de l'Economie et des Finances, M. Pierre BEREGOVY, est intervenu hier devant les participants au colloque ministériel sur les marchés pétroliers, réuni à Paris par la France et le Venezuela (cf. C.E. du 28 juin). Le ministre français s'est déclaré en faveur d'un ren-

forcement des mécanismes du marché pétrolier : "les fluctuations à court terme liées au fonctionnement du marché doivent normalement s'opérer", mais il convient de "réfléchir aux moyens de créer un environnement stable permettant au marché de trouver plus aisément son équilibre dans le moyen terme".

Parmi ces moyens, M. BEREGOVY suggère des incitations aux opérateurs à apporter des améliorations au marché à terme. La politique énergétique peut également contribuer à stabiliser le marché. La Banque mondiale pourrait en particulier intensifier ses activités dans le domaine énergétique et pétrolier, selon le ministre français. La Banque européenne pour la reconstruction et le développement (BERD) aura également "un rôle actif à jouer" en Europe de l'Est, toujours selon M. BEREGOVY.

Autre piste de réflexion avancée par le maire de Nevers : l'harmonisation de la fiscalité pétrolière "pour tenir compte des effets sur l'environnement". Rappelons que le commissaire européen à l'environnement, M. Carlo RIPA DI MEANA, s'est prononcé depuis plusieurs mois en faveur d'une taxation des produits énergétiques les plus polluants.

# LA TRIBUNE

de l'Expansion

02/07/91

PETROLE. Séminaire international à Paris

## Consommateurs et producteurs entre statu quo et vœux pieux

■ « Le dialogue pétrolier est aujourd'hui rentré dans les faits », se réjouissait hier un responsable français de l'énergie, dans les couloirs du centre international de l'avenue Kléber. La tenue d'un séminaire réunissant lundi et mardi à Paris producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole est en soi un succès, souligne-t-il. Vingt-cinq pays y participent, aux côtés de plusieurs organisations internationales. Du jamais vu - du moins de cette ampleur - depuis la réunion internationale sur l'énergie de décembre 1975.

Organisée dans le cadre de la coopération Nord-Sud, elle s'était alors traduite par un échec, producteurs et consommateurs s'étant par trop affrontés durant le premier choc pétrolier pour pouvoir engager un dialogue serein. En juillet 1991, quelques mois après la fin de la guerre du Golfe, l'atmosphère apparaît singulièrement allégée. De tous côtés on ne parle que de dialogue, de rapprochement, et de confiance mutuelle à promouvoir. Oui, mais comment ? « Le terme de dialogue semble vouloir signifier différentes choses selon les interlocuteurs », a fait remarquer Thorvald Stoltenberg, ministre norvégien des Affaires étrangères.

Entre la position américaine, partagée par la Grande-Bretagne ou le Japon, qui considère comme seules valables les discussions bilatérales entre clients et fournisseurs, et celle française, vénézuélienne ou norvégienne en faveur d'actions concrètes pour améliorer l'information et le fonctionnement du marché, il y a un fossé. Quant à l'Algérie, son ministre a été le seul à aborder clairement les questions du prix du brut et du contrôle du marché pétrolier, pour souhaiter qu'elles soient abordées au cours de la réunion : « Il serait faux de penser que le marché puisse à lui seul assurer la

stabilité », a expliqué en substance Nordine Alt-Laoussine. Les interférences sont parties intégrantes des relations économiques internationales, dans l'énergie (subventions au charbon) ou l'automobile (quotas). »

Il y a peu de chances pour que le souhait de l'Algérie se réalise, producteurs et consommateurs devant poursuivre leurs discussions « en évitant les points sensibles ». D'où un premier écueil qui guette la conférence : une succession de déclarations courtoises et consensuelles sur le pétrole et son environnement, sans propositions concrètes et sans lendemain. Il semble cependant que ce tout dernier point soit en voie d'être résolu. A la rencontre de Paris devraient succéder d'autres réunions à Caracas ou ailleurs, les participants souhaitant qu'elles soient prises en charge par d'autres couples producteurs-consommateurs.

Quant à l'émergence de propositions dépassant le cadre des bonnes intentions, on n'en est pas encore là. Quelques idées ont cependant été avancées pour tenter de concrétiser le dialogue. Côté producteurs, le Venezuela a appelé à promouvoir l'intégration en amont dans le pétrole, c'est-à-dire à faciliter les investissements des pays consommateurs dans les capacités de production et de raffinage des pays producteurs. Côté consommateurs, Pierre Bérégo-voy a plaidé en faveur d'un renforcement des mécanismes du marché, pour lui permettre de trouver plus aisément son équilibre dans le moyen-terme : par exemple, accroître le flux des informations (projets d'investissements, niveau des stocks...) échangées par les deux camps ou encore harmoniser la fiscalité pétrolière pour tenir compte des effets sur l'environnement.

ALINE RICHARD



# L'Humanité

2 - JUIL 1991

Ouverture du séminaire parisien sur le pétrole

## BRUT, LE PRIX D'AMÉRIQUE

*Toute discussion franche sur les prix et leur fixation a été écartée  
Les grands pays capitalistes et, en premier lieu, les Etats-Unis entendent bien  
pourtant agir, marché aidant, pour museler toute hausse des cours du brut*

**L**E séminaire entre pays producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole, réuni depuis hier à Paris, a été gratifié, par ses organisateurs (France et Venezuela), d'un ordre du jour volontairement informel.

Roland Dumas l'a martelé en ouverture des débats : cette réunion n'a « pas pour objet d'instaurer un contrôle intergouvernemental des marchés pétroliers », a souligné le ministre français des Affaires étrangères. « Une meilleure prévisibilité des cours est souhaitable, a-t-il reconnu, mais elle ne résultera pas d'une improbable régulation étatique. Elle naîtra de la confiance mutuelle à tous les niveaux de la chaîne pétrolière. » Le même son de cloche devait être ensuite produit par Armando Duran, ministre vénézuélien des Relations extérieures, qui rappelait les inconvénients des fluctuations brutales des cours et proposait « d'explorer les domaines dans lesquels il était possible d'instaurer un dialogue ».

En quoi devrait-il consister ? De l'avis d'Olivier Appert, directeur des hydrocarbures au ministère français de l'Industrie, l'affaire consisterait surtout en un « échange d'informations » concernant, par exemple, l'état des stocks, les capacités réelles de production. Il a reconnu, par ailleurs, que l'ordre du jour, en refusant d'intégrer explicitement la discussion sur les prix, était sans doute « en deçà de ce qu'attendaient les pays producteurs, et au-delà de ce que souhaitaient certains pays consommateurs ».

En effet, alors que, du côté de l'OPEP, on souhaitait que la réunion de Paris « contribue à une meilleure stabilité des prix », les Etats-Unis n'ont par exemple accepté de s'y rendre que retranchés derrière un statut d'« observateur », nuance peu compréhensible

dans la mesure où aucune décision ne doit émaner de la rencontre. Selon « le Monde » daté d'aujourd'hui, si les organisateurs ont écarté tout débat sur les prix, c'est afin « d'amadouer les Américains, arc-boutés sur un credo libéral — les prix sont fixés par le marché — qui camoufle en fait une position de force, les prix du brut étant, dans une très large mesure, fixés aujourd'hui par concertation directe entre le premier exportateur, l'Arabie Saoudite, et leur protecteur, les Etats-Unis ». Une réalité qu'aucun discours occidental ne reflète. Pierre Bérégovoy n'a-t-il pas estimé à la tribune du séminaire que réglementer « fortement les marchés pétroliers pour en limiter arbitrairement les fluctuations » reviendrait à « empêcher celui-ci de jouer son rôle » ? Et il ajoutait : « Le marché est facteur de bonne allocation des ressources. »

Il ne s'agit pas de « sortir, mais d'organiser le marché », a confirmé Dominique Strauss-Kahn devant les journalistes. Le ministre français de l'Industrie s'est félicité à juste titre de la participation à cette réunion : l'ensemble des pays invités (25) sont représentés, la plupart au niveau ministériel, exception faite des « réticents » (Etats-Unis, Japon, Canada, Royaume-Uni...), ainsi que plusieurs des plus importantes organisations internationales (CEE, ONU, FMI, Banque mondiale, OPEP, Agence internationale de l'énergie, Conseil de coopération du Golfe, BERD, Association européenne des compagnies pétrolières). Il a souhaité que le séminaire parisien débouche sur d'autres du même type, sans pour autant soutenir l'idée de la création d'une nouvelle structure à cet effet.

Michel Camdessus, directeur du

Fonds monétaire international, qui introduisait un débat sur le « fonctionnement du marché », l'a implicitement approuvé en considérant le FMI comme « l'endroit où, depuis longtemps, producteurs et consommateurs, sur un pied d'égalité, en toute confiance, apportent et discutent leurs analyses et prévisions de développement et leurs mesures d'adaptation à ces développements ». Semblables lauriers ont été aussi décernés à l'Agence internationale de l'énergie (AIE) pour son action pendant la guerre du Golfe. Le « plan d'urgence » instauré par l'agence en plein conflit a largement contribué à faire dégringoler les cours bien au-dessous du prix de référence de 21 dollars, établi par l'OPEP. L'AIE n'est plus considérée comme « l'arme anti-OPEP », a pourtant affirmé Dominique Strauss-Kahn pour justifier la volonté de la France d'y adhérer.

Le « plan d'urgence » consistait, pour l'essentiel, dans le déblocage des stocks stratégiques des grands pays consommateurs. Ceux-ci confirment au séminaire qu'ils sont très accrochés à cet instrument dit de « stabilité », en réalité une arme efficace pour faire chuter les prix. Au chapitre des « solutions », M. Cardoso, commissaire européen, a par ailleurs suggéré l'instauration d'une taxe sur les produits pétroliers, dont le produit serait destiné au financement de la lutte en faveur de l'environnement. Cette autre mesure agirait sur les prix finaux et donc, en conséquence, sur la compétitivité des hydrocarbures, ont fait valoir les pays producteurs. Le chapitre des solutions favorables au pouvoir d'achat des pays producteurs sera-t-il aussi abordé ? Le « dialogue » aurait sinon un fâcheux air de sens unique.

Sophie Salsac



# Les Echos

2 JUIL. 1991

## ENERGIE

### Producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole ont noué le dialogue

Le gouvernement français considère que l'ouverture, hier à Paris, du séminaire de réflexion entre producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole constitue en elle-même un succès, même si aucune décision concrète ne doit résulter dans l'immédiat de cette rencontre.

◆ Les représentants des vingt-trois pays invités, plus ceux des deux puissances invitantes, la France et le Venezuela, se sont retrouvés hier pour un séminaire de deux jours réunissant à Paris producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole. « La tenue de cette réunion est un très grand succès, dans la mesure où elle rassemble la majorité des personnalités qui comptent dans le monde du pétrole », a affirmé Dominique Strauss-Kahn, le ministre français de l'Industrie. Une initiative de ce type menée il y a deux ans par la Norvège n'avait pas abouti.

Le séminaire de Paris a été ouvert par Roland Dumas, le ministre français des Affaires étrangères, qui a souligné que « l'idée du dialogue entre producteurs et consommateurs n'est pas neuve », mais que les divergences économiques et les différences politiques et idéologiques ont longtemps empêché son ouverture. Evoquant les réticences qui continuent à exister, en particulier celles des Américains qui sont représentés à Paris par un simple observateur, M. Dumas a réaffirmé que le dialogue engagé ne visait pas à instaurer un contrôle intergouvernemental des marchés pétroliers, même si ceux-ci demeurent encore perfectibles, mais à permettre plus de transparence sur la politique énergétique des Etats.

Selon le ministre français, « une meilleure prévisibilité des cours est souhaitable, mais elle ne résultera pas d'une improbable régulation étatique. Elle naîtra de la confiance mutuelle à tous les niveaux de la chaîne pétrolière ».

### Affronter les incertitudes

De son côté, le ministre vénézuélien des Affaires étrangères, Armando Duran, a souligné que la réunion de Paris devrait « explorer les domaines dans lesquels nous pourrions nous mettre d'accord » afin de « créer une atmosphère de confiance fondée sur la coopération et l'échange d'informations pour contribuer à réduire les incertitudes ». Selon Armando Duran, les principaux thèmes d'une coopération entre producteurs et consommateurs sont la sécurité des investissements étrangers, la liberté du commerce, la protection de l'environnement, le financement, la coopération industrielle et le transfert technologique.

Michel Camdessus, le directeur général du FMI, a présenté hier son analyse sur l'évolution à venir des marchés pétroliers. Selon lui, l'OPEP possède de grandes possibilités d'expansion de sa production, qui pourrait atteindre 35 millions de barils/jour d'ici à cinq ans (contre 23 millions actuellement). Cela « peut enrayer toute tendance à la hausse des prix du pétrole à moyen ou à long terme. Mais, bien entendu, ces disponibilités du côté de l'offre n'excluent pas des épisodes d'instabilité à court terme ». L'ouverture du dialogue pétrolier peut cependant permettre d'affronter ces périodes dans de meilleures conditions.

Par ailleurs, Antonio Cardoso e Cunha, le commissaire européen à l'Energie, a évoqué la mise en place de stocks régulateurs au niveau européen et la création d'une taxe écologique sur la combustion des énergies fossiles.

Jean-François Polo



# LE FIGARO

०२/०९/९१

## **ÉNERGIE**

### **Pétrole : vive le marché !**

Un contrôle intergouvernemental des prix ou de la production n'est pas la bonne solution pour stabiliser les cours, estiment les vingt-cinq pays producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole réunis au « séminaire ministériel » de Paris.

(Page III)

## ÉNERGIE

# Pétrole : le marché doit fixer le prix du baril

*Le contrôle intergouvernemental des prix du brut n'est pas une solution, estiment producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole, réunis à Paris.*

Vingt-cinq pays producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole sont réunis depuis hier à Paris pour un échange de vues sur les moyens propres à empêcher de trop fortes fluctuations des prix du brut. Ces pays parviendront-ils à imprimer à leur dialogue une dynamique suffisante pour lever les réticences des États-Unis ? Tel est, avant même toute question technique, l'enjeu premier et essentiel des discussions.

