

Qatar to maintain its position as world's largest LNG producer: NBK



With non-oil growth expected to taper as the government's investment programme reaches an advanced phase, Qatar has turned back to gas/liquefied natural gas (LNG) production as it intends to maintain its position as the world's largest LNG producer, according to NBK.

Non-oil growth is expected to taper with the government's investment programme reaching an advanced phase; only four years remain for many of the high-profile infrastructure projects, such as the metro, light rail system and stadia, to be completed in time for the 2022 FIFA World Cup, it said in a report.

The \$7.4bn Hamad Port, which Qatar plans to develop into a regional transport hub and with which Doha hopes to bypass trade sanctions, was officially inaugurated at the end of 2017, leaving only a handful of projects left for the authorities to eke out future output gains, it said.

"Attention, therefore, has turned back to gas/LNG production," NBK said, adding in the short term, the delayed 1.4bn cubic feet per day Barzan gas facility should finally come on line in the fourth quarter of 2018, supplying additional volumes of gas and condensates; while in the medium term, Qatar's intention to expand liquefaction capacity by 30% to 100mn tonnes per annum will significantly boost growth in the hydrocarbon sector.

Qatar's economic growth is expected to edge up slightly in 2018 to 1.7%, following last year's growth of 1.5%, before accelerating to 2.2% in 2019.

The economic activity will benefit from output gains in both the hydrocarbon (+0.3%) and non-hydrocarbon sectors (+3.3%),

with the former witnessing an expansion in crude and LNG production and the latter benefitting from the government's \$200bn infrastructure spending programme.

Qatar's public finances appear to be on a sound footing following the government's fiscal consolidation efforts (cuts to subsidies, merging of ministries etc.), which brought public expenditures down by 12% in 2017, and the rise in oil and gas prices, it said.

"The fiscal deficit should continue to narrow to 1.2% of GDP (gross domestic product) by 2019, helped by firmer energy prices and additional non-hydrocarbon revenue streams, such as value added tax," it said.

The deficit has been financed primarily by domestic debt, although Qatar returned to the international bond markets in April with a successful \$12bn bond sale.

Meanwhile, Qatar Central Bank's international reserves appear to have recovered to \$24.7bn in May; around \$20bn was tapped in 2017 to stem the capital outflows.

NBK said public debt is expected to peak at 57.8% of GDP this year, before falling to 54.3% of GDP in 2019.

Fracking



Fracking to extract oil and natural gas from shale rock has produced a flood of energy in the U.S. and Canada, lowered fuel prices and created tens of thousands of jobs. It's helped the two countries lessen their dependence on foreign energy and cut their use of coal, the dirtiest fossil fuel, by almost a third since 2008. At the same time, fracking is associated with earthquakes, greenhouse-gas emissions and water and air pollution. Fracking raises questions about whether the benefits justify the costs,

whether the minuses can be diminished through technology and regulation, or whether fracking presents a threat so grave it must be banned, an action many communities have taken.

The Situation

Hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, was largely responsible for a 52 percent increase in U.S. oil and gas output from 2008 to 2015 and has made the country one of the world's biggest producers of the two fuels. Fracking generates a little more than half the oil and gas the U.S. produces today. The practice has yet to take off outside North America. Environmental concerns have provoked a backlash, with bans or limits imposed by several European countries, Canada's Quebec province and, in the U.S., the states of New York, Vermont and Maryland and hundreds of counties and municipalities. Saudi Arabia and other members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries tried to drive North American frackers out of business starting in 2014 by flooding the market to push down oil prices. The biggest crash in the price of crude in a generation put some frackers out of business and prompted others to scale back. In 2016, U.S. crude production declined 5.7 percent and gas output fell 1.7 percent. After slashing costs by more than a quarter by adopting more efficient drilling techniques, the fracking industry began to rejuvenate in 2017. At the same time, U.S. President Donald Trump began to reduce energy regulations.

The Background

The first commercial use of fracking was in 1949 in Oklahoma. The technique involves forcing water mixed with sand and chemicals into a well to create fissures in shale rock so the oil or gas trapped inside escapes. Advances in another innovation, horizontal drilling, came in the early 1980s and provided access to shallow layers of shale deep underground. The subsequent exploitation of the Barnett Shale formation in

Texas proved large-scale fracking was economically viable, not least because of high oil and gas prices.

