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Shale gas arrives in Europe

Unnoticed by the general public, one of the first European shale gas wells was drilled in Poland in 2009\(^1\). In the USA, where the shale revolution originated and has been well underway since the mid-2000s\(^2\), a heated debate about the topic was already raging. It is not only a debate about inflammable tap water, energy security, global climate change and gas prices, but also one which lays bare the entangled web between industry and politics.

This debate has now reached Brussels, where the European Parliament (EP) and other EU institutions have been besieged by the big players from the oil and gas industry. ExxonMobil, Halliburton, Statoil, Shell, PGNiG, Total, OMV and co. are not only trying to downplay the devastating environmental and social effects of shale gas development, but are also seeking to brand gas as a climate-friendly energy option for a low-carbon future.

Avoiding a regulatory framework for shale gas at the EU level is at the top of the industry’s wish list. Backed up by their government, Polish Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) are trying to paint a rosy picture of shale gas development, hoping for more energy independence from Russia.

This report maps corporate lobbying in the current battle around shale gas in the EU. The European Parliament is expected to vote later this month on two reports on whether shale gas should be regulated, marking the end of the first round of the lobby battle in Brussels.

### Shale gas and hydraulic fracturing

The term unconventional gas generally refers to shale gas, but also includes tight gas and coal gas (coalbed) methane. Shale gas is natural gas trapped in shale rock formations, which makes it hard to recover. The exploitation of these resources has only become possible thanks to the combination of two technologies: horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing. In order to extract shale gas, an enormous quantity of water containing chemicals is pumped into the well, in order to “frack” or fracture the shale bed and push the gas to the surface\(^3\).

Most of this toxic cocktail remains underground where it poses a potential danger to the water table. The rest flows back as waste water which can be contaminated with radioactive substances, depending on the local geology. Shale gas is therefore a lot more harmful to the environment than conventional natural gas\(^4\).

In Europe, Poland and France have the largest estimated shale gas resources, and the UK, Sweden and Germany are thought to have significant reserves\(^5\). Yet there is general agreement that Europe is unlikely to experience the kind of boom seen in the US, which has become a net exporter of gas due to shale gas exploitation. European resources of unconventional gas are seen as at best compensating for the decline in conventional gas production, limited in part by the different geology, legislation and also by higher population density\(^6\).
EU policies related to shale gas

So far, no coherent approach for the regulation of fracking exists in the EU, even though a number of EU regulations, such as the Mining Waste Directive and the Groundwater Directive, apply to hydraulic fracturing. Whereas Poland is pressing ahead with shale gas development, bans and moratoriums on shale gas are currently in place in France, Bulgaria and parts of Germany. The shale gas industry now fears restrictions being imposed across Europe.

Studies conducted on behalf of the European Parliament's Environment Committee and the Commission's Directorate General (DG) Environment have recommended tighter legislation at the EU level. A report commissioned by DG Energy in 2011 however concluded that “current legislation, especially in the field of environmental protection already covers most aspects linked to shale gas activities”. Green MEPs criticised this conclusion in a letter to Energy Commissioner Günther Öttinger, saying: “This complacency unfortunately is very much in line with your earlier unwillingness to have an open ear for citizens' concerns”. However, the emphasis of the report was not that surprising as it was written for DG Energy by the law firm Philippe and Partners, which represents a number of oil and gas firms.

Environmental regulation vs economic viability

Lax regulation seems to be a precondition for the economic viability of shale gas. In a meeting with DG Environment, a representative from Shell said that “shale gas represents a marginal business for (large) companies, so making it too costly would drive (these) companies out of shale gas in the EU”. This appears to have been the case in Austria where OMV pulled out of its plans to drill for shale gas after environmental impact assessments were made mandatory.

Shale gas's exemption from a number of environmental protection acts spurred the shale gas boom in the US. The results are documented in the film Gasland which shows ground water contaminated with toxic substances used for hydraulic fracturing, tap water igniting, as well as evidence of severe health damage resulting from hazardous substances in drinking water and air.

Quo vadis shale gas regulation?

“The earlier the better” is something of a truism among professional lobbyists in Brussels. The corporate lobby machinery was therefore already running long before the EU's initiatives on shale gas were announced. This strategy has already paid off for the industry. The two draft reports presented by the European Parliament's Committees on Environment and Industry in spring 2012, both took an industry-friendly line. The pro-shale-gas tone in the Industry Committee draft faced little resistance; but the Environment Committee draft was significantly altered following criticism from other MEPs. Plenary votes are expected in November.