Les Américains, en effet, sont opposés à cette initiative menée conjointement par les Français et les Vénézuéliens. Washington a toujours affirmé qu'en matière de relations entre producteurs et consommateurs de pétrole, il préférerait une approche bilatérale (le dialogue USA-Arabie Saoudite par exemple) à une approche multilatérale.

Les États-Unis n'ont donc envoyé qu'un « observateur » au « séminaire ministériel » de Paris. Et leur désapprobation fait peser une lourde hypothèque sur l'ensemble de l'entreprise. Mais, hier soir, le ministre français de l'Industrie, Dominique Strauss-Kahn, qui préside la réunion, se disait « convaincu que, s'il y a une réédition du séminaire, les États-Unis y participeront au niveau ministériel ».

Le climat, en tout cas, et les objectifs des participants semblent très différents de ceux qui prévalaient en 1975, lors de la conférence Nord-Sud - qui avait déjà suscité la réticence active de Washington. La plupart des pays producteurs espéraient alors qu'une négociation politique permettrait de fixer « le juste prix » du pétrole, c'est-à-dire celui qui assurerait un déve-



Roland Dumas et Pierre Bérégovoy : des pistes de réflexion.  
(Photos Ceccarri/Le Figaro.)

veloppement harmonieux aux producteurs du tiers monde...

Ce n'est plus le cas aujourd'hui. Les participants du séminaire de Paris ont tous admis que c'est le marché qui doit déterminer le prix du pétrole. Voilà une évolution qui devrait être de nature à rassurer Washington.

### Ni conclusion ni communiqué

Même si un certain nombre de participants, et c'est le cas de la France, estiment que, reconnaître la nécessité d'un marché libre ne veut pas dire que les principaux protagonistes renoncent à toute concertation, voire à certaines interventions. C'est bien, en effet, ce que font les membres du G7, en ce qui concerne les monnaies.

Tous les participants, également, reconnaissent que de trop fortes fluctuations des prix sont dommageables, tant

pour les pays consommateurs que pour les pays producteurs. C'est ce qu'a souligné le ministre des Relations extérieures, Roland Dumas, dans son allocution d'ouverture. Le ministre de l'Économie, Pierre Bérégovoy, de son côté, a ébauché des pistes de réflexion pour améliorer le fonctionnement des marchés et rendre plus « lisibles » les intentions des producteurs et des consommateurs. « En rendant l'offre et la demande de pétrole plus flexibles, a-t-il déclaré, nous pouvons réduire l'amplitude des fluctuations des prix. »

Même si le séminaire de Paris ne donne lieu à aucun communiqué final ni à aucune conclusion formelle, il aura au moins un mérite : permettre pour la première fois depuis 1975, et dans les deux sens du mot, une « reprise » du contact entre producteur et consommateurs de pétrole.

Édouard THÉVENON.



# Le Monde

2 - JUL. 1991

Rassemblant des pays producteurs et des pays consommateurs

## Un véritable sommet pétrolier est réuni à Paris

Vingt et un ministres, autant de haut fonctionnaires, représentant onze pays consommateurs et douze pays producteurs de pétrole ainsi que les principales organisations économiques internationales : le séminaire organisé à Paris lundi 1<sup>er</sup> et mardi 2 juillet a toutes les allures d'un véritable sommet pétrolier.

En dépit des précautions de style des deux organisateurs, la France et le Venezuela, pour ne pas froisser les Etats-Unis, cette réunion constitue bel et bien l'amorce d'un dialogue international.

Cette initiative, la première en son genre, avait d'emblée valeur de test. « Il y avait dans la démarche des présidents français et vénézuélien une bonne part de pari », a reconnu le ministre français de l'Industrie, M. Dominique Strauss-Kahn.

Le « pari » franco-vénézuélien était simple : pouvait-on s'appuyer sur la bonne volonté manifestée au cours de la guerre du Golfe afin d'éviter un nouveau choc pétrolier, tant par les producteurs que par les consommateurs, pour organiser une véritable concertation à moyen et long terme à l'échelle de la planète ? Les réponses reçues à l'invitation prouvent que les pays producteurs y sont prêts et qu'au sein des consommateurs un petit groupe seulement, mené par les Etats-Unis, résiste sans oser toutefois opposer un non formel.

Des vingt-trois pays invités au niveau ministériel aucun n'a boycotté la réunion. Tous les producteurs ont envoyé un, voire plusieurs ministres. Seront ainsi présents à Paris sept ministres du pétrole de l'OPEP - Arabie saoudite, Iran, Indonésie, Emirats arabes unis, Algérie, Nigéria et,

bien sûr, Venezuela, - et cinq de pays extérieurs à l'organisation - URSS, Mexique, Norvège, Oman et Egypte. Du côté des consommateurs, outre la France, six pays seront aussi représentés au niveau ministériel - Italie, Allemagne, Brésil, Inde, Tchécoslovaquie et Espagne, - deux autres ont envoyé un fonctionnaire de rang élevé - la Grande-Bretagne et les Pays-Bas. Quatre pays seulement ont choisi de manifester leurs réticences, en déléguant des « observateurs » de rang moyen : Etats-Unis, Canada, Japon et Corée.

Les organisations internationales enfin ont répondu de façon très positive puisque le FMI, la Banque mondiale, l'ONU, le Conseil de coopération du Golfe, la CEE, l'OPEP, l'Agence internationale de l'énergie, la BERD et l'Association européenne des compagnies pétrolières seront tous représentés par des responsables de premier plan.

### Eviter les fluctuations erratiques

Reste à savoir si ce sommet qui ne dit pas son nom et, selon le ministre français de l'Industrie, « tient plus du colloque scientifique que de la réunion syndicale », peut déboucher sur un résultat concret. Rien n'est moins sûr, compte tenu des ambiguïtés de départ. Car de quoi s'agit-il au fond ? De trouver les moyens d'éviter au marché pétrolier les fluctuations erratiques des vingt dernières années. Comment, dans cette perspective, éviter de parler de prix ? C'est pourtant bien ce à quoi s'efforcent les organisateurs afin d'amadouer les Américains, arc-boutés sur un credo libéral - les prix sont fixés par les lois du marché - qui camoufle en fait une position de force, les prix du brut étant dans une très large mesure fixés aujourd'hui par concertation directe entre le premier exportateur - l'Arabie saoudite - et leur protecteur - les Etats-Unis.

La voie est donc étroite pour les organisateurs français et vénézuéliens, obligés de louvoyer entre deux écueils : d'un côté le risque, si les thèmes retenus sont trop vagues, de n'aboutir à rien, de l'autre le danger de provoquer un clash avec les Américains si au contraire la rencontre touche au vif du sujet.

Sans aller jusqu'à un accord international formel, il est possible toutefois de faire beaucoup avancer les choses. « Le marché joue un rôle utile, bien qu'imparfait, dans l'allocation des ressources à court terme, mais il est incapable de fournir les signaux de prix nécessaires aux décisions d'investissement qui influencent l'équilibre de l'offre et de la demande à long terme », note M. Robert Mabro, dans une étude publiée par l'institut d'Oxford pour les études énergétiques (1) à l'occasion de cette réunion. « Le rôle du marché, ajoute-t-il, doit donc être complété par deux autres types de mécanismes : l'un qui améliore les informations nécessaires pour prendre de bonnes décisions d'investissement, l'autre qui donne au marché des indications sur un niveau autour duquel les prix peuvent fluctuer librement à la hausse et à la baisse en réponse aux forces économiques à court terme. »

Sans attendre de convaincre les Américains du bien-fondé de cette démarche, les organisateurs du séminaire de Paris se contenteront d'aborder le sujet de fond - les prix du brut - par la bande. Les thèmes retenus - évolution à moyen terme du marché pétrolier, coopération industrielle entre producteurs et consommateurs, fonctionnement des marchés à terme, pétrole et environnement - sont a priori suffisamment larges pour permettre tous les débats.

VÉRONIQUE MAURUS

(1) Un dialogue entre producteurs et consommateurs : le pourquoi et le comment, par Robert Mabro, Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, 7, Woodstock Road, Oxford OX2 6FA, Grande-Bretagne.

JUL 05 1991

The World Bank/IFC/MIGA  
O F F I C E M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: 03-Jul-1991 05:59am

TO: Alexander Shakow ( ALEXANDER SHAKOW )

FROM: Robert Picciotto, CPBVP ( ROBERT PICCIOTTO )

EXT.: 84569

SUBJECT: Oil Seminar

The meeting went as expected. The US "observed" and there was very limited participation by Japan and the UK. The tone was measured and pragmatic. Algeria tried to liven things up, with little success. There was polite disagreement on taxation of oil products and the environment. Saudi Arabia was tough on nuclear power and decried the use of the term "oil shocks" only on the upside. The most widely quoted expert was Adam Smith -- a far cry from the confrontational attitudes of the 70's.

It was decided to pursue the dialogue. Norway offered to sponsor another meeting at the political level while IEA said that they would organize meetings of experts.

My presentation (modified to take account of excellent material furnished by Tony Churchill) was well received and provided an opportunity to push policy themes and the market as well as inform the Ministers about the role of the Bank, IFC and MIGA in the energy sector. Profile kept deliberately low, as planned.

CC: Anthony A. Churchill ( ANTHONY A. CHURCHILL )  
CC: Sven Sandstrom ( SVEN SANDSTROM )  
CC: Afsaneh Mashayekhi ( AFSANEH MASHAYEKHI )



REPRESENTATION PAR PAYS

PAYS	REPRESENTANTS	FONCTIONS
<p>A</p> <p>ALGERIE</p>	<p>M. NOUREDDINE AIT-LAOUSSINE</p> <p>M. H. MESLOUB</p> <p>M. ALI AISSAOUI</p> <p>M. AHMAR ZEGHBIB</p> <p>M. KAMEL BRAITI</p>	<p>MINISTRE DE L'ENERGIE</p> <p>DIRECTEUR GENERAL DES RELATIONS MULTILATERALES DU MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES</p> <p>CHEF DE LA DIVISION ENERGIE AU MINISTERE DE L'ENERGIE</p> <p>CONSEILLER DU MINISTRE DE L'ENERGIE</p> <p>CHARGE DU PROTOCOLE AU MINISTERE DE L'ENERGIE</p>
<p>ALLEMAGNE</p>	<p>M. DIETER VON WUERZEN</p> <p>M. ELMAR BECKER</p> <p>M. WERNER REICHENBAUM</p> <p>M. EIKE ROEHLING</p>	<p>SECRETAIRE D'ETAT AU MINISTERE DE L'ECONOMIE</p> <p>D. Gal DE L'ENERGIE</p> <p>MINISTRE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES. CHEF DE SERVICE DES RELATIONS NORD/SUD</p> <p>SOUS DIRECTEUR. MINISTERE DE L'ECONOMIE</p>
<p>ARABIE SAOUDITE</p>	<p>M. HISHAM NAZER</p> <p>M. KADER HARZALLAH</p> <p>M. SULEIMAN AL HARBILISH</p> <p>M. MAAMOUN KURDI</p>	<p>MINISTRE DU PETROLE</p> <p>VICE MINISTRE</p> <p>VICE MINISTRE ADJOINT</p> <p>AMBASSADEUR. DIRECTEUR DES AFFAIRES ECONOMIQUES AU MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES</p>
<p>B</p> <p>BRESIL</p>	<p>M. JOAO SANTANA</p> <p>M. SAMUEL PINHEIRO GUIMARAES</p> <p>M. FLAVIO MOREIRA SAPHA</p> <p>M. MAURICIO DE ALVARENGA</p>	<p>MINISTRE D'ETAT, MINISTRE DE L'INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A L'AMBASSADE A PARIS</p> <p>CHARGE DE MISSION AUX AFFAIRES INTERNATIONALES</p> <p>DIRECTEUR DE LA PETROLEO BRASILIENRO SA PETROBRAS</p>

<p>H INDE</p>	<p>M. SHANKARANAND  M. VENKATASUBRAMANIAN M. HARISH CHANDRA GUPTA M. PAVAN K. VARMA  M. T.S. DARBARI</p>	<p>MINISTRE DU PETROLE  PRESIDENT "INDIAN OIL CORPORATION" JOINT SECRETARY (MINISTERE DU PETROLE DIRECTEUR (MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES EXTERIEURES) SECRETAIRE PRIVE DU MINISTERE</p>
<p>INDONESIE</p>	<p>M. GINANDJAR KARTASASMITA  M. ABDA'OE M. WIJARSO  M. FAISAL AMIR M. HARDIKUSUMO  M. ARIFIN PANIGORO</p>	<p>MINISTRE DES MINES ET DE L'ENERGIE  PRESIDENT DIRECTEUR DE PERTAMINA CONSEILLER DU MINISTRE POUR L'ENERGIE CHEF DE BUREAU DIRECTEUR DE ANDIKALAIN (SECTEUR PRIVE PRESIDENT DIRECTEUR DE MEDCO (SECTEUR PRIVE)</p>
<p>IRAN</p>	<p>M. GHOLAM-REZA AGHAZADEH  M. SEYYED MAJID EDAYATZADEH-RAZAVI  M. MOHSEN HACHEMI-BAHRAMANI  M. MOHAMMAD ALIPOUR-JEDDI  Mlle MINA ZANDIEH  M. ALI-REZA HAMIDI YOUNESSI</p>	<p>MINISTRE DU PETROLE  VICE-MINISTRE DU PETROLE POUR LES AFFAIRES INTERNATIONALES  INSPECTEUR AU CABINET DU PRESIDENT DE LA REPUBLIQUE  D. Gal ADJOINT AU MINISTERE DU PETROLE POUR L'OPEP ET LES RELATIONS INTERNATIONALES EXPERT  INTERPRETE</p>
<p>ITALIE</p>	<p>M. GUIDO BODRATO  M. GIUSEPPE FORNASARI  M. PURI PURINI</p>	<p>MINISTRE DE L'INDUSTRIE, DU COMMERCE ET DE L'ARTISANAT  SOUS SECRETAIRE D'ETAT A L'INDUSTRIE CHEF DE SERVICE A LA DIREC- TION DES AFFAIRES ECONOMIQUES DU MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES</p>
<p>J JAPON</p>	<p>M. TERUSUKE TERADA  M. TOSHIHIRO TAKAHASHI  M. RYOUJI DOI  M. TAKESHI HIKIHARA</p>	<p>MINISTRE-CONSEILLER DE L'AMBASSADE DU JAPON A PARIS DIRECTEUR BUREAU ENERGIE (AFFAIRES ETRANGERES) AGENCE DE L'ENERGIE (MITI) DIRECTEUR ADJOINT DU BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DIRECTEUR ADJOINT BUREAU ENERGIE (AFFAIRES ETRANGERES)</p>
<p>M MEXIQUE</p>	<p>M. FRANCISCO ROJAS  M. MANUEL TELLO  M. JOSE LUIS AHUMADO</p>	<p>D. Gal DE "PETROLEOS MEXICANOS" AMBASSADEUR DU MEXIQUE EN FRANCE SECRETAIRE D'ETAT AU MINIS-</p>