The Argument

Advocates of fracking point out that abundant gas has let many U.S. power plants abandon coal, helping drive down energy-related carbon emissions 12 percent from 2005 to 2015. It's also decreased U.S. dependence on Persian Gulf oil, with U.S. net energy imports as a share of consumption in recent years hovering around 10 percent – levels last seen in the 1980s. The environmental risks of fracking, proponents argue, can be mitigated. For instance, operators can reduce leaks of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, by testing and repairing pressure safety valves. Pollution of nearby water sources can be minimized by ensuring that oil and gas wells are properly sealed with cement. Fracking's champions say the risks of small earthquakes – linked mainly to the injection of wastewater into underground wells – can be lessened by mapping deep-rock formations and avoiding areas where tremors might result. They say frackers can trim their tremendous consumption of fresh water by recycling wastewater or using foam or gel as alternatives. Opponents say fracking is inherently too hazardous to tolerate. They say that methane leaks not only offset the greenhouse-gas savings from fracking but could outweigh them. Critics say strictly enforced nationwide regulations are required before operators would make investments that might curb environmental risks. They argue that the oil and gas industry has the power to block comprehensive regulation, and that the Trump administration has no interest in such oversight in any case. That leaves in place an existing patchwork of gap-filled laws. Opponents argue that the abundance of fossil fuels fracking produces will prove a curse because it will delay the development of renewable alternatives and thus impede the effort to slow global warming.

Court Orders U.A.E. to Let Expelled Qataris Back In



CAIRO – The top United Nations court intervened Monday in the bitter political feud dividing the Persian Gulf, ordering the United Arab Emirates to allow the return of Qatari citizens expelled from the country last year.

The provisional order by the International Court of Justice, which is based in The Hague, is expected to have limited concrete effect. The court has no powers of enforcement and the United Arab Emirates, in response to the verdict, insisted it was already in compliance with it.

But the decision, by the most prominent international body to rule on the dispute, struck a symbolic blow to the punishing trade and diplomatic embargo that the United Arab Emirates and its allies – Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Bahrain – have been pressing against Qatar for the past year in an effort to isolate the tiny and fabulously wealthy nation.

“This sends an early, strong signal that there will be no tolerance shown to countries that take arbitrary measures against Qataris,” Lulwa al-Khater, a spokeswoman for Qatar’s foreign ministry, said in comments published by Qatar’s state media.

The ruling may have its biggest impact in the battle for influence in Western capitals and international bodies, where Qatar and its foes have spent tens of millions of dollars in the past year on conferences, lawyers, news media advertisements and Washington lobbyists.

The court order “marks another blow to the blockade, which has failed from the beginning to gain support from the international community,” said Kristian Coates Ulrichsen, a fellow for the Middle East at Rice University’s Baker Institute for Public Policy.

Qatar’s foes initially enjoyed loud support from President Trump, who appeared to side with their accusations that Qatar was financing Islamist terrorist groups and was secretly in league with Iran. Qatar denied the charges, saying it was being targeted for its outspoken TV network, Al Jazeera.

American officials pointed out that Qatar was home to a major American military air base, and Mr. Trump later backed off. In April he welcomed Qatar’s emir, Tamim bin Hamad al-Thani, to the White House, where Mr. Trump hailed him as a “great friend.”

In the complaint filed to the International Court of Justice last month, Qatar argued that the United Arab Emirates breached an international convention on racism when it expelled thousands of Qatari citizens in the opening weeks of the embargo in June 2017.

Under the ruling issued Monday, the United Arab Emirates must allow families with a Qatari member that were separated to be reunited, and Qatari students who were expelled must be allowed to resume classes or obtain records to continue elsewhere. A third order stipulated that Qataris should be allowed to seek legal redress in the United Arab Emirates.

The orders do not constitute a final ruling, and it could be years before the full case is heard and decided.

The United Arab Emirates minister of state for foreign affairs, Anwar Gargash, attempted to put a positive spin on the decision, saying in a Twitter post that the judges had refused six other Qatari demands.

Mr. Gargash said his government had already met the “conditions required” by the court ruling.

Actors offered money by UK casting agency to take part in ‘anti-Qatar event’ outside Downing Street



A UK casting agency has been offering actors money to take part in an “anti-Qatar event” outside Downing Street during a meeting between Theresa May and the ruler of the Arab country.

The Independent has seen an email sent to extras offering £20 per person to take part in the supposed protest from 11am until 12.30pm on Tuesday, just before Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani is due to arrive at No 10.

“This is NOT a film or TV production,” casting agency Extra People said in the email to their actors. “The company are looking for a large group of people to fill space outside Downing Street during the visit of the president of Quatar (sic). This is an ANTI-Qatar event – You will not have to do or say anything, they just want to fill space. You will be finished at 12:30.”