The European Commission is also currently assessing the need for a risk management framework for unconventional fossil fuels and is expected to come up with a proposal for regulation in 2013.

Gas – an energy option for the future?
Even though the debate around shale gas regulation is currently an important focal point for the gas industry, the bigger battle is about the role that gas, including shale gas, will play in the EU's future energy mix. The fossil fuel lobby is hoping to include natural gas as one pillar for a low-carbon energy future in the EU's energy strategy, which could make fossil fuel projects eligible for funding that was earmarked for the development of renewables\textsuperscript{23}.

According to GasNaturally, which brings together several key players in the gas industry: “The mitigation of climate change has become one of the most important issues for the gas industry”\textsuperscript{24}. The main targets for lobbyists include documents related to Energy Roadmap 2050, which sets out a possible energy scenario for the EU that would coincide with the goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80-95% as compared to 1990 levels until 2050\textsuperscript{25}, and Horizon 2020, a new EU programme with a 80bn Euro budget for research and innovation from 2014-2020\textsuperscript{26}.

**Protagonists in the shale gas battle**

At the forefront of those lobbying MEPs and the European Commission are big oil and gas producers from the US including ExxonMobil, Chevron and Halliburton, European companies like Statoil, PGNiG, Shell and Total, as well as representatives from the chemical industry. On the other side, a handful of civil society organisations are raising environmental concerns, lobbying for a ban on fracking or at least a strict regulatory framework\textsuperscript{27}.

The EU Transparency Register\textsuperscript{28} reveals that the battle to influence the European institutions is far from balanced. Companies such as Exxon and Shell have declared spending several millions of euros per year representing their interests to EU institutions, and these figures may well be underestimated\textsuperscript{29}. Needless to say, they already far exceed the total annual budget of environmental organisations\textsuperscript{30}. Halliburton and Marathon Oil have not even registered, even though they have contacted the Commission regarding shale gas several times\textsuperscript{31}.

Corporate interests are backed by a number of powerful industry associations such as the European employers’ confederation, BusinessEurope and Eurogas, an association representing the European gas wholesale, retail and distribution sectors.

Apart from big oil and gas, another influential sector is closely observing the debate around shale gas: big money. Financial institutions like Deutsche Bank and Ernst&Young have commissioned studies about shale gas prospects in Europe\textsuperscript{32}.

**With a little help from your PR friends**

Professional lobby firms such as Burson-Marsteller and Fleishman-Hillard are also involved, hired by the oil and gas industry to provide guidance through the European legislative jungle\textsuperscript{33}, support in addressing MEPs and organising events\textsuperscript{34}. Those two firms alone maintain an army of more than 100 lobbyists, most equipped with access badges for the European Parliament. Emails sent to MEPs and Commission representatives show that they are also active on shale gas. Fleishman-Hillard is working on shale gas on behalf of ExxonMobil and FTI Consulting is working for Halliburton.

Talisman Energy, a US-company specialised in shale gas drilling and Marathon Oil, also involved in shale development in the US, rely on Hill+Knowlton Strategies for their
communications with the Commission\textsuperscript{35}. The PR firm also supports America’s Natural Gas Alliance (ANGA) which is trying to greenwash shale gas development in the US. In the 1950s, the same company conducted a huge campaign on behalf of the tobacco industry in the US, masking the links between tobacco and lung cancer\textsuperscript{36}.

A Polish “Flame of Hope” for Shale Gas

“Shale gas will be a priority under the Polish EU presidency,” said a Polish government official in the run-up to the Polish EU Presidency in the second half of 2011\textsuperscript{37}. At the same time the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs had a contract with Burson-Marsteller for around 0.5 million Euro, making it the firm’s third largest client in 2011\textsuperscript{38}.

A Polish “Flame of Hope” for shale gas shone in the European Union, not only because of the Polish EU Presidency, but also thanks to a campaign of the same name launched by PGNiG, Poland’s largest oil and gas company which holds most of the country’s shale gas exploration licenses\textsuperscript{39}. According to the company, the campaign was “designed to indicate to the European Parliament that unconventional gas development has broad support, and that it should not be subject to any action that would impact its prospects negatively”\textsuperscript{40}.