	M. MARCO ANTONIO DINIZ BRANDAO	CONSEILLER, CHEF DU SERVICE ECONOMIQUE A L'AMBASSADE A PARIS
	M. MARCOS LEAL RAPOSO LOPES Mme MARIA FELICIANA ORTIGAO	SECRETAIRE D'AMBASSADE  SECRETAIRE DES RELATIONS EXTERIEURES
C		
CANADA	M. GEORGE HAYNAL	D. Gal DE LA POLITIQUE ECO- NOMIQUE (MINISTERE DES AF- FAIRES EXTERIEURES).
	M. DAVID HELDER	REPRESENTANT, ADJOINT DU CANADA AUPRES DE L'OCDE
	Mme PATRICIA LORTIE	CONSEILLER AFFAIRES POLITIQUES ET ECONOMIQUES (AMBASSADE DU CANADA EN FRANCE)
	M. KEVIN O'SHEA	PREMIER SECRETAIRE (AMBASSADE DU CANADA EN FRANCE)
CORÉE	M. SHIN JANG-BUM	D. Gal ADJOINT POUR LES AFFAI- RES ECONOMIQUES AU MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES
	M. CHO HWAN-BOK	CONSEILLER A L'AMBASSADE DE COREE A PARIS
	M. HONG SEONG-HUA	D. ADJOINT DE LA DIVISION DE L'ENERGIE ET DES RESSOUR- CES NATURELLES AU MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES
	M. KIM SU-SUNG	ATTACHE A LA DIVISION DU PETROLE BRUT DU MINISTERE DE L'ENERGIE ET DES RESSOURCES NATURELLES
E		
EMIRATS ARABES UNIS	M. YOUSSEUF BEN OMAIR BEN YOUSSEUF M. DPHAM FAYCAL MISHIL M. SOHEIL FARES AL MAZROUI	MINISTRE DU PETROLE ET DES RESSOURCES NATURELLES DIRECTEUR DU CABINET DU MINIS- TRE D.Gal DE L'A.D.N.O.C
EGYPTE	M. HANDI EL BAMI M. AHMED SIDKY M. HUSSEIN ABDALLAH M. NEHAD ABDELLATIF  M. SAAD EL SEBAI	MINISTRE DU PETROLE ET DE L'ENERGIE AMBASSEUR D'EGYPTE SOUS-SECRETAIRE D'ETAT DU PETROLE MINISTRE PLENIPOTENTIAIRE AMBASSADE D'EGYPTE - PARIS MINISTRE PLENIPOTENTIAIRE COMMERCIAL AMBASSADE D'EGYPTE - PARIS
ESPAGNE	M. JC. ARANZADI  M. P. SIMARRO M. R. VAZQUEZ de PRADA	MINISTRE DE L'INDUSTRIE ET DU COMMERCE SECRETAIRE GENERAL A L'ENERGIE CONSEILLER TECHNIQUE
ETATS-UNIS	M. HECKLINGER  M. RONALD ROBERTS	DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY ECONOMIC BUSINESS BUREAU STATE DEPARTMENT 1er SECRETAIRE A L'AMBASSADE

01 01 E

M. PEDRO HAAS  
 M. JAVIER JIMENEZ  
 SPRIU  
 M. DAVID IBARRA  
 M. GUSTAVO MOHAR  
 M. GERARDO FASALAGUA

D. Gal DE "PETROLEOS MEXICANOS INTERNATIONAL"  
 SOUS DIRECTEUR COMMERCIAL A "PETROLEOS MEXICANOS"  
 COORDINATEUR DES CONSEILLERS DU D. Gal DE "PETROLEOS MEXICANOS"  
 REPRESENTANT DE "PETROLEOS MEXICANOS" A LONDRES  
 SOUS DIRECTION COMMERCIALE DE "PETROLEOS MEXICANOS"

N  
 NIGERIA

M. JIBRIL AMINU  
 M. DAVID OGBODO  
 M. BEN OSUNO  
 Dr. JOHN  
 M. TAIWO IDEMUDIA

MINISTRE DES RESSOURCES PETROLIERES  
 CHEF DU CABINET DU MINISTRE  
 GOUVERNEUR POUR LE NIGERIA A L'OPEP  
 D. Gal DE LA Sté NATIONALE NNPC  
 Mbre DU CONSEIL EXECUTIF DE L'OPEP

NORVEGE

M. THORVALD STOLTENBERG  
 M. ARNE ROY WALIHER  
 M. TORE SANDVOLD  
 M. ODD HARALDSEN

MINISTRE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES  
 AMBASSADEUR, CONSEILLER SPECIAL POUR LES QUESTIONS ENERGETIQUES AU MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES  
 D. Gal AU MINISTERE DU PETROLE  
 D. Gal ADJOINT

O  
 OMAN

M. SAID BIN AHMED AL SHANFARI  
 M. HERMANN FRANSSEN  
 M. ALI BIN ABDALLAH AL TAMINI  
 M. RACHED BIN KHALED AL BARWANI

MINISTRE DU PETROLE ET DES RESSOURCES MINIERES  
 CONSEILLER DU MINISTRE  
 D. Gal DES AFFAIRES ADMINISTRATIVES ET FINANCIERES  
 DIRECTEUR DU MARKETING

P  
 PAYS-BAS

Me VAN ROOY  
 M. DESSENS

MINISTRE DU COMMERCE EXTERIEUR  
 D. Gal DE L'ENERGIE, MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ECONOMIQUES



## R

ROYAUME UNI

M. DEREK DAVIES  
 M. NEIL HIRST  
 M. ANTHONY BRENTON  
 M. ROY FIELD  
 M. PETER JENKINS

D. Gal DES HYDROCARBURES  
 MINISTERE DE L'ENERGIE  
 ASSISTANT-SECRETARY A LA  
 DIRECTION DES HYDROCARBURES  
 CHEF DU DEPARTEMENT DE L'ENER-  
 GIE ET DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT AU  
 FOREIGN OFFICE  
 DIRECTION DES HYDROCARBURES  
 MINISTERE DE L'ENERGIE  
 PREMIER SECRETAIRE, AMBASSADE  
 DE GRANDE-BRETAGNE A PARIS

## T

TCHECOSLOVAQUIE

M. VLADIMIR DLOUHY  
 Mme ELISKA ROHLOVA  
 M. VACLOV JUNEK  
 M. JAN SLABY  
 M. JURAJ OBLOZINSKY

MINISTRE FEDERAL DE L'ECONOMIE  
 DIRECTEUR DU DEPARTEMENT ENER-  
 GIE  
 D. Gal DE CHEMAPOL  
 VICE DIRECTEUR TECHNIQUE DE  
 L'ENTREPRISE CHEMOPETROL  
 DE LITVINOV (bohème)  
 DIRECTEUR COMMERCIAL DE  
 L'ENTREPRISE SLOVNAT' (SLOVA-  
 QUIE)

## U

URSS

M. TCHOURILOV  
 M. SOROKINE  
 M. BAIKENOV  
 M. DVOURETCHENSKY  
 M. KHARLANOV  
 M. PIATKINE

MINISTRE DU GAZ ET DU PETROLE  
 CHEF ADJOINT DE LA DIRECTION DES  
 RELATIONS INTERNATIONALE DU MID  
 CONSEILLER D'ETAT DE LA REPUBLIQUE  
 DU KAZAKHSTAN  
 VICE PRESIDENT DU COMITE D'ETAT POUR  
 LA GEOLOGIE DU RSFSR.  
 VICE PRESIDENT DE L'UNION DES EXPOR-  
 TEURS DE PETROLE DE L'URSS

DIRECTEUR DU SERVICE GENERAL DE  
 PREVISION

6 EXPERTS ACCOMPAGNENT LA DELEGATION

## V

VENEZUELA

M. ARMANDO DURAN  
 M. CELESTINO ARMAS  
 M. ADOLFO RAUL  
 TAYLHARDAT  
 M. MARIO RODRIGUEZ

MINISTRE DES RELATIONS EXTE-  
 RIEURES  
 MINISTRE DE L'ENERGIE ET DES  
 MINES  
 AMBASSADEUR DU VENEZUELA EN  
 FRANCE

PDVSA (PETROLEOS DE VENEZUELA,  
 S.A.)

## VENEZUELA

M. EDMUNDO GONZALEZ URRUTIA	AMBASSADEUR, CONSEILLER TECHNIQUE AU CABINET DU MINISTRE DES RELATIONS EXTERIEURES
M. DAVID LOPEZ HENRIQUEZ	AMBASSADEUR, DIRECTEUR DE CABINET DU MINISTRE DES RELATIONS EXTERIEURES
M. GONZALO PLAZA	GOUVERNEUR A L'OPEP
M. NESTOR RAMIREZ	CONSEILLER TECHNIQUE DU MINISTRE DE L'ENERGIE ET DES MINES
M. ALIRIO PARRA	CONSEILLER DU MINISTRE DE L'ENERGIE ET DES MINES
M. MANUEL FELIPE SIERRA	CONSEILLER DU MINISTRE DES RELATIONS EXTERIEURES
M. RAFAEL CASADO	CONSEILLER DU MINISTRE DES RELATIONS EXTERIEURES



REPRESENTATION DES ORGANISATIONS

<u>ORGANISATIONS</u>	<u>REPRESENTANTS</u>	<u>FONCTIONS</u>
AGENCE INTERNATIONALE DE L'ENERGIE (A.I.E)	M. LUMSDEN	DIRECTEUR DU SECTEUR "MARCHÉ PETROLIER"
ASSOCIATION DE L'INDUSTRIE PETROLIERE EUROPEENNE (EUROPIA)	M. BLOCH M. PORTAL	PRESIDENT SECRETAIRE GENERAL
BANQUE MONDIALE	M. PICCIOTO Mme MASHAYEKHI	VICE PRESIDENT DE LA BANQUE MONDIALE CHEF DE DIVISION SECTEUR ENERGIE
BANQUE EUROPEENNE DE LA RECONSTRUCTION ET DU DEVELOPPEMENT (BERD)	M. GUEDJ	CHARGE DES PROBLEMES DE L'ENERGIE
COMMISSION DES COMMUNAUTES ECONOMIQUES EUROPEENNES (CEE)	M. CARDOSO E CUNHA M. MANIATOPOULOS	COMMISSAIRE A L'ENERGIE (DG XVII) D. Gal. ENERGIE
CONSEIL DE COOPERATION DES ETATS DU GOLFE (CCEAG)	M. BISHARA M. ABDALLAH AL OMRAN Dr. ANOVAN YOUSSEF ABDALLAH	SECRETAIRE GENERAL SECRETAIRE PARTICULIER DE M. BISHARA D. Gal DU PETROLE ET DU GAZ
FONDS MONETAIRE INTERNATIONAL (F.M.I)	M. CAMDESSUS	DIRECTEUR GENERAL
O.N.U	M. CONSTANTINO	CHARGE DU SECTEUR ENERGIE A LA DIESI
O.P.E.P	M. SUBROTO	SECRETAIRE GENERAL
	M. Kemal SAIKI	CHEF DE LA DIVISION COMMUNICATION

2 July 1991

**MINISTERIAL SEMINAR**

**OIL PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS**

Paris, 1 - 2 July 1991

Draft presentation by

**Mr C.S. MANIATOPOULOS**

Director General for Energy

Commission of the European Communities



## ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Mr President, Ministers, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is a great pleasure for me to participate in this Seminar and I feel deeply honoured at sharing with the Secretary General of the GCC Dr Bishara the responsibility of introducing the subject of Energy and Environment. Within the restricted time available I want to touch upon some fundamental issues, like population and economic growth, the available policy choices to fight acid rain and global warming, the importance of new environmental friendly technologies and of new economic and fiscal ~~instruments~~<sup>instruments</sup> and of course the roles of government and industry.

More questions will be raised than answers given. However, my sole objective is to raise issues which might stimulate discussion.

### Population and Economic growth

According to UN projections world population will increase by more than 3 billion people by the year 2020. The greater part of this growth will take place in the developing regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

As a result of this population increase and the need for economic growth to improve the standard of living in developing countries, demand for energy is forecast to increase, thereby causing further regional and global environmental degradation.

The fundamental challenge of the future therefore, will be to resolve the question of whether or not rapid economic growth, a clean environment and secure energy supplies are compatible objectives. Convincing answers to this question need to be developed.

### Sustainable Development, Integration of Environmental Dimensions into Energy Policy

Economic growth is not only necessary for the well being of our societies but also for the solution of the most pressing environmental problems, such as acid rain, ozone depletion and global warming. In fact, environmental improvement requires substantial financial resources and



economic strength. Economic growth must be realised in a sustainable manner.

