

**Question for written answer E-006436/2015**  
**to the Commission**  
Rule 130  
**Adam Szejnfeld (PPE)**

Subject: Europe's energy security

On the one hand, the monopolistic position of Russian energy firm Gazprom means that it is now a threat not only to Member States, but to the entire EU, for example due to the risk of gas supplies being withheld, price increases, or alterations to transit routes. Direct and indirect blackmail is taking place on a number of levels. This matter seems to be serious, especially in light of aggression on the part of pro-Russian units in Ukraine, attempts to stop the transportation of energy sources through that country, or changes to transit routes, for instance through Turkey and Greece. This can therefore be seen as moves aimed at breaking the unified stance and joint measures taken by the Member States, while they import more than half of the raw materials consumed in the generation of energy, and 20 % of them are entirely dependent upon a single external supplier, Russia.

On the other hand, the EU has a highly restrictive energy and climate policy, in particular towards itself. This gives rise to further dangers with a common denominator. Instead of having a global effect, this limits the competitiveness of European industry, and 'off loads' a portion of this on other regions beyond Europe, along with jobs. There is a danger that this could backfire on us, and will not bring about climate change, will reduce economic competitiveness, increase unemployment, and exacerbate poverty.

In my view we need to take a pragmatic approach towards energy and climate change issues, not a dogmatic one. My question, therefore, is whether the European Commission shares the concerns I have expressed, and what actions does it intend to take to tackle this problem?