The Polish government also hired academic support from Oxford professor Dieter Helm, who “assisted the Polish government in their presidency of the European Union Council”\textsuperscript{41}. Whereas the eloquent university professor was previously known as an advocate of nuclear power\textsuperscript{42}, he now seems to have jumped on the gas train, while continuing to attack renewables. “The idea that a European economy built on wind farms and solar panels can be either environmentally or economically sustainable is implausible. (...) Gas offers a transitional way of getting emissions down, and Europe can get out of coal and into gas at limited cost,” he wrote\textsuperscript{43}. Despite his clear partiality, Helm was appointed by the European Commission as chair of the advisory group on the Energy Roadmap 2050\textsuperscript{44}.

Preparing the ground in the Commission
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Documents obtained through the freedom of information regulation show that representatives from DG Energy, DG Environment and DG Climate all met with numerous corporate lobbyists on the subject of shale gas development in Europe. Thirteen formal meetings between the Commission and representatives from ExxonMobil, Talisman Energy, Shell, Statoil, Halliburton, Chevron and GDF Suez relating to shale gas were held between January and August 2012.

DG Energy seems to be on particularly friendly terms with the industry: email conversations obtained through access to documents request often are in a colloquial tone, and corporate lobbyists are often addressed on a first-name basis.

**Drinking to Shale gas in the Parliament**

You need bait to catch a fish – and free drinks to win the favour of parliamentary assistants. At least this seemed to be the approach during Gas Week 2012, a four-day long event in April 2012 inside the Parliament, organised by GasNaturally, a group that unites several players from the gas industry, and the International Oil and Gas Producers Association (OGP). The event followed the publication of the two parliamentary draft reports on shale gas. Speakers during the week included representatives from ExxonMobil, Chevron, Total, GDF Suez, and OMV who are all or hope to be involved in shale gas projects across Europe. In contrast, there was only one single speaker from a civil society organisation during the entire week.

One day before the Parliament's Environment Committee voted on the report on shale gas, the rapporteur, Boguslaw Sonik MEP, and his Polish compatriot Bogdan Foot on the gas, Corporate Europe Observatory, November 2012
Marcinkiewicz MEP (both from the European People's Party) hosted a dinner debate on shale gas, co-organised with Lewiatan, the Polish Confederation of Private Employers. Given that Marcinkiewicz is also Chairman of the Board of two gas companies, CETUS Energetyka Gazowa and LNG-SILESIA, it is not really surprising that the event was almost entirely uncritical.

Whereas many more events on shale gas were supported by the industry, there has been just one event inside the Parliament co-organised by a civil society organisation, allowing critical voices to be heard. A study on the global warming potential of shale gas presented during the event triggered a storm of protest on the Parliament's mailing list, inter alia defaming it as “a biased piece of propaganda”.

Brussels Bubble
Shale gas has also been on the agenda at the European Energy Forum (EEF), one of the many informal (ie untransparent) "intergroups" which provide industry with access to MEPs.

The EEF's stated mission is to provide a place for debate with those holding economic, legislative or executive power. It has been referred to as a "submarine of the energy industry" as it gives energy companies the opportunity to share their views with Parliament and Commission representatives on a regular basis. While MEPs pay a symbolic membership fee, companies buy access for a minimum of 7000 euro per year. Among the members are a number of companies involved in the shale gas business: Chevron, Eni, Eurogas, ExxonMobil, GDF Suez, OMV, OGP, Orlen, PGNiG, Shell, Statoil and Total. Civil society organisations are not invited. EEF has organised at least two dinner debates on shale gas in Strasbourg since 2010. Details of who took part have not been disclosed.

Lobbyists also have the chance to mingle with MEPs and Commission representatives at numerous other conferences and events. Shale Gas World is one of the largest events of that kind in Europe, bringing together shale gas operators and political decision makers once a year in Poland, with the conference's motto to keep the “foot on the gas”. In the run-up to the event, the organisers invited shale gas stakeholders to an exclusive “Shale Gas Networking Party” in Warsaw.