The Community supports the notion of sustainable development and has agreed upon the binding legal commitment which states that "environmental protection requirements shall be a component of the Community's other policies".

By adopting this more global approach instead of the traditional one of isolated solutions we want to avoid the simple transfer of an environmental problem from one medium to another.

However, this requires a concrete policy approach on how to cope with environment problems and define solutions which are efficient and feasible as well as transferable to other national or regional conditions.

#### Acid Rain, Technology Answers to Environmental Problems

The first wide-ranging environmental issue of continental concern arose in the late 70's, linked to the acidification of precipitations, causing widespread damage in natural ecosystems (lakes, forest, crops) and to man-made structures (corrosion of monuments, building materials).

Therefore legal measures have been taken to limit acid emissions (SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>) from fossil fuel burning in power plants, industrial boilers, domestic heating appliances and road traffic. Technological means were available or under development to meet these legal requirements.

To a lesser extent, the rational use of energy also brought about some relief in the rate of acid emissions.

Nowadays, with regard to these traditional air pollutants, namely SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, we can conclude, that technological solutions to reduce emissions are available and that there is a political will, in the Community, to make use of this technology and that consequently these emissions will decrease over time.

However, this relatively positive picture is only valid for the Community and some other industrialised countries. For developing countries or countries in eastern Europe, acid rain is still a pressing and predominant problem, leading to environmental degradation.

In these areas, substantial investments are still required and a broad potential for cooperation exists.



Lessons could be learned especially with regard to the elaboration of legal provisions, the choice of technology and the definition of environmentally friendly energy strategies.

At this point we must ask ourselves, which type of technologies offer the most effective and sustainable solutions?

- those that remove the harmful effects of emissions?
- those that reduce the production of emissions when using energy?
- or those that reduce energy consumption itself?

Furthermore we have to reflect carefully on the technology choice, as it is influencing substantially the shape of our society.

### Global Warming

The new challenge which the Community and the world are facing today is the Greenhouse effect and the possibility of climate change. As laid down in various UN-Resolutions, climate change is a common concern of mankind. Therefore, solutions to this global problem can only be effective if all major Greenhouse gas emitters, from energy and non energy sources, be it developed or developing countries, contribute to it.

There is at present no economically viable technology available to clean these emissions out of the flue gas stream. Therefore, CO2 emissions are a direct function of fossil fuel combustion. Man made CO2 emissions from energy represent about 80% of total anthropogenic CO2 emissions and the energy sector is the largest source of emissions of green-house gases.

You all know the results presented by the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change (IPPC) which seek reductions of CO2 emissions of more than 60% to stabilise CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere. Are these scientific objectives feasible, even in the long term? We should not underestimate the fact that fossil fuels represent at present 90% of all commercial energies and demand reductions of 60% or more would totally change our energy systems, infrastructures and present set of technologies.

A substantial number of industrialised countries, the Community included, have adopted the policy target of stabilising CO2 emissions by the year 2000 at their 1990 level as an important first step in controlling climate change. The tools available to reduce CO2 emissions are well known and can in a very broad way be divided into two groups: "energy efficiency improvements" and "substitution of fuels". In practice this could mean:



- rational use of energy;
- increased use of natural gas;
- increased use of renewable energies and
- increased use of nuclear energy.

For industrialized and partly developing countries improvements in energy efficiency represent the most promising potential concerning CO2 emission reductions. Many studies show that substantial improvements can be made. In the Community we have presented a new energy efficiency programme (SAVE) aimed at accelerating improvements and changing past trends. We know that the cornerstone of action must be a commitment to energy efficiency and conservation. However, there still exist many barriers to penetration of more energy efficient technologies and major difficulties need to be overcome. And of course energy efficiency alone cannot solve the problem.

Nuclear energy would contribute to limit CO2 emissions. But we have to recognise that this option, although, still valid, faces difficulties concerning public acceptability. Do we have to introduce policy changes, for example with regard to nuclear wastes?

We have to take into consideration that the measures mentioned above, are not in the same manner suitable for developing and developed countries. This is a major political issue that needs to be solved.

It is obvious that the instruments mentioned above, like energy efficiency, renewables, or a switch to nuclear and natural gas would result in a reduced demand for coal and oil. Here we are touching directly on the interests of coal and oil exporting countries. The specific difficulties of these countries, and the developing countries in particular, need to be carefully considered. This is another major political issue calling for ..... global consideration.



## Economic and Fiscal Instruments

In the past governments have to a large extent used norms and standards, regulations and information campaigns to change perceptions and fight environmental degradation. Although these instruments remain valid tools, the policy makers today ask themselves whether the use of economic and fiscal instruments wouldn't be a more efficient and cost effective way to solve environmental problems.

In the Commission we are at present preparing proposals to introduce a combined energy/CO<sub>2</sub> tax to meet our CO<sub>2</sub> stabilisation objective. Such a tax would, if endorsed by the Council, reduce demand, especially for fossil fuels, by increasing energy prices.

The intentions behind the tax are not to discriminate against a certain fuel because of energy considerations, but to improve energy efficiency, to foster the implementation of new technologies and to partly integrate the real social costs of the various energies.

Here again we have a broad field for discussion.

- Are economic and fiscal instruments suitable tools for sectoral policy making?
- Is it acceptable to intervene in the market and to change energy prices and the relative competitiveness of fuels?
- Who should benefit from the economic rent, the tax revenues?
- How would developing oil and coal exporting countries be affected?
- What are the competition effects of such intervention for our industries?

Finally, I have to mention the most important question of the huge financial requirements needed to increase production and invest for environment improvement.

#### Environmental problems and oil production and distribution

So far I have mainly touched upon topics linked to energy consumption. However, energy production and distribution also create environmental problems. Oil spills, platform and tanker accidents, devastated shore lines are all too well known features.



Control seems to be easier, as the actors, like oil companies, are not too numerous and fairly well organised. Regulations exist, however, and improvements may be realised provided energy industries undertake commitments, and by doing so, make themselves an integral part of the solution.

The Commission has invited the major Community industries to develop codes of conduct within their own areas of responsibility, which would raise environmental awareness in companies, improve management and operations and result in overall environmental improvement. Such codes could cover subjects like environmental impact assessment and auditing, use of best economically viable technology available, demand side management, etc..

Could this approach be a new way forward to integrate industry into the solution process? Are there better means to raise environmental awareness in industry?

Mr President, Ministers, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have tried to touch upon some subjects that seem to be essential for our discussions on energy and environment. It was not possible in this introduction to be exhaustive or to cover all important subjects.

I didn't mention, for example, next year's conference on Development and Environment, which is understood to be "the" major event for advancing environmental thinking. Neither did I cover the transport sector in detail, an environmental nightmare for which solutions and new ways forward need to be found.

Finally, I didn't address the problem of burning oilwells in Kuwait and the linked environmental threat. However, all these issues can be introduced into the discussion at a later stage.

Chairman, Ministers , ladies and gentlemen, allow me at the end of my contribution to express once more my sincere congratulations to the organisers of this conference for their initiative; my great pleasure at having been able to be present; and finally my thanks for your attention.



Dear Colleagues and Friends,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is indeed a pleasure and an honour for me to welcome you in Paris, in the company of my Venezuelan colleagues, at the opening of this seminar which has brought oil producers and consumers together.

The idea of a dialogue between producers and consumers is by no means new. Several countries have advocated this principle for many years. Some have even endeavoured to promote it actively. May I, in this regard, pay tribute to Norway's pioneering role and to Mrs Brutland's visionary appraisal.

Unfortunately, the practical implementation of this idea has for long come up against conflicting economic interests, as well as ideological differences.

Times have changed, however. All around us, we can see age-old barriers crumbling. Today, there is greater awareness on both sides that economic contradictions in this particular sphere are more apparent than real.

The absence of concertation between producers and consumers has long been likened to a game in which each player ended up, sooner or later, losing.

"Explosions" in oil prices have provided producers with no more than short-term gains as the impact of such increases on economic activity eventually brings about a fall in consumption.

Conversely, the collapse of the oil market can only bring fleeting consolation to the consumers. It encourages wasteful consumption and the pollution that goes with it. It increases external dependency and finally encourages new price rises. In point of fact, these tremors merely disrupt the world economy and, more particularly, the least developed economies. This process was aptly summed up by our French fabulist, Jean de la Fontaine, in his simple yet forceful maxim "we venture to lose by seeking to gain too much".

The recent Gulf crisis has revealed a genuine change in attitudes : unlike what may have happened in the past, the reactions of producers and consumers converged in such a way as to encourage market equilibrium.

Exporters on the whole displayed a very responsible attitude. Even those countries which had limited freedom of manoeuvre summoned up their resources during those eventful weeks when every barrel of oil was welcome. I should like to pay tribute to them here.

Meanwhile, the International Energy Agency adopted measures along the same lines. These measures were applied with flexibility in accordance with the real state of supply and demand so that soaring prices as referred to earlier could be avoided.

These signs could have been even more promising had there been closer contact between producers and consumers.

We have therefore to draw a lesson from these recent months of tension. Today, dialogue can and should be established. The President of the Republic of Venezuela, M. Carlos Andres PEREZ, and the President of the French Republic, M. François MITTERRAND, became deeply convinced of this at the same moment. They exchanged views and letters about it and decided to act jointly.

Let no one conclude that our two countries claim to hold alone the key to the dialogue to which we aspire and which we need. As you will know, we engaged in broad consultation before organizing the meeting which is opening today. This dialogue can continue without our co-sponsorship, but we are naturally more than ready to make our own contribution.

In spite of the positive trend I mentioned earlier, there has been evidence of persistent reluctance here and there and occasionally obsession with traditional ways of thinking which have led to deadlock. In the light of this, France and Venezuela have sought to give some additional impetus and to take the first step so that the exchange of ideas would subsequently seem quite natural.



May I remind you that France applied last year to join the International Energy Agency. She felt, that a more mature approach had brought about a new situation which enabled her to join the Agency without repudiating her previous course of action, quite to the contrary. In actual fact, the process of maturation had perhaps not gone as far as we might have wished. I nevertheless observed with satisfaction that the Agency, at its last ministerial meeting, firmly advocated closer contact with the producers.

When announcing their joint initiative, France and Venezuela emphasized that it was not aimed at establishing intergovernmental control over oil markets. While those markets may admittedly be still perfectible, they do fulfill their purpose adequately.

Nonetheless, operators on those markets need more information and a better insight into the various national energy policies. They are aware of the political climate existing between producer and consumer countries. Although it would be desirable to be able to forecast price fluctuations more accurately, this could not be achieved through hypothetical government regulation. It could be born out of mutual confidence at all stages in the oil producing process, between operators and between governments alike. In this respect, it is vital to promote a climate which is favourable to investment in both directions.

France and Venezuela have devoted their efforts in recent months for building up this mutual trust. Everyone is aware of the part that oil can play in destabilizing our planet both politically as well as economically.

I earnestly hope that the meeting which is opening today will serve as a landmark on the way towards a degree of rapprochement and understanding in keeping with what is at stake. On that will depend, to a large extent, the prosperity and security of the world of tomorrow.

**DRAFT 1**

**Ministerial Seminar for Oil Producers and Consumers**

**Paris  
July 1-2, 1991**

**Mr. Robert Picciotto  
Vice President, Corporate Planning and Budgeting  
The World Bank**



## Background

For the last twenty years, oil has probably been the single most important economic commodity. Oil has the greatest share of world trade, provides the dominant force in the determination of all energy prices, and plays a large part in the balance of payment position of both exporters and importers.

Oil market shocks have renewed the interest in oil and energy policy. This outlook for the oil market has changed dramatically in phases over the past fifteen years. During the 1970s and early 1980s, oil price shocks and the relatively modest early reduction in oil demand intensity convinced many observers that demand growth was inevitable. The collapse of the oil prices in the mid-1980s did in fact lead to increasing demand for oil. A common feature of many energy forecasts was the extrapolation of current trends: when markets were tight, the expectation was for tight markets to continue; when the markets became soft, it became the common view that the shock conditions would continue. Prior to the latest Middle East war, the conventional wisdom called for a lengthy continuation of a soft oil market well into the 1990s.

The three shocks in the last fifteen years indicate that although the global oil supply system has become increasingly more flexible, it still remains prone to disruptions. There is a limit to the spare production capacity which is available quickly to offset the impact of sudden and significant cut-offs in flow. The latest price shock took place against a background that differs in three ways from the past:

- (i) Oil remains the most important single fuel, but its importance has declined substantially from 46% of total energy in 1979 to about 39% in 1990. This has been due to a large extent to the longer term effects of the oil shocks of the 1970s,

which caused enhanced development of indigenous energy resources, particularly in non-OPEC production as well as in new technologies; diversification away from oil, particularly into coal, natural gas and nuclear; and improved energy efficiency and conservation.

- (ii) Notable demand factors, declining economic growth in recent years, and demographic changes have yielded changing patterns of energy demand.
- (iii) The increased level of commercial and official oil stock has assisted in smoother price adjustments.

Industry perspectives have emphasized the cyclical nature of oil prices. High prices set in motion economic forces, which reduce demand and increase supply, but the response is slow and capital intensive. However, market response relieve the constraints and prices fall. The lower prices in turn stimulate demand and eliminate some of the new high cost sources of supply. The cycle turns and growth in demand leads again to high prices.

As a commodity with large fixed costs of production and supply , but very low variable costs, oil is uniquely vulnerable to cyclical commodity price variations, but less so than many other <sup>commodities</sup> ~~countries~~. In addition, oil resources are very unevenly dispersed in the world, with 60% of proven reserves in the Persian Gulf, which also accounts for 45% of world oil exports, making prices vulnerable to regional disruptions. We need to distinguish between disruptive oil price movements, in which the equilibrating function of prices is negated by secondary disruptive effects, and normal market price fluctuations, both long term and short term, which are essential to ensure efficient development of energy markets. What is essential if we aspire to a more stable future, is a stable framework within which market forces can operate effectively. Bringing about this orderly market environment calls for a consistent policy on the part of both producers and



consumers. Consumers must also have a policy framework in which the role of oil is made clear, and which allows producers to plan their large investments in the knowledge that markets will be available and accessible. Price stability is also ensured by price transparency and liquidity on international markets. Although such markets may appear to exaggerate price instability, they also have a strong role to play in helping to control risk and disseminate information. Commodity markets function most effectively where the flow of data is as efficient as possible, and where access to the markets is as wide as possible. Adequate market supervision and regulation are of course vital to their success.