Extra People told *The Independent* it was “contacted by an individual” to “source people” for the event, but refused to reveal the identity of the client.

At 8.15pm, shortly after media reports first began to

circulate about the job offer, the agency sent another mass email to its extras saying “on reflection” it would not be involved “in such a project”.

A spokesperson said the agency decided to cancel the project having begun “to understand what the hirer was asking of our artistes and the event involved” after “receiving further information”.

“We quickly made the decision to withdraw our involvement and wish to have no association with the event,” he added.

The planned event comes amid a visit to Britain by Mr al-Thani aimed at promoting Qatar in the face of a year-long blockade by four neighbouring states – Saudi Arabia, Egypt, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Bahrain.

They accuse Qatar of funding Islamist terrorism, supporting extremists and fostering ties with Saudi’s arch-rival Iran.

Qatar in turn has accused Saudi Arabia, its biggest neighbour, of “bullying” and risking a new conflict amid the ongoing diplomatic crisis.

On Tuesday, the UAE was ordered by the United Nations’ highest court to immediately allow Qatari families affected by the dispute between the countries to reunite.

The International Court of Justice in The Hague imposed the measure before it hears the full case filed by Qatar at a later date.

According to Qatar, which filed the suit in June, the UAE has as part of the boycott expelled thousands of Qataris, blocked transport and closed down the offices of the Doha-based Al-Jazeera news channel.

The UAE had argued the case was without merit and should be dismissed.

Questions raised over paid protest timed for Qatari leader's No 10 visit



A casting agency advertised for paid extras to come and stand outside the gates of Downing Street when the emir of Qatar visits on Tuesday, amid accusations that the country's Gulf rivals are paying protesters to oppose the country's activities and create the impression of an upswell of British support against the country.

"This is NOT a film or TV production," said the advert from booking agency Extra People, offering £20 to respondents willing to take part. "The company are looking for a large group of people to fill space outside Downing Street during the visit of the president of Quatar [sic]. You will not have to do or say anything, they just want to fill space."

A Qatari diplomat pointed the finger at the country's regional rivals, who have placed it under an economic blockade since last year, creating a vicious and expensive media war often fought through lobbyists, online advertising and selective leaks to journalists in the UK and US.

"The blockading countries have a long history of using paid protesters to try and discredit those who do not agree with their views," said the Qatari diplomat. "Despite their latest attempts to spread lies about Qatar, the visit of HH the Emir has further strengthened the historic and strategic partnership between Qatar and the UK."

The casting agency later retracted the advert and said that

they did not want to be involved in providing extras for the event, which was arranged to coincide with the arrival of Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani to meet prime minister Theresa May.

“Upon receiving further information about the event, which regrettably was after our enquiry went out to our artistes, we began to understand what the hirer was asking of our artistes and the event involved,” said a spokesperson for the booking agency.

The agency declined to identify their client but said they backed out when they realised the event would involve the extras protesting outside the gates of Downing Street.

There have also been separate claims that attendees were paid to take part in an earlier anti-Qatar protest outside parliament on Monday afternoon. Protesters at the earlier event waved placards referring to allegations Qatar paid up to \$1bn to terrorist groups as a ransom for 28 members of a royal hunting party kidnapped in Iraq.

The advert raises questions over the growing influence of Gulf money in the UK, with the ongoing political struggle between Qatar and the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia. It follows an agreement by the Independent to licence its brands to a publishing business with close links to the Saudi government to produce Middle Eastern versions of its publications.

A series of anti-Qatar adverts have appeared on billboards around London, while other adverts highlighted the country's treatment of migrant workers, its record on LGBT rights, and the continued existence of an absolute monarchy.

Many of the protests were also attended by British-based Qatari businessman Khalid Al-Hail. He has previously organised a “Qatari opposition” conference in London featuring paid speakers, such as the former cabinet minister Iain Duncan Smith and the BBC journalist John Simpson.

Al-Hail has also been linked to a high-profile big budget football conference opposing corruption in sport, which was attended by Tory MP Damian Collins and footballer Louis Saha, and focused on criticism of the decision to award Qatar the right to host the 2022 World Cup.

Qatar's successful bid to host tournament has been beset by widespread allegations of corruption and poor conditions for workers building the stadiums.

Qatari-funded news network al-Jazeera has previously claimed that extras were paid to protest against the Qatari government at events in Germany.