Buy an expert or become one yourself
Think tanks function as another important vehicle for the shale gas industry’s message. The Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), one of the most important think tanks in Brussels, organised the European Gas Policy Forum 2012, sponsored by Exxon and Chevron. This bought them a presence on the platform, prominent branding and a place at a pre-conference VIP dinner, advertised as “bringing together speakers and senior policy decision makers to discuss shale gas development”. The price of the sponsorship: 10 000 euro

The Polish Kosciuszko Institute, which supported the European Gas Policy Forum, advertises itself as “an independent and non-governmental research institute”. However, the institute’s views on shale gas are anything but independent. Its Unconventional Gas - a Chance for Poland and Europe? project is mainly financed by PGNiG. Shale Gas? “Yes, we can!”, the title of one of their publications, also seems to be the slogan of the institute’s crusade in Brussels. In another paper, they call for industry-financed propaganda films on shale gas in order to influence the European debate: “It is recommended to produce information spots and a series of scientific films for the general public, resembling for instance the recently released film “Truthland”, a response to the film “Gasland”, which was highly critical of shale gas.”

Except Gasland was a low-budget documentary produced by independent filmmaker Josh Fox, and Truthland was financed by the Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA).

Most European studies and assessments about shale gas draw on the US experience, where a lot of supposedly independent studies were in fact financed by the gas industry or written by scientists with vested financial interests. The same story now seems to be repeated in Europe. And academia is not the only target.

**Concerted intervention into public discourse**

Total financed a media trip for French journalists to the US, including three journalists from Le Monde. The company’s investment in the media trip paid off, as the newspaper went on to call for a rethink of the country’s current ban on hydraulic fracturing. The fact that Jean-Michel Bezat failed to mention that the trip for his reportage was paid for by Total created a small scandal.

In the UK, The Telegraph (online) has benefited from Statoil’s financial support in its Fuelling the UK series. European newsite Euractiv has “communication partnerships” with ExxonMobil, GDFSuez and Total.

Companies also seek to provide the public with their own information - not always in a transparent way. ExxonMobil’s platform on unconventional gas, for example, heads the results in a Google search for “Shale gas in Europe”. While the content is highly biased, the fact that it comes from Exxon is carefully hidden in the small print. ExxonMobil has also found a way to bring its message straight into people’s living rooms: TV advertisements running in several countries show the company’s employees talking about the great potential for shale gas exploration, how safe it is, and also how concerned they are about environmental issues. According to a presentation by an ExxonMobil representative, these ads are part of ExxonMobil’s public awareness campaign in Germany, that is regarded as exemplary.

Centrica, Eni, E.ON Ruhrgas, Gazprom Export, GDF SUEZ, Qatar Petroleum, Shell and Statoil have set up the European Gas Advocacy Forum (EGAF), which advocates greater reliance on natural gas.
Greenwashing (shale) gas – highlights from the industry

In the face of climate change, it is not advisable to be against renewables too openly. Players from the gas industry, such as the European Gas Advocacy Forum (EGAF), have therefore resorted to praising gas as “a good match with renewables”\textsuperscript{76}. A clever move, as it is widely accepted that natural gas will be needed for a transition period\textsuperscript{77}. But whereas environmental organisations advocate scenarios where renewables account for up to 80\% of the energy supply in 2050, reports circulated by the gas industry such as Making the Green Journey Work\textsuperscript{78}, advocate only 30-34\% of renewables in 2050. The gap comes from a significantly higher share of gas and nuclear, with the gas industry relying on the use of carbon capture and storage (CCS) in their projections. This means renewables and natural gas are more rivals than ideal partners, particularly when it comes to long-term infrastructure investments.

The cost of fossil fuels

Another evergreen argument is that renewable energy is expensive compared to supposedly competitive and cheap fossil fuels and nuclear energy. “Wind power is a folly for which businesses and, let us not forget, domestic consumers pay dearly,”\textsuperscript{79} according to an article in The Telegraph’s Fuelling the UK series. An EGAF-report similarly concludes that the EU would save enormous amounts of money by choosing gas instead of renewables, ignoring the enormous amounts of public money subsidising fossil fuels and nuclear\textsuperscript{80}.

Gas as a climate-friendly alternative

“Gas produces significantly cleaner energy than other fossil fuels”, according to Shale Gas Europe, an online platform on shale gas recently launched by Chevron, Cuadrilla Resources, Halliburton, Shell, Statoil and Total\textsuperscript{81}. While this may be true, it fails to mention that natural gas still is a fossil fuel emitting significant amounts of greenhouse gases. And the greenhouse gas balance for shale gas is even worse than for conventional natural gas\textsuperscript{82}.

In addition, the drop in global gas prices due to the shale gas boom in the US could thwart the development of renewable energies around the globe. Fatih Birol, chief economist to the International Energy Agency (IEA) has therefore warned: “A golden
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age for gas is not necessarily a golden age for the climate\textsuperscript{83}.