The geo-political realities of oil supplies inevitably give some cause for concern. The question of supply security is linked to that of price stability, but while price instability may occur while supplies are still available, supply security is also concerned with actual physical supplies, which may be disrupted because of political, technical or natural events. Hence, the role of stocks in providing a short term back up is clearly important and is fully recognized by consuming countries. Security of economic supply is also provided by diversity in energy markets—both diversity of petroleum producers and diversity of fuels. These aspects of the energy industry have developed rapidly over the past two decades. However, any premium which is paid by countries for security of supply must be carefully judged against the real risks involved and against the available alternatives—energy independence for its own sake can be expensive and illusory goal, as some countries have discovered to their cost.

New financial market instruments for oil trading have also provided an avenue for hedging the risk. The oil futures market has developed as a dynamic institution that provides a powerful hedging device and many organizations are heavily involved in financial trading that extends the market well beyond its traditional limits. These new markets are important and they will play an increasingly prominent role. However, it is important to note that the new futures markets only

provide a diversification of the risk, not elimination of the risk nor the price shocks for the market as a whole.

Perhaps the most effective means of ensuring supply security and price stability in petroleum is through a more open international investment climate, which will allow countries involved in the petroleum industry, to invest in one another's economies, and thus give them a stake in global economic success. There is ample scope for increased investment across borders. ~~The petroleum sector is often the sector to which it is easiest to attract capital.~~ At a time when capital is often short for investment in crucial infrastructure and human resources, it would often be wise to make maximum use of the private sector's willingness to invest in petroleum. International petroleum investment can take several forms. Producing countries are already investing down the petroleum chain into refining and marketing in importing countries (both industrialized and developing)—this gives them a stake in market development and stability. Consuming countries have taken stakes in downstream facilities, including petrochemicals, in exporting countries, which helps to improve integration in world markets. In addition, foreign private investors are playing a role in increased security of supply by investing in exploration and production as well as downstream activities in many countries. All of this favor stability and security in world petroleum markets. An additional important factor is to accept that economic, financial and industrial efficiency, and effective government policies go hand in hand with increased energy security. The vulnerability of an economy to a disruption in petroleum markets depends in part upon the flexibility of response of its industrial and financial sectors, and upon the effectiveness of government planning and coordination.

### **The Role of the World Bank**

The World Bank's role in bringing about more secure and stable petroleum markets is largely defined by the principles above. Thus, the Bank assists developing countries in the



development of new sources of petroleum supply, improved macroeconomic and sectoral policies, and increased allocative efficiency. World Bank lending to the energy sector accounted for \$3.7 billion in FY90 and in general accounts for about 20 percent of total Bank lending. In its policy dialogue with countries, the Bank encourages efficient production and consumption of energy, and competitive markets for petroleum products and efficient pricing policies so as to create diversity of supply and market efficiency. The Bank, through not only its energy sector lending, but also Structural Adjustment Loans, also encourages competition in energy supply in the interests of competitive efficiency, where this is practical. Of course, countries have different traditions in regard to the structure of their petroleum industries, and structural changes often take time. The Bank promotes overall efficiency through its policy dialogue and lending criteria of energy use as a means of rationalizing energy demand.

#### ***Petroleum Exploration Promotion***

In a policy which dates back to the petroleum shocks of the 1970s, the Bank encourages diversification of energy supplies, and development of indigenous resources where these are economically viable. Thus, the Bank assists countries to develop indigenous oil reserves as well as economic gas reserves which can substitute for oil in power and industry. One of the tools for increasing production capacity has been through the Bank's Petroleum Exploration Promotion Projects.

The Bank has supported these projects to attract the investment budgets of international oil companies since the the late 1970s in about 40 countries, most of them in Sub-Saharan Africa. Sub-Saharan Africa, to a lesser degree Latin America and the Caribbean, and a few countries in Asia have been the main areas of operation. The objective of these projects is to seek the development of indigenous energy resources by encouraging international oil companies to invest in petroleum exploration and production in the country. Components have included seismic and

other data acquisition, processing, and interpretation; basin synthesis studies; legal/contractual and negotiations assistance; and training, institution-building, and strategic planning.

The Bank began to be involved in such projects in the wake of the significant real increases in the price of crude oil and other energy in the late 1970s and early 1980s. LDCs which were net importers of commercial energy found themselves in the direst economic position, forced to spend on average over half their total export earnings on energy imports. It became apparent that finding indigenous sources of petroleum would alleviate the import burden or (in the most optimistic scenarios) lead to net exportable quantities of oil and/or gas which would bring in sorely needed hard currency.

The Bank's decision at that time to intervene in assisting developing countries to attract the interest of the private sector in investment must be seen against the background of the Bank's overall involvement in the upstream (exploration and production) sector. The exploration, discovery, and production of oil and gas in the developing world requires a level of technical expertise and financial capability which lies outside the realm of the Bank or any of the other developmental or aid assistance agencies. Only the private sector petroleum industry has the resources and expertise to take the lead in this key resource development process.

Because the petroleum industry is naturally profit-motivated, it must be induced by an adequate incentive structure to engage in this activity within the developing countries which constitute the Bank's clients. The risks which the industry perceives in the Africa Region in particular, must be appreciated, but they attend many of our borrowers in other Regions as well, and the Bank is well placed to help eliminate or reduce them to a level which the industry finds acceptable. The Bank has, through its presence, represented the honest broker between the countries, who need and want the expertise and financial resources of the petroleum companies,



and the companies themselves, who are anxious to obtain new, promising exploration rights and control over producible resources.

The World Bank's affiliate, the International Finance Corporation, is active both in mobilizing lending to the private sector for petroleum projects, and in taking equity shares in petroleum ventures, through which it encourages foreign private investment. The IFC's Five-Year Program, FY85-89, included a new initiative calling for equity investments of \$100 million in oil and gas exploration ventures during the program period and follow-up equity and loan investments totaling \$300 million for further delineation and development requirements arising from successful investments. This Program has allowed smaller, independent oil companies to make a valuable contribution to increased exploration in these countries and IFC's participation in exploration ventures has increased the willingness of these companies to invest in developing countries.

### ***Fuel Diversification***

One of the results of fuel diversification has been the rapid increase in natural gas use in the last few years. Optimism has rarely run so high in the worldwide natural gas industry. Energy analysts in the U.S., Europe, and elsewhere are busy forecasting even high demand growth ranging into the next century.

We feel, however, that only now is the development of natural gas receiving adequate attention. There are a variety of reasons for the slow development of natural gas in developing countries. They revolve around complex issues relating to legislation, regulation, ownership, institutional structure, fiscal regimes, financing, information flows, etc.

Natural gas is not being exploited at anywhere near its full potential. It's development is becoming increasingly attractive for the following reasons:

- **Gas Reserves:** Proven world gas reserves are as large as the world's oil reserves. Close to half of these gas reserves are widely distributed in 57 developing countries. Most geological estimates expect that probable gas reserves, particularly in developing countries, are higher than oil reserves.
- **Gas Costs:** In many developing countries, the marginal cost of natural gas delivered to the main markets is low, relative to alternative fuels.
- **Environment:** Natural gas is the most environmentally benign of all the world's principal energy sources. To help in the global warming problem, for the same amount of energy, natural gas produces only half the carbon dioxide of coal, and less than two-thirds that of oil.
- **Technology:** New techniques have increased the economic attractions of natural gas by sharply lifting efficiency. Combined cycle gas turbine technology can achieve thermal efficiencies of close to 50% for electricity generation.

World Bank lending for the natural gas sector was at a peak of about \$650 million per year in the mid-1980s and planned lending is expected to be at about \$660 million in FY91. In addition, the Bank is active in promoting private sector interest in the gas sector in developing countries.

The Bank is currently active in the gas sector in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America. In Poland, following a \$250 million loan to expand the gas production and transmission facilities, we have been working on a number of policy issues such as energy pricing, setting up an



appropriate legal/contractual framework for the petroleum sector and restructuring of the energy sector to ensure a more efficient and competitive structure for energy enterprises.

## **Conclusion**

Turmoil in the oil markets creates great economic uncertainty, and this uncertainty has real costs. Given past trends, these costs are not likely to be less in the future. However, the recent trends reinforce the importance of recognizing the lessons from the latest oil shock and capitalizing on the new conditions that it created.

The recent Persian Gulf crisis showed that oil markets are working much more smoothly and energy pricing served as a rationing tool. However, the large public stocks of oil could together with commercial stock provide an even better tool in future if the rules for their draw down are clarified and if there is more flexibility to substitute between the public and commercial inventories of stock. The debate regarding the relative role of the public and the private sector remains. Nonetheless, the market forces are now stronger and more flexible and there is an increasing trend towards a free market in the petroleum sector. However, governments need to continue to be involved in ensuring that the market mechanisms improve, providing sufficient regulation, and ensuring that externalities, in particular, environmental costs and benefits are taken into account in the energy sector.

入

① No mention of the link  
to development mandate

② Energy growth & dev. strategy

③ Dev. market based  
environment sensitive.  
socially conscious.

- efficient prod' & cons
  - energy efficiency, energy eff.
- energy

### Introduction

- How what you talk about & relate why & why not
- Note why energy relative by imp. 2 parts



# INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR GAS TECHNOLOGY INFORMATION

① CM  
② JH

The International Energy Agency (IEA), founded in 1974, is the energy forum for 21 industrialized countries. Among its other activities, the IEA helps member countries to set up collaborative projects for research, development (R&D) and demonstration of energy-related technologies. In October, 1990, the IEA sponsored a conference in Lisbon, Portugal, on emerging natural gas technologies. One outcome of that conference was the recommendation that an international center for gas technology information be established. The United States Department of Energy (DOE) has expressed an interest in leading this activity for the IEA, and has asked the Gas Research Institute (GRI) to join in preparing a concept paper to be presented to the IEA for its consideration. The Center will be a not-for-profit organization funded by those member countries of the IEA who choose to participate. It will provide an international clearinghouse of information to facilitate the introduction of new gas-related technologies into the global energy market.

There is a growing awareness on the part of the international natural gas community of the need for better access to information about gas technologies and for analysis which aims at enhancing R&D cooperation and technology transfer in gas supply, transportation, and utilization. Today, natural gas is primarily a regional resource. Gas technology, however, is already a global resource.

## *Need for the Center*

The need for the Center is a natural consequence of the expanding use of natural gas worldwide. Gas reserves contain 45 percent of the energy in the world's proved hydrocarbon reserves, and gas accounts for 35 percent of the total hydrocarbon consumption. During the 1980s, global consumption of natural gas grew an average of 3 percent per year, compared to 2 percent for primary energy.

Only 13 percent of the current annual production of natural gas leaves the country of origin. The inherent characteristics of gas make long-distance transportation infrastructure very capital intensive. Yet the clean burning characteristics make it a desirable source of energy for an increasingly environmentally conscious world. The outlook for global energy requirements underscore the need to develop indigenous gas resources in the developing world, to assist in the rebuilding of the energy infrastructure of the newly emerging democracies of Eastern



Europe, to enhance the efficiency of the use of gas in the industrialized countries, and to improve the economy and efficiency of long distance transportation to bring isolated gas resources within the reach of the rapidly growing energy demand centers. Each of these objectives is critically dependent upon advances in technology.

There are substantial efforts underway throughout the world to improve the technologies of gas production, transportation, and utilization. An inventory of new technological concepts await introduction into the marketplace, and experience is being gained with field testing and early introduction of new practices and equipment. The body of information gained in these activities is being communicated, but usually only in bilateral exchanges among the most active participants.

Natural gas, itself, will increasingly become an international resource with a developed world trade as the transportation systems evolve, but the resource of technological information and new technologies is ready to enter a world trade today. The need is for access by more of the interested participants to a comprehensive source of information that will better coordinate the investment decisions in R&D, more rapidly and more broadly disseminate both research results and early marketplace experience with new technologies, and facilitate the adoption of proven technologies over wider geographic markets.

Development of this information source will require a proactive effort to bring the most active current participants into the dialogue, to organize the available inventory of technological experience, and to develop communications networks that reach a broad audience of potential users of gas technology that do not have extensive R&D activities. It will require original analysis to consider the requirements for adaptation of emerging technologies to applications in new economic, cultural, and climatological situations.

Assessments of the global natural gas resource, collection of general gas production and consumption data, and the projection of supply and demand are currently being provided by a variety of commercial, national, and international sources. Rather than duplicating these efforts, the Center in its analytical activities will focus on emerging problems and on opportunities in the marketplace that are amenable to the application of gas technologies. More extensive and better targeted international cooperation and collaboration in R&D will enable individual members of the Center to transfer gas technologies and practices more effectively into the global marketplace.



The Center will perform three basic functions to complete its objectives:

- o **Technology Information Exchange**
- o **Technology Analysis**
- o **Technology Transfer**

Today, a variety of organizations collect information about energy and technology. But none of these organizations exclusively focus on natural gas technology. The Center will collect, abstract, archive, and distribute reports on the results of gas-related research and experience with new gas technologies.

There is considerable information provided by the IEA and others concerning the size of the global gas resource and the general trends in gas markets. There are national and sometimes cooperative efforts to address specific, identified technological issues. Yet little is done to evaluate the technological "needs" of the marketplace and to anticipate the requirements for new technologies and encourage the R&D that is required.

The Center will assess the state of R&D and evaluate the capabilities of gas technologies which have applications to international gas issues. The result will be to discover the gaps in technology that need to be filled in order to meet the needs of the international marketplace. The international natural gas community has opportunities to use technology to improve its access to new gas resources, expand end-use markets, and assist in the increased use of natural gas to meet new environmental requirements. This analysis can provide the basis for identifying the cooperative R&D that should be performed.