International Court of Justice orders UAE to protect Qatari citizens' rights



QNA/ The Hague

***Provisional verdict calls for reunion of Qatari-UAE mixed families, opportunity for Qatari students to complete their studies and Qataris access to judicial services in the UAE**

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) on Monday issued an order granting Qatar's request for provisional measures against the United Arab Emirates (UAE) in a case relating to the UAE's unlawful and discriminatory treatment of Qatari citizens.

The court's order requires the UAE to immediately allow Qatari-UAE mixed families, who were separated due to UAE procedures, to reunite.

The ICJ also said Qatari students should be given the

opportunity to complete their studies in the UAE or to retain records of their studies to be able to continue their education elsewhere.

The court also ruled that Qataris should be allowed access to judicial services in the UAE.

Qatar had moved the ICJ against the backdrop of discriminatory measures imposed by the UAE against Qatari nationals since June 2017.

The measures included the forced expulsion of all Qatari nationals from the UAE within two weeks, banning them from entering or passing through its territories and closing UAE airspace and seaports to Qatar.

In its complaint, Qatar said that the UAE has deprived Qatari companies and individuals of their property and deposits, and rejected their basic access to education, treatment and courts in the UAE. Through the ICJ, Qatar demanded that the UAE return all the rights to Qataris and compensate them for the damages.

The UAE's actions have been widely condemned by numerous independent human rights organisations, including Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and Reporters Without Borders.

Qatar filed its application instituting proceedings under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) before the ICJ on June 11, 2018. The same day, it also requested the court, as a matter of urgency, to order provisional measures protecting the Qatari people from discrimination while proceedings are ongoing.

In granting Qatar's request for provisional measures, the court noted that Qatar has offered to negotiate with the UAE on the implementation of the CERD, but Abu Dhabi has not responded.

The ICJ found that the measures enacted by the UAE authorities on June 11, 2017 were intended only for Qatar nationals, which amount to racial discrimination.

HE the Spokesperson for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Lolwah al-Khater welcomed the court's order. She said: "Qatar is very pleased that the court has not been affected by attempts to repudiate and change the facts, and taken decisive steps to minimise their effect on our people."

She went on to say that "this is just the first step in a long struggle to vindicate our rights, but it sends a strong early

signal to the UAE that its actions will not be tolerated. Qatar will now press forward, and we trust the UAE will meet its international obligations and comply with the court's order in the meantime."

The case under CERD represents one aspect of a larger dispute that began on June 5, 2017 when the UAE, along with Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Egypt, imposed an unlawful land, sea and air siege against Qatar and its people as part of a campaign of political and economic coercion.

The ICJ is now expected to set a schedule for further proceedings in the case. Its order will remain in effect until the court issues its final judgement on the merits.

Oil bulls cut and run as US trade war derails market



Bloomberg/New York

Crude oil's biggest plunge in two years has money managers heading for the hills.

Hedge funds cut their net-long position – the difference between wagers on a price gain and bets on a drop – in Brent crude by the most since 2016. Bulls fled the market on concern that the escalating US-China trade war will imperil economic growth, denting oil demand amid signs of mounting supply from the US to Saudi Arabia.

"Extended trade tensions with China threaten global economic growth," said Rob Thummel, managing director at Tortoise Capital Advisors LLC, which manages \$16bn in energy-related assets. An economic slowdown would "negatively impact global crude oil demand growth" as output from Saudi Arabia and Libya rises.

Oil has tumbled from a four-year high in May as President

Donald Trump prepares to slap tariffs on \$500bn of Chinese goods. Though Trump also leaned on Saudi Arabia to lower prices by pumping more, the kingdom said it will actually trim crude exports next month after bolstering production the most in three years in June.

Saudi Arabia "does not try to push oil into the market beyond its customers' needs," the Energy Ministry said in a statement on Thursday.

The world's largest oil exporter is fulfilling a pledge made in late June that the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries and allies including Russia would boost output by about 1mn barrels a day.

Output from Libya rose last week as production from its eastern fields climbed, offsetting thousands of barrels in production lost from the partial shutdown of the country's biggest deposit after gunmen kidnapped workers there. "The return of Libya was a really big thing, and the addition from Saudi Arabia," said James Williams, president of London, Arkansas-based energy researcher WTRG Economics.

The Trump administration, meanwhile, was said to be considering tapping the nation's emergency oil supply to tame rising fuel prices before congressional elections in November, according to people familiar with the matter.

Hedge funds slashed their Brent net-long position by 21% in the week ended July 17 to 353,245 contracts, according to ICE Futures Europe data on futures and options released on Friday. That was the lowest level since August 2017.