**Downplaying risks of shale gas**

Last but not least, the industry is trying to downplay the dangers from shale gas development. According to Shale Gas Europe, “(t)here is absolutely no difference” between shale gas and natural gas\textsuperscript{84}. But while the gas might have the same chemical composition, the crucial difference is the technology used for extraction, and the environmental and health risks entailed.

Despite that, the exact composition of fracking additives is protected by the patent law in the US and does not have to be disclosed\textsuperscript{85}. Halliburton is now hoping for similar rules in Europe, as an internal email from DG Energy shows: “In the fringes I also quickly met Halliburton. Their intention is to lobby against full disclosure of the additives in fracturing fluids”\textsuperscript{86}. In order to avoid mandatory rules, companies try to get away with voluntary codes of conduct.

In the meantime, other companies like ExxonMobil and Chevron are trying to convince the public and the Commission (documents obtained through freedom of information regulation) of the harmlessness of fracking fluids by claiming that the same substances are used in household products.

![Typical Chemical Additives Used In Frac Water](image)

**A new cold war on gas?**

Polish politicians are particularly concerned that legislation from Brussels...
might prevent the country from fully exploiting its domestic shale gas resources. Poland sees shale gas as a way of becoming more independent from reliance on Russia, who is accused of charging the former Eastern block higher prices for its gas than the rest of Europe\textsuperscript{87}.

This move towards shale gas is also supported by the current US government which launched an Unconventional Gas Technical Engagement Program (UGTEP) in 2010 “in order to help countries seeking to utilize their unconventional natural gas resources to identify and develop them safely and economically”\textsuperscript{88}. US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has toured Poland and other Eastern European countries, advocating shale gas development\textsuperscript{89}.

"We strongly support Lithuania's energy independence strategy, which includes regional development of nuclear power, liquefied natural gas, unconventional oil and gas, as well as gas and electricity links between the Baltic States and the rest of the European Union," Clinton said during a visit to the Baltic country\textsuperscript{90}. Chevron and Transatlantic Petroleum, which both hoped to drill for unconventional gas in Bulgaria\textsuperscript{91}, sponsored the National Day celebrations of the Bulgarian Embassy to the United States\textsuperscript{92}.

Media report a new cold war over shale gas, claiming that the US engagement in Eastern Europe as well as in countries like India and China is not purely motivated by economic interests, but is also aimed at reducing Russia's geopolitical influence in emerging economies. “The conflict is not over which type of regime these countries have, but over how dependent they are on Russian energy supply”\textsuperscript{93}.

**Conclusion**

The gas industry is pulling out all the stops in order to avoid new environmental regulations for shale gas at the EU level. The two parliamentary reports on shale gas provide some evidence of industry's influence. With their vote on shale gas expected in November, the European Parliament will have the opportunity to give a clear sign for the need to regulate shale gas development.

Shale gas not only poses unforeseeable risks to the environment, the climate and human health, it could also undermine the development of renewable energies and lock Europe into even deeper fossil fuel dependency. Although this contradicts the EU's commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, gas in combination with carbon capture and storage is now being promoted as a green alternative by the industry.

Trend-setting documents for Europe's energy future like Roadmap 2050 and Horizon 2020 are the next targets for the corporate lobby machinery. Investment in renewable energy is at risk from greenwashed fossil fuel extraction. Instead of pressing the last drops of fossil fuels out of the Earth's crust, it is time to turn to real alternatives. But switching to new solutions will not be easy, given the tenacity and extent of the gas lobby.
## Appendix 1