The ultimate goal of R&D is to move new technology into practical applications. At each stage of the R&D process — research, development, demonstration, and commercialization — the term "technology transfer" can be applied. The central mission of the Center will be to promote the widespread commercialization of gas-related technologies by providing a continuing international forum where an effort to increase information dissemination and international cooperation and collaboration concerning natural gas technologies can take place.

GRI, an internationally recognized organization already expert in natural gas technologies, intends to form a subsidiary to carry out the operation of the Center. Initially it will consist of a staff of approximately 15. Most of its activities — such as analytical studies, library services, and information manage-



ment — will be performed by contract management with other organizations. This approach will provide flexibility in conforming programmatic areas to the policy guidance and strategic direction of an Executive Committee of sponsoring IEA members. The initial budget is expected to be \$3 to \$4 million per year.

In the conduct of its business, the Center expects to utilize seminars, meetings, and workshops to obtain the broadest involvement of the international natural gas community.

***GRI's Qualifications  
as Operating Agent***

GRI is a not-for-profit membership organization of natural gas distribution, pipeline, and production companies. GRI plans, manages, and develops financing for a cooperative R&D program in gaseous fuels and their use.

GRI is a technical R&D management organization that was formed and is supported by all segments of the U.S. natural gas industry. Although GRI shares the business prospective provided by its Board of Directors, it is not directly involved in selling natural gas. Rather, its organizational mission is to develop new gas technologies and practices, and bring them to the marketplace for the mutual benefit of the gas industry and gas customers. GRI uniquely brings both an industry and market-oriented perspective to the appraisal of technology needs and opportunities, without the proprietary and commercial motives that must guide most private sector activities.

GRI is already active in the international coordination of R&D efforts and the transfer of technological products. The 21 associate members of GRI represent an established interaction with 15 countries. GRI has performed cooperative research projects with international co-funders, and since 1980 it has helped to organize the International Gas Research Conference. GRI's experience in managing gas technologies for the diverse interests of the U.S. gas industry gives it insights that are needed to successfully operate the International Center for Gas Technology Information.

***Information about  
the Center***

For further information please contact either Dr. Daniel A. Dreyfus, Vice-President, Strategic Planning and Analysis, or Dr. Richard H. Hilt, Assistant Director, Energy Forecasting and Analysis, at GRI's Washington Office, 1331 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Suite 730 North, Washington, D.C., 20004-1703, Telephone (202) 662-8989; or Mr. Marvin I. Singer or Ms. Barbara McKee of the U.S. Department of Energy, Telephone (202) 586-1577 or (301) 353-3991.



ROUTING SLIP		DATE: 07-31-1991
NAME		ROOM NO.
Ms. Afsaneh Mashayekhi, TENOD		N6055
① Mr. Noru		
② File		
APPROPRIATE DISPOSITION		NOTE AND RETURN
APPROVAL		NOTE AND SEND ON
CLEARANCE		PER OUR CONVERSATION
COMMENT		PER YOUR REQUEST
FOR ACTION		PREPARE REPLY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION		RECOMMENDATION
INITIAL		SIGNATURE
NOTE AND FILE		URGENT
REMARKS:  By Pouch  _____  _____  A		
FROM: C. Fucci, EXTEU	ROOM NO.: Paris	EXTENSION: 3044

AUG 02 1991

08-025

file

8/2

J.P.N.

2.AN (OR)

THE WORLD BANK/INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION  
**OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

DATE: July 29, 1991

TO: Harold E. Wackman, Division Chief, Industry and Energy, Technical Dept

FROM: Carmelo Furci, EXTEU *[Signature]*

EXTENSION: 3044

SUBJECT: European Energy Charter - Preparatory Conference, July 15-18, 1991, is  
Brussels - BTOR.

*AM: Too bad we weren't present. We should try to get into the next stage. I think this is very important.*

1. As agreed with you, I attended the Conference on the proposed European Energy Charter that took place in Brussels from July 15 to 18. The Conference lasted one day less than planned.

2. Background

The initial proposal of the introduction of a European Energy Charter was submitted by the Dutch Prime Minister, Mr. Lubbers, during a meeting of the European Council in Dublin on July 25-26, 1990. This initiative basically aimed at establishing a European Energy Community to capitalize on the complementary relationship between the European Economic Community, the USSR and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Having taken into consideration different formal and informal communications from several member States, President Delors, at the CSCE Summit in Paris on November 21, 1990 developed the preliminary ideas of the Commission on the possible content of such a European Energy Charter. In particular, he indicated that "the central objective of energy policy is to ensure security of supply in conditions which allow the competitiveness of the economy and the well-being of our people to grow, and at the same time creating a stable and advantageous situation for energy problems". In Rome, on December 14-15, 1990, the European Council called for an International Conference to be held in 1991 to draft a European Energy Charter. The Conference took place in Brussels, July 15-18, 1991; this is the Conference I attended on your behalf.

3. Participants

The President of the Conference was the former Dutch Ambassador to the EEC, Charles Rutten; the General Secretary was Mr. Clive Jones, Deputy Director, Energy Division of the EEC. Guest speakers were Mrs. Y. van Rooy, Dutch Minister of Economy and President of the Council Ministries of Energy of the EEC and Mr. A. Cardoso E Cunha, member of the Commission in charge of Energy. 37 countries were represented, both from the East and the West; 5 countries invited as observers (mainly from Africa); 7 international organizations were present -including the World Bank- as observers; and several European Institutions (Annex 1 - list of participants).

4. Agenda

This was distributed at the start of the conference (annex 2): To a large extent, the Conference was a typical EEC meeting: a lot of time wasted on matters of procedure (I used to be an observer of the EEC in Brussels on

*21*



matters of procedure (I used to be an observer of the EEC in Brussels on behalf of an Italian company, before joining the Bank almost a year ago). No one knew what the issues were, although the Commission distributed a draft of the European Energy Charter. Between welcome speeches and how to proceed during the following sessions the opening of the Conference produced no results at all. One exception: the President of the Conference, Ambassador Rutten, called the USSR to address the Conference in the opening session. After 30 minutes of consultations, the Soviet Ambassador to the EEC, S. E. Woronine, decided to make a statement. It was obvious that the commission wanted to force the USSR to commit itself in support of the Charter in order to observe the reaction of the other delegations.

## 5. Statements by delegations

5.1 Ambassador Woronine, after expressing support for the Charter clearly stated that "the importance of the Conference goes beyond purely energy limits. It will give important boost to cooperation in a wider political and economic perspective as well as facilitate achieving a human goal - solution of survival of humanity's problems- in relation to natural fuel and energy resources, exhaustion, pollution of our planet and of the space around the Earth as a result of industrial activity". He also stated the importance that the Charter should not set certain countries or organizations against others; on the contrary, it is supposed to facilitate coordination of national energy's programs and policies and contribute to their compatibility. In this respect, according to the Soviet delegation, "we have to use possibilities of already existing International Economic Organizations - the International Energy Agency, the World Bank and the EBRD." He also stressed the necessity of an institutional and legal framework for the Charter. This will probably be in the future the main point of disagreements among the delegations.

5.2 We could summarize the positions emerged as follows:

a. USSR, Central and Eastern countries

Support for the Charter but underlining the need for a legal framework. Commitment for a speedy procedure to make the Charter operational.

b. E.E.C.

Obvious support from the EEC for the draft Charter (annex 3), and its speedy adoption and formal agreement to be signed in the proposed Hague Conference of December 15, 1991. Two EEC countries, Spain and Italy, surprised other member countries by declaring the need to involve Maghreb countries as signatories of the Charter. I was told by the Head of the Italian delegation that a lot of discussion took place on this issue behind the scene. But, the Spanish delegation in particular, pressed for the inclusion of Maghreb countries. This will be another difficulty to be overcome in the meetings to follow.

c. United States

The U.S., although expressing support for the Charter underlined the need to involve more the OECD. Obviously the U.S. would have difficulties in letting the EEC take the lead on this Charter, particularly because they fear to be left out vis-a-vis Eastern European countries. Apparently the U.S. were initially not meant to participate in the Conference but were included at a later stage. They also want more specificity in relation to the legal framework and terms of reference of the Charter.

d. Japan

The Japanese delegation threw a "bomb" in the Conference: after expressing general support for the Charter and many thanks for their participation, Mr. Ushida, Head of the delegation stated: "Since Japan is ready to participate actively in the work of the Conference as a fully-fledged participant, and not as a remote and marginal bystander, allow me to say a few words on the organizational aspects of the conference". And then went on attacking the logistics and money wasting of the Conference, i.e. why 6 working languages instead of one or two. He continued by saying that "all in all, my delegation at present is not in a position to commit itself in meeting these expenses to be incurred". No one, at first, understood the message. What followed was even more devastating. In a few words, Japan took the view, when referring to the adoption of the Charter, of a step-by-step approach. "If we try to do too many things at the same time, we are afraid we may not succeed. We had better take "slow but steady approaches instead of drastic and radical ones". Japan sees the Charter as a European hegemonic instrument in the field of energy in relation to USSR. Everybody was taken by surprise and the President of the Conference called for a coffee break...

Apparently EEC countries knew of Japan's cautious approach but not to the extent of an attack on the Conference itself. I cannot envisage Japan signing the Charter in its present form.

e. International organizations

Because of a lot of politics and manoeuvring going on, many observers decided not to make statements. I followed this line. Only the EBRD made a statement that was very strong as the Japanese one, although for different reasons. Mr. Daniel Guedj stated that "the European Bank is here to play an active role in the implementation of the European Energy Charter. Indeed, the European Energy Charter promotes co-operation between countries in order to avoid simultaneous juxtaposition of shortage and excess capacity, lack of scale economy benefits and unreliable supply. An adequate role has to be devoted to the European Bank, so that programs and activities of all of us could be optimized by an appropriate coordination". I do not think the Commission was pleased with the last part of the statement. He also insisted that the EBRD is the "real" European Bank.

> But does it matter?  
> Also related to "the Northern territories" ..



5.3 Many other matters of procedures were discussed in relation to future meetings of the various working groups. The Conference managed agreement on the terms of reference only for the first two working groups (annex 4), but a meeting schedule of the Charter Conference was established for all 5 working groups (annex 5). A bureau of the European Energy Charter Conference was also proposed and approved in order to coordinate future proceedings (annex 6).

## 6. Individual meetings

During the Conference I had the opportunity of meeting various Heads of delegations.

### 6.1 The Soviet Ambassador

He was sitting in front of me during the official dinner. I exchanged views on the situation of the USSR. 4 main points were basically discussed:

- a. He was representing the Soviet Union and not a group of Republics. He particular insisted that in the West we pay too much attention to individual Republics. Therefore International Organizations could run the risk of "jumping in the vacuum" - as translated by his interpreter- if they were not to deal with central government.
- b. He asked many questions on the World Bank and the differences with the IMF. I illustrated to him our institution, its organization and functioning, our role as a development institution and the work of the Paris office. Ambassador Woronine particularly wanted to know what exactly we mean by "technical assistance". He also stated that the "USSR will soon formally apply for membership".
- c. He expressed some concern about the EBRD.
  - i. Why so little financial resources was allocated to USSR.
  - ii. Was the EBRD "controlled" by the World Bank.
  - iii. Was the EBRD the "Master of the economic reconstruction of Eastern countries".

I stated that we do not control the EBRD, that there might be some joint initiative for projects but that he should ask these questions to the EBRD. But the EBRD's representative was not there.

- d. He clearly stated that he had the mandate to push as much as he could to implement the European Energy Charter.
- 6.2 With Mr. A. Maghrbi, Head of delegation of Tunisia we discussed his concern that too much attention to Central and Eastern Europe could divert financial aid from Africa. He also clearly said that they were hoping to be active part of the European Energy Charter and that for this they were counting on the help of Italy and Spain.
- 6.3 The Head of the Italian delegation, Mr. A. Puri Purini informed me that if the Charter was to be adopted with the U.S. and Japan, then the

European Energy Charter would be "another formal but not substantial" EEC initiative.

- 6.4 Various Heads of delegations asked for meetings with representatives of our institution. Therefore I suggest that the colleague attending future meetings should be available to discuss important issues with other delegations.

#### CONCLUSION

It is important that an expert on Energy will follow the future meetings of the Conference since the various working groups will concentrate on technical issues. As it was suggested by the President of the Conference, Ambassador Rutten, observers, like the World Bank, can participate in the meetings of one or more working groups.

My impression is that the Conference will not meet the deadline of having the Hague Conference, December 16, 1991 as the final stage of the European Energy Charter. Many other delegations expressed doubts on the outcome of the Conference, particular because of some issues:

- a. Disagreement over a legal framework of the Charter.
- b. Role of the U.S. and Japan.
- c. EEC's position towards Maghreb countries.
- d. Nuclear safety.

But the European Energy Charter is an important initiative and our institution must be there, even if the final result will probably be a modest one.

Attachments

c.w. and c.c.: O. Lafourcade

cc: J. Grenfell, H. Bretaudeau, Z. Alahdad, Z. Kalim, A. Shakow.  
B. Montfort, A. Churchill, **A. Mashayekhi**

*Jim with  
so sure!*



**CHARTRE EUROPEENNE DE L'ENERGIE**

**Conférence préparatoire**

**15-19 juillet 1991**

**Liste des participants**

**Centre de Conférences  
Albert Borschette**

ORATEURS INVITES

Mme Y. van ROOY

Président en exercice du  
Conseil des Ministres de  
l'Energie des Communautés  
Européennes

M. A. CARDOSO E CUNHA

Membre de la Commission des  
Communautés Européennes

PRESIDENT DE LA CONFERENCE

S.E. Charles RUTTEN

SECRETAIRE GENERAL DE LA CONFERENCE

M. Clive JONES

SECRETARIAT DE LA CONFERENCE

M. R. DE BAUW  
M. L. ERVIK  
M. C. KATHARIOS  
M. V. RULLENS  
M. V. SOROKIN



# ETATS PARTICIPANTS

## ALBANIE

Dr K. ROBO  
M. H. KRENAR

CHEF DE DELEGATION

## ALLEMAGNE

Dr U. BÖGE  
M. J. BOBINGER  
Dr G. HERX  
M. H. KAHT  
M. M. KUSKE  
Dr G. WASCHKE

CHEF DE DELEGATION

## AUSTRALIE

M. G.S. WOOD  
M. R. ALDERSON  
M. I.C. DICKIE  
M. B.R. JONES  
M. D.L.H MORGAN

CHEF DE DELEGATION

## AUTRICHE

Dr R. HLADIK  
Mme D. ANDRATSCH  
Mme H. STEINHÄUSL

CHEF DE DELEGATION

## BELGIQUE

M. SONCK  
M. J. NACKAERTS  
M. JURICIC  
M. VAN BRUSSELEN  
Mme F. MARCELLE  
M. FAVEYTS  
M. POSSEMIERS

CHEF DE DELEGATION

## BULGARIE

M. B. GENOVSKI

CHEF DE DELEGATION

## CANADA

M. J. KLASSEN  
M. D. HORLEY  
M. J. MONDAY  
M. G. WINSTANLEY

CHEF DE DELEGATION

## CHYPRE

S.E. N. AGATHOCLEOUS  
M. A. CONSTANTINIDES  
M. I. PAPADOPOULOS  
M. I. SHEKERIS

CHEF DE DELEGATION

## **COMMUNAUTES EUROPEENNES**

### CONSEIL DES MINISTRES

M. C.W.M DESSENS  
M. H. BOURGEAU

CHEF DE DELEGATION

### COMMISSION

M. C.S. MANIATOPOULOS  
M. J.C. GUIBAL  
M. Chr. WAETERLOOS

CHEF DE DELEGATION

### **DANEMARK**

M. H.J. KOCH  
S.E. H. IVERSEN  
M. F. ERSKOV  
M. P. SCHROEDER  
Mme H. WINDEMULLER

CHEF DE DELEGATION

### **ESPAGNE**

M. R. PEREZ-SIMARRO  
Mme C. CANOVAS DEL CASTILLO  
M. A. NAVARRO  
M. M. PEREZ-ZARCO

CHEF DE DELEGATION

### **ETATS-UNIS**

M. D. BROWN  
S.E. T. NILES  
Mme K. BROWN  
M. T. GILLET  
M. G. ZEIGLER

CHEF DE DELEGATION

### **FINLANDE**

S.E. A. SATULI  
S.E. E. LIIKANEN  
M. P-M ENGBERG  
Mme A. MAKKONEN  
M. J. OJALA

CHEF DE DELEGATION

### **FRANCE**

M. CL. MANDIL  
M. D. MAILLARD  
M. J. MAIRE  
M. J.P. SCHWEITZER  
M. G. TAGLIANA

CHEF DE DELEGATION

### **GRECE**

M. N. HATOUPIS  
M. C. ARONIS  
Dr G. KOUTZOUKOS  
Mme A. TZIKA

CHEF DE DELEGATION

### **HONGRIE**

M. L. LENGYEL  
M. T. LASZLO  
M. L. SAG

CHEF DE DELEGATION



**IRLANDE**

M. S. O'MUIRI  
M. M. BRENNAN  
M. P. RYAN

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**ISLANDE**

M. T.O. JONSSON

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**ITALIE**

M. A. PURI PURINI  
M. G. BIANCHI  
M. P. FALCIANI  
M. L. MARRAS  
M. A. REGA

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**JAPON**

M. T. UCHIDA  
M. T. TAKAHASHI  
M. I. KASHIMA  
M. T. HIKIHARA  
M. T. IJUIN

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**LIECHTENSTEIN**

Mme A. WILLI  
M. T. JÄGER

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**LUXEMBOURG**

S.E. P. MERTZ  
M. R. BECKER  
M. J. CLOOS  
Mme D. SCHMITT  
M. M. TRAUFFLER

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**MALTE**

S.E. J. LICARI  
M. J. CARUANA  
M. C. INGUANEZ  
Dr P. SALIBA

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**NORVEGE**

S.E. A. WALTHER  
M. P.R. KOREN  
M. G. GJERDE  
M. K. MANSIKA  
M. K. MANSIKA  
M. J. THOMPSON

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**NOUVELLE ZELANDE**

S.E. D. GAMBLE  
Mme D. BROOME  
M. H. JUDD

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**PAYS-BAS**

M. S.I.M GOSSES  
M. H. DEMPER  
M. E.J. DENEKAMP  
Mme M.A.J de PLANQUE

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**POLOGNE**

M. R. LUCZKIEWICZ  
M. K. LIPKO  
M. I. POPCZYK  
M. I. TRUSZCZYNSKI  
M. M. WILCZYNSKI

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**PORTUGAL**

M. C. MIGUENS  
S.E. L. DE OLIVEIRA NUNES  
Mme H. DA SILVA  
Mme G. ROBLES  
M. L. VARANDAS

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**ROUMANIE**

M. V. VAIDA  
M. V. MUSATESCU  
M. D. OLARU  
M. L. COMANESCU

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**ROYAUME-UNI**

M. D. SLATER  
M. A. BRENTON  
M. S. FREMANTLE  
M. P. MILLETT  
M. J. THORNTON

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**SUEDE**

M. R. BOUVENG  
M. M. NORDBÄCK  
M. F. SCHIPPEL

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**SUISSE**

S.E. R.M. JEKER  
S.E. B. de TSCHARNER  
M. J.J. HENCHOZ  
Dr H.R. LÜTHI  
M. R. STÜCHELI  
M. J.L. TOURON

CHEF DE DELEGATION



**TCHECOSLOVAQUIE**

M. M. JICHA  
S.E. K. LUKAS  
M. M. CERNOHUBY  
M. J. HAUSER  
M. M. KODIS

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**TURQUIE**

S.E. T. ISKIT  
M. C. PALA  
M. T. ÜGDÜL  
M. A. ÜLKER

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**URSS**

S.E. WORONINE  
M. L.S. CHRILEV  
M. V.V. GERASIMOV  
M. N.A. MARKOV  
M. V.V. TASKAEV  
M. V. ZIMIN

CHEF DE DELEGATION

**YOUgosLAVIE**

M. S. SPASIC  
M. V. JOVASEVIC  
M. LJ. LAZAR  
M. D. LOPANDIC

CHEF DE DELEGATION

## ETATS OBSERVATEURS

---

ALGERIE  
M. T. ABADA

ARABIE SAOUDITE  
Non représenté

BAHREIN  
Non représenté

EMIRATS ARABES UNIS  
Non représenté

KOWEIT  
M. A. AL-SAMMAK

MAROC  
M. M. BOUHAOULI

OMAN  
Non représenté

QATAR  
M. S.B. AL-NAIMI  
M. H.K. BEN ALI

TUNISIE  
M. A. MAGHRBI



# ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES

AIE

M. P. VLAANDEREN

AIEA

M. P. VILLAROS

BANQUE EUROPEENNE D'INVESTISSEMENT

M. J. GIRARD

M. J. MÜLLER-BORLE

BERD

M. D. GUEDJ

BANQUE MONDIALE

M. C. FURCI

OCDE

M. P. REYNERS

UN-ECE

M. K. BRENDOW

# INSTITUTIONS EUROPEENNES

## SECRETARIAT GENERAL DU CONSEIL DES MINISTRES

M. SCHWAIGER  
M. TESTA

## COMMISSION DES COMMUNAUTES EUROPEENNES

### Cabinet de M. le Commissaire Cardoso E Cunha

M. P. DE SAMPAIO NUNES

### Secrétariat Général de la Commission

M. CAMERON

### Service Juridique

M. D. ALLEN  
M. M. VAN ACKERE-PIETRI

### Direction Générale Relations Extérieures

M. LUDLOW  
M. J. NEVE

### Direction Générale Energie

M. P. CARVOUNIS  
Mme N. COMMEAU-YANNOUSSIS  
Mme M. GUIN  
M. P. LAMBERT  
M. R. MEIJER

- L'interprétation est assurée par le Service Commun Interprétation-Conférences.

- L'organisation de la conférence a été confiée à l'Unité Organisation et Techniques de Conférences de la Commission des Communautés Européennes.



E U R O P E A N E N E R G Y C H A R T E R

P R E P A R A T O R Y C O N F E R E N C E

(BRUSSELS, 15-19 JULY 1991)

AGENDA

1. Opening of the Conference by the EC Council Presidency
2. Election of Chairman :  
  
The European Community will propose Mr Charles RUTTEN (NL) former Ambassador to the EC
3. Opening Address by
  - Mrs Y. VAN ROOY  
Dutch Secretary of State for Economic Affairs
  - and
  - Mr CARDOSO E CUNHA  
Commissioner in charge of the Energy Sector
4. Statement of Chairman in which administrative matters (i.e. financial arrangements for the preparatory Conference) and general procedures are outlined :
  - striving for consensus, but no blocking vote;
  - 6 languages (English, German, Spanish, French, Italian, Russian);
  - secretariat (composition, head of secretariat, tasks, status, location, coordination with bureau) :  
  
The EC will propose Mr Clive JONES  
(Deputy General Director - Commission)  
as General Secretary of Conference;
  - bureau, in support of Chairman (composition, tasks, status);
  - position of observers

5. Introduction of draft Charter by
  - Mr MANIATOPOULOS
  - General Director - Commission
  - USSR/Statement
6. General statements on draft Charter
  - (Suggested duration not more than 10 minutes.
  - Delegations will be asked to give text of statements to the secretariat)
7. Decision about setting up working groups.  
Appointment of Chairmen
8. Decision about further plenary session, group sessions  
(start of work)

The first 3 agenda points will be open session (including press)

---



EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES  
THE COUNCIL

Brussels, 10 July 1991 (1)  
(0)

DRAFT

EUROPEAN ENERGY CHARTER

The representatives of the Governments of the States and of the European Community participating in the Conference, meeting in .....  
on .....,

Having regard to the Paris Charter for "a new Europe" signed in Paris on 21 November 1990 following the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe,

Having regard to the document adopted in Bonn on 11 April 1990 by the CSCE Conference on Economic Co-operation in Europe,

Having regard to the report on the conclusions and recommendations of the Conference on Security Co-operation in Europe meeting in Sofia on 3 November 1989, on the protection of the environment,

Anxious to give formal expression to this new desire for a European-wide co-operation based on mutual respect in order to create the conditions for reducing tension and imbalance within the international community,

Aware that there are problems of reconstruction and restructuring in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and that it is desirable for the European Community and all the States concerned to participate in joint measures to bring about the economic progress which is essential if the reforms undertaken in these countries are to be successful,

Certain that making use of the complementary features of Europe where energy is concerned will benefit the world economy,

Persuaded that energy is essential for economic progress and more generally for social development and a better quality of life,

Convinced that there exists in Europe a common interest in problems of energy supply, safety of industrial plants, particularly nuclear plant, and environmental protection,

Concerned to do more to attain the objectives of security of supply, optimum management of resources and efficient use of resources,

Assured of support from the European Community, particularly through completion of the internal energy market,

Resolved to promote a new model for energy co-operation in the long term in Europe within the framework of a market economy,

Eager to establish a climate of confidence so as to be able to capitalize on the existing complementary features and to establish closer, mutually beneficial commercial relations,

Convinced of the importance in this connection of creating and improving developed, balanced energy infrastructure, without which a genuine increase in trade in energy will not be possible,

Aware of the need to develop technological co-operation and to promote the free movement of energy products in order to increase trade throughout the continent of Europe,

Affirming that their energy policies are linked by interests common to all their countries and that they should be implemented in accordance with the principles set out below,



Affirming the essential importance of improving the production, transport and efficient use of energy with due regard for the environment in the perspective of a market covering the whole continent of Europe,

Affirming, finally, their desire to take the consequent action and apply the principles set out below, -

HAVE ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING DECLARATION CONSTITUTING THE "EUROPEAN ENERGY CHARTER"

Title I: OBJECTIVES

The signatories are desirous of improving security of supply on an acceptable economic basis and of maximizing the efficiency of production, conversion, transport, distribution and use of energy, to enhance safety and the environment. In a spirit of political and economic co-operation, they agree to promote the development of a large energy market throughout Europe based on the principle of non-discrimination and on market-oriented price formation. They are determined to create a climate favourable to the operation of enterprises and to pursue consistent energy policies which implement market principles.

To this end, they agree to take action in the following fields:

1. Expansion of trade in energy, which will be achieved by means of:

- a functioning, free market for energy products;
- free access to known and future energy resources and exploitation thereof on a commercial basis of long-term profitability, taking account of national sovereignty over resources;
- removal of technical, administrative and other discriminatory barriers to trade in energy and associated equipment and services;
- modernization, renewal and rationalization of services and installations for the production, transfer and use of energy;
- development of infrastructure.

2. Co-operation and co-ordination in the energy field, which will entail:

- access to technical and economic data;
- formulation of laws allowing all concerned to exploit the resources;
- harmonization at a high level of the technical specifications and safety rules applicable to energy products and installations;
- research, technological development and demonstration projects.



3. Optimum use of energy and environmental protection, which will imply:

- the promotion of environmentally-friendly energy sources, the development of new and renewable energy sources and new clean technologies in an economically viable framework;
- using and creating conditions to use energy as economically, efficiently and rationally as possible, particularly on the basis of market-oriented price formation;
- efficient measures and mechanisms to combat environmental problems related to energy;
- a high level of nuclear safety.

Title II: IMPLEMENTATION

In order to attain the objectives set out above, the signatories agree that joint action must be taken to achieve convergence of energy policies.

They underline that practical steps to define energy policies are necessary in order to intensify co-operation in this sector and further stress the importance of regular exchanges of views on action taken, drawing on the experience of existing international organizations in this field.