### Shale gas lobbying in Europe - a timeline

(yellow indicates industry lobbying activity, green shows action by member states)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/09/07</td>
<td>European Energy Forum (EEF), OGP</td>
<td>Dinner Debate in Strasbourg: Unconventional gas and sustainable energy: myth versus reality, speaker: Beate Raabe OGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/05</td>
<td>French government</td>
<td>Moratorium on hydraulic fracturing in France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/06</td>
<td>EP, Environment Committee (ENVI)</td>
<td>Publication of report on unconventional gas: Impact assessment on shale gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/07/01-12/31</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>EU Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/09/30</td>
<td>PGNiG</td>
<td>Launch Flame of Hope Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/01/18</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Ban on hydraulic fracturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/03/30</td>
<td>EP, Industry Committee (ITRE)</td>
<td>Publication of the Committee’s draft report on shale gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/04/11</td>
<td>EP, Environment Committee (ENVI)</td>
<td>Publication of the Committee’s draft report on shale gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/04/23-27</td>
<td>OGP, GasNaturally</td>
<td>Gas Week 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/05/15</td>
<td>EP, Industry Committee (ITRE)</td>
<td>Deadline for amendments for ITRE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/05/22</td>
<td>European Energy Forum (EEF), ExxonMobil</td>
<td>Dinner Debate in Strasbourg: Unconventional Natural Gas: an opportunity for a new indigenous energy source for Europe, speaker: Tristan Aspray, ExxonMobil’s Exploration Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/05/29</td>
<td>EP, Environment Committee (ENVI)</td>
<td>Deadline for amendments for ENVI report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/09</td>
<td>European Commission DG Environment</td>
<td>Publication of report on unconventional gas: Support to the identification of potential risks for the environment and human health arising from hydrocarbons operations involving hydraulic fracturing in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/09</td>
<td>European Commission DG Climate</td>
<td>Publication of report on unconventional gas: Impact of potential shale gas production in the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/09/18</td>
<td>Lewiatan, MEP Boguslaw Sonik</td>
<td>Dinner Debate for MEPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Details</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/09/18</td>
<td>EP, Industry Committee (ITRE)</td>
<td>ITRE report voted in Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/09/19</td>
<td>EP, Environment Committee (ENVI)</td>
<td>ENVI report voted in Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/09/24</td>
<td>European Energy Forum (EEF)</td>
<td>OMV Dinner debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/10/03</td>
<td>CEPS, supported by Chevron, ExxonMobil</td>
<td>European Gas Policy Forum, Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/11</td>
<td>European Parliament</td>
<td>Plenary votes on the two shale gas reports expected in November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Expected to come up with a proposal on shale gas regulation, the consultation process between DG Energy, DG Environment, and DG Climate has already started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2

Overview of resources spent on lobbying activities by companies, industry associations and professional consultancies, inter alia working on shale gas

### Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Lobbyists</th>
<th>Total Lobbying Budget (in €)</th>
<th>Country involved in shale gas exploration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chevron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300000 - 350000 (2011)</td>
<td>Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, US, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExxonMobil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 750 000 - 5 000 000 (2010)</td>
<td>Poland (pulled out), Germany, US, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250 000 - 300 000 (01/2011-07/2011)</td>
<td>Austria (pulled out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGNiG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>350 000 - 400 000 (2011)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 750 000 - 5 000 000 (2011)</td>
<td>Sweden, US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statoil</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>250 000 – 300 000 (2011)</td>
<td>US, Australia, interested in European market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talisman Energy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300 000 - 350 000 (01/2012-08/2012)</td>
<td>Poland, Canada, US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 250 000 - 2 500 000 (2011)</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Industry associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Lobbyists</th>
<th>Total Lobbying Budget</th>
<th>Members (inter alia)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eurogas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 007 500 (2011)</td>
<td>GDF Suez, OMV, PGNiG, Shell, Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Chemical Industry Council (cefic)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6 000 000 (10/2011-09/2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GasNaturally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>360 000 (09/2011-09/2012)</td>
<td>Eurogas, OGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Association of Oil &amp; Gas Producers (OGP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>987 000 (2011)</td>
<td>Chevron, ExxonMobil, GDF Suez, Marathon Oil, OMV, Shell, Statoil, Talisman Energy, Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Consultancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Lobbyists</th>
<th>Total Lobbying Budget</th>
<th>Shale Gas Clients and respective turnover (in €)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Financial Range (Year)</td>
<td>Companiess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burson-Marsteller</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8 755 000 (2011)</td>
<td>Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs: 500 000 - 600 000, ExxonMobil: 200 000 - 250 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleishman-Hillard</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9 915 957 (2011)</td>
<td>ExxonMobil: 350 000 - 400 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTI Consulting</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3 500 000 - 3 750 000 (2010)</td>
<td>Halliburton: 150 000 - 200 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill &amp; Knowlton Strategies</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4 550 000 (2011)</td>
<td>Talisman Energy: 50 000 - 100 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(if not otherwise stated, all data from the EU's Transparency Register, last accessed on 29.10.2012)

**Footnotes for table:**


iii [www.exxonmobil.com/Corporate/energy_production_hf.aspx](http://www.exxonmobil.com/Corporate/energy_production_hf.aspx)
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