They agree to attain the objective of a large European energy market in the following fields by joint action on:

- access to and exploitation of resources,
- protection of investments,
- growth of trade,
- technical specifications and rules on safety,
- research, technological development and innovation,
- rational use of energy and environmental protection.

In implementing this joint action, they agree to make full use of the potential of operators and to facilitate co-operation between undertakings from different countries, acting on the basis of market principles.

#### 1. Access to and exploitation of resources

Considering that effective development of natural resources is a sine qua non for attaining the objective of establishing a large European energy market, the signatories agree to facilitate access to and exploitation of resources by the interested operators.

To this end, they shall ensure that the rules on the exploration, development and acquisition of resources, including the rules on exclusive ownership or sharing of resources, are transparent and non-discriminatory.

They recognize the need to formulate such rules on mineral rights wherever this has not yet been done. They agree to take all necessary measures to co-ordinate their action in this area.



Aware of the need to be able to put the available resources on the entire market, the signatories agree on the need to remove all discrimination and barriers of any kind to the exploitation of such resources.

With a view to facilitating the development and diversification of resources, the signatories agree to avoid imposing discriminatory rules on operators, notably rules governing the ownership of resources, internal operation of companies and taxation.

## 2. Protection of investments

The signatories shall ensure that the existing international rules on investment and trade are applied.

They affirm that it is important for the signatory States to conclude and ratify binding agreements on promotion and protection of investments.

Moreover, the signatories guarantee the right to repatriate profits and to obtain or use the convertible currency needed. They shall co-ordinate their rules on company accounts, to the extent necessary to ensure transparency in energy matters.

## 3. Growth of trade

In order to develop and diversify trade the signatories undertake progressively to remove the barriers to such trade with each other in energy products, equipment and services and to facilitate the transit of such products across their territory.

They stress the importance of the development of large international transmission grids and their interconnection. To this end, they shall ensure the compatibility of the technical specifications governing the installation and operation of such grids, notably the stability of electricity grids.

4. Technical specifications and rules on safety

The signatories shall, with due regard to the existing international agreements:

- apply technical specifications, rules and conformity test systems designed to maintain high standards on safety, in particular nuclear safety, and the protection of health, the environment, and consumers' and workers' interests;
- to this end, formulate such technical specifications and common rules by joint agreement or agree to the mutual recognition of their specifications and rules.

5. Research, technological development and innovation

The signatories agree to promote exchanges of technology and co-operation on their technological development and innovation activities.

To this end, they shall encourage:

- participation in research and development activities;
- the preparation of pilot or demonstration projects;
- the application of technological innovations;

- the dissemination of know-how and new technologies;
- the launching of information and training activities.

This action shall be taken subject to the international rules on the protection of industrial, commercial and intellectual property.

6. Rational use of energy, and environmental protection

The signatories hold the view that joint action is necessary in the field of rational use of energy and environmental protection. This should include:

- the creation of framework conditions for the exchange of know-how regarding energy technologies and rational use of energy;
- the creation of framework conditions for profitable investment in energy projects and increased use of market-based instruments designed to prevent environmental damage.

Title III: SPECIFIC AGREEMENTS

In order to pursue the objectives of the Charter and to implement it, the signatories undertake to negotiate the arrangements for increased co-operation, notably in the following areas, by means of specific agreements constituting the various aspects of a single form of co-operation:

- nuclear energy and improvements in safety in that sector;
- prospecting, mining and clean coal technologies;



- efficient use of energy, including environmental protection;
- development of renewable energy sources;
- prospecting and use of natural gas and transmission via high-pressure gas pipelines;
- modernization of power stations, interconnection of power grids and transmission of electricity via high-voltage power lines;
- prospecting, use and transportation of oil and oil products and modernization of refineries;
- transfers of technology and encouragement of innovation.

In order to formulate in more detail the conditions, content and legal scope of these areas, the signatories agree to set up a working party which will be required to submit its findings within [six months].

---

CONFERENCE ON EUROPEAN ENERGY CHARTER

CONFERENCE SECRETARIAT

CHC 2 (Rev 1)  
(EN)

16 July 1991

---

SUBJECT: Terms of Reference

---

The annexed note sets out the Conference Chairman's suggestions concerning the terms of reference of Working Groups I and II, the role of the Conference Bureau and the position of observers.

EUROPEAN ENERGY CHARTER CONFERENCE

SUGGESTED TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. Terms of reference Charter Group:

1. The Charter Group has a general responsibility for the preparation of the text of the energy Charter.
2. The text of the Charter will be in the form of a political declaration.
3. The group will also discuss the possibility of defining a list of core protocols, which might be included in the basic protocol.

II Terms of reference Basic Protocol Group:

1. This group has the responsibility to prepare a text of a binding basic protocol which covers general issues, such as organisation and institutional matters, dispute settlement, secretariat and financing.
2. This group will also discuss the possibility to include into the basic protocol general principles common to the specific protocols.

III Terms of reference group on Energy Efficiency and Environmental Aspects

IV Terms of reference group on hydrocarbons

V Terms of reference group on nuclear energy including safety

The terms of reference of groups III, IV and V will be defined by the Bureau at a later state of the conference.

---

Terms of reference of the Bureau

The Bureau will have the overall responsibility for matters regarding the organisation of the Preparatory Conference and the conduct of negotiations. The Bureau may propose to the plenary the institution of new groups.

---

Position of observers

Observers will be invited to make a statement at the plenary part of the Preparatory Conference. Observers have the right to attend plenary and working group meetings, unless the meeting decides otherwise. They can be invited to make statements.



CLJ/JaI  
10.7.91REVISED DRAFT

## CHARTER CONFERENCE - MEETING SCHEDULE

<u>Week beginning:</u>		
9 September	WG I (Charter)	3 to 4 days
16 September	-	
23 September	WG I	3 to 4 days
3-4 October	WG II (Basic Protocol)	3 to 4 days
7 October	WG I	2 to 3 days
15 October	WG II	2 to 3 days
21 October	PLENARY	2 to 3 days
28 October <sup>1</sup>	(WG III, IV, V)	2 days each
4 November	WG I	3 days
11 November	WG II	3 days
18 November	WG I, II	2 to 3 days each
25 November	(III - V)	2 days each
2 December	PLENARY	3 to 4 days
9 December <sup>2</sup>	(A VOIR)	
16 December	HAGUE CONFERENCE	2 days

---

<sup>1</sup> Energy Council - 29 October

<sup>2</sup> Energy/Environment Council - 10 December

PROPOSAL

EUROPEAN ENERGY CHARTER CONFERENCE

Bureau Membership

Ambassador Charles Rutten (Conference Chairman)

USSR (Vice Chairman)

Portugal (Vice Chairman)

European Commission (Chairman, Working Group I)

United Kingdom (Chairman, Working Group II)

Hungary (Chairman, Working Group III)

Norway (Chairman, Working Group IV)

Canada (Chairman, Working Group V)

Mr Clive Jones (Conference Secretary-General)



# Record Removal Notice

<b>File Title</b> Energy - European Energy Charter - 1v		<b>Barcode No.</b>  1262952		
<b>Document Date</b> [undated]	<b>Document Type</b> Note w/attachment			
<b>Correspondents / Participants</b> To: Ms. Mashayekhi From: Eveline Herfkens, Executive Director				
<b>Subject / Title</b> Facsimile from the Dutch Embassy regarding the Energy Conference in Brussels				
<b>Exception(s)</b>				
<b>Additional Comments</b> Declassification review of this record may be initiated upon request.		The item(s) identified above has/have been removed in accordance with The World Bank Policy on Access to Information or other disclosure policies of the World Bank Group.		
		<table border="1"><tr><td><b>Withdrawn by</b> Shiri Alon</td><td><b>Date</b> March 28, 2023</td></tr></table>	<b>Withdrawn by</b> Shiri Alon	<b>Date</b> March 28, 2023
<b>Withdrawn by</b> Shiri Alon	<b>Date</b> March 28, 2023			



## Pan-European Energy Talks Get Underway in Brussels

Brussels — Talks began here July 15 on an ambitious pan-European energy charter, with delegates promising to work out details of the first ever East-West energy agreement by yearend.

EC officials conceded that negotiations on the charter won't be easy. "We have to agree on whether to give the charter only a political significance or to build a legally binding system," a high-ranking EC energy expert told OILGRAM NEWS. "Finding a balance between the two options may be quite difficult."

EC sources said the Soviet Union had insisted in its opening statement at the conference on its willingness to opt for market-oriented measures in the energy sector. EC Energy Commissioner Antonio Cardoso e Cunha said Moscow had said it's willing to accept "market terms and practices" and wants to attract western investments. He said he couldn't guess at just how much money would be needed to modernize the Soviet energy sector.

Cardoso insisted that the charter proceedings are "not exclusive," and although Mideast oil producers weren't invited to participate, they could attend as observers. "Our goal was not to have a world conference," Cardoso said, but added that the EC is ready to engage in

other forms of dialogue with Arab producers who may be allowed to sign any sectoral "basic implementing protocols" that are added to the charter.

### Soviets as Supplier

Yvonne van Rooy, the Dutch minister for external trade, told the meeting that the Mideast will "remain a crucial area in our energy supplies," but added that the Soviet Union could become a "major" additional supplier to meet western energy demand.

She said the charter will be instrumental in bringing market oriented systems to the Soviet Union and eastern Europe. It will help ensure greater security of supply for energy importing nations in the west, increase nuclear safety and help raise environmental standards in the east, she said.

The chairman of the conference, Dutch Ambassador Charles Ruetten, said the week-long meeting will focus on "procedural issues," with separate discussions on how the charter will be negotiated, content and scope of the sectoral protocols, energy efficiency, environmental norms, nuclear energy and hydrocarbons. He said he'll seek to reach agreement by consensus.

"By the end of the year we hope to have a text which is acceptable to as many delegations as possible," he said.

## Dole Mtbe Bill Would Deprive Refiners of Flexibility — API

Washington — An amendment in the Surface Transportation bill that would require gasoline shipped through common carrier pipelines to contain virtually no Mtbe, or the full amount mandated by the Clean Air Act, would deprive refiners of the needed flexibility to comply with the act, American Petroleum Institute says.

According to an API analysis, the provision, authored by Sen. Dole (R-KS), would "bar or significantly impair" the ability to "average" or "trade" fuel properties — which Congress included in the act — to give fuel suppliers maximum flexibility to make and move gasoline in the most efficient manner.

The amendment also is unfair because

it applies only to refiners that ship by common carrier pipeline and not those that ship by proprietary pipeline, tanker, barge, rail or truck, the analysis says. It also "gives special treatment" to 10% ethanol blends and makes it more difficult to use other oxygenates."

Congress' Clean Air Act has mandated massive increases in the use of oxygenates "so another statutory restriction is not necessary to ensure markets for ethanol." The presence of some Mtbe doesn't preclude the use of ethanol, "although it may not allow the blenders' preferred subsidy — the tax benefit obtained with the use of 10% ethanol in gasoline."

NCE will spend \$8-million in the next five months to drill and tie-in 65 to 73 gas wells, construct a battery and build a 4 mi. pipeline to connect with existing facilities. Production is scheduled for November. NCE will earn a 90% working interest in the lands before payout and Bow Valley will have the option to convert to a 40%

working interest after payout. NCE will pay Bow Valley a fee for processing and transporting, and Bow Valley will operate the program and market the gas produced.

TCPL GASLINE TO N.Y.: TransCanada PipeLines Ltd. will make a second attempt to persuade the National Energy Board to allow it to build a C\$40-million natural gas pipeline connecting with the Empire Pipeline from Niagara Falls to Syracuse. TransCanada wants to build the 25-km line near Chippawa on the Niagara River in southwestern Ontario to ship 117,500 Mcf/d of gas to New York utility, Rochester Gas & Electric. In rejecting the proposal, the NEB said it would release its reasons later this month.

### WASHINGTON BEAT

EASTON PROMOTION: John Easton was named acting general counsel of the Energy Dept. to replace Stephen Wakefield who left on July 12 (ON 4/25). Easton will retain his title of assistant secretary for international affairs & energy emergencies pending his nomination by the White House to be the permanent general counsel, a DOE spokesman said. Easton's current position and the general counsel position require Senate confirmation.

### ON THE MOVE

M. W. Kellogg Co.: Lawrence Opalka, vice president and director of proposals and estimating, was named vice president and director of project management.

MSR Exploration Ltd.: Otto Buis was named president and CEO of the newly reorganized company. Patrick Montalban was named executive vice president and chief operating officer as well as president and CEO of MSR Inc., MSR Exploration Inc., MSR Drilling Inc., MGE Inc. and GHGS Inc. Buis, along with Bruce Hirsche, George Field and Peter Tertzakian, were named as the new board with Hirsche as chairman.

Southern Natural Gas Co.: Ralph Daily, former assistant vice president of gas information, was named vice president of gas supply and reserves.

### IT'S AGAINST THE LAW

Platt's OILGRAM NEWS is copyrighted under U.S. and international laws. Reproducing, duplicating, photocopying, telefaxing or inputting it into a computer, is an infringement of copyright, punishable by law.

## News Briefs

### FOR THE RECORD

BOW & NCE FARMOUT: Bow Valley Industries said it farmed out to NCE Resources Group Inc. 11,680 acres in the Hatton area of southwest Saskatchewan.





# Record Removal Notice



<b>File Title</b> Energy - European Energy Charter - 1v		<b>Barcode No.</b>  1262952	
<b>Document Date</b> [redacted] July 5, 1991	<b>Document Type</b> Facsimile		
<b>Correspondents / Participants</b> Conseil des Communautés européennes			
<b>Subject / Title</b> Note verbale			
<b>Exception(s)</b>			
<b>Additional Comments</b> Declassification review of this record may be initiated upon request.		The item(s) identified above has/have been removed in accordance with The World Bank Policy on Access to Information or other disclosure policies of the World Bank Group.	
		<b>Withdrawn by</b> Shiri Alon	<b>Date</b> March 29, 2023