Money managers' net-long position in West Texas Intermediate crude fell by 7.4% to 401,690 futures and options, the biggest decline since May, according to US Commodity Futures Trading Commission data released Friday. Longs also slipped 7.4%, while shorts fell 7.5%.

Though crude has recovered from lows reached in late June as Opec weighed an output boost, trade tensions have roiled the market. A measure of crude volatility soared last week to levels last seen almost a year ago.

US supply data, meanwhile, showed mixed signals for the

market. Gasoline held in US storage tanks dropped by the most since May and fuel demand increased, according to government data, overshadowing the biggest increase in American crude inventories since April.

US production gains have “caused some players who don’t have conviction to exit,” said Gene McGillian, manager of market research at Tradition Energy. “We saw some topping out of Brent around \$79 and the idea that the Saudis and Russians were willing to add oil back into the market.”

In the fuel market, money managers trimmed their net-long position in benchmark US gasoline by 9.1%, the first decline in three weeks. The net-bullish position on diesel slid 27%, the most since February.

Exxon Faces Russian Clash as Rosneft Files \$1.4 Billion Claim

Exxon Mobil Corp. faces a legal clash with Russian oil giant Rosneft PJSCover its largest energy project in the country, with a potential liability of more than \$400 million.

Russia’s state-owned oil behemoth filed an arbitration claim alleging “unjust enrichment” against all the Sakhalin-1 co-owners, including its own units, for a total of 89 billion rubles (\$1.41 billion), according to the country’s legal database. The offshore project is Exxon’s flagship in the nation after quitting most of its developments earlier this year due to sanctions. The U.S. company operates the venture with a 30 percent stake.

The press office for Exxon’s unit in Russia said it’s “aware

of the court action, rejects the claims and will take action to defend the rights of the Sakhalin-1 consortium," without elaborating.

Rosneft's claim covers a period from 2015 through to May this year, although no further details were published. Rosneft didn't immediately respond to calls and messages seeking comment.

Sakhalin-1, which pumps more than 200,000 barrels of crude per day, is the only major oil project in Russia still operated by an international company. It's an exception in a nation where state-controlled companies have steadily expanded their control of energy resources, including developments around Sakhalin Island off the Pacific coast.

Kremlin Control

In 2007, during President Vladimir Putin's second term, the Kremlin pressured Royal Dutch Shell Plc to sell a controlling stake in the Sakhalin-2 oil and gas project to Gazprom PJSC. In 2015, Russia's audit chamber told the nation's parliament that the government lost out on about \$5 billion of taxes and other payments from the Sakhalin-1 venture because Exxon failed to increase natural gas sales.

Exxon in turn filed a claim over taxation of Sakhalin-1 three years ago, which last year ended up with an out-of-court deal with the Russian government. Despite halting some drilling earlier this year due to international sanctions, Exxon said it could continue operations at Sakhalin-1 because it predates the 2013 deals that were subject to the restrictions.

An arbitration court of Russia's Sakhalin region registered the Rosneft claim on July 20 and set a preliminary hearing for September 10, according to the legal database. The court asked Rosneft to provide details of an agreement for the development

of a northern tip of Chayvo field off Sakhalin Island. The Moscow-based producer has said it's developing this area on its own, while it's bordering with Sakhalin-1's Chayvo field.

Rosneft units own 20 percent of the Sakhalin-1 project, as does India's ONGC Videsh Ltd. Japan's Sakhalin Oil & Gas Development Co. holds the remaining 30 percent.

Lawmakers, Lobbyists and the Administration Join Forces to Overhaul the Endangered Species Act



WASHINGTON – The Endangered Species Act, which for 45 years has safeguarded fragile wildlife while blocking ranching, logging and oil drilling on protected habitats, is coming under attack from lawmakers, the White House and industry on a scale not seen in decades, driven partly by fears that the Republicans will lose ground in November's midterm elections.

In the past two weeks, more than two dozen pieces of legislation, policy initiatives and amendments designed to weaken the law have been either introduced or voted on in Congress or proposed by the Trump administration.

The actions included a bill to strip protections from the gray wolf in Wyoming and along the western Great Lakes; a plan to keep the sage grouse, a chicken-size bird that inhabits millions of oil-rich acres in the West, from being listed as endangered for the next decade; and a measure to remove from

the endangered list the American burying beetle, an orange-flecked insect that has long been the bane of oil companies that would like to drill on the land where it lives.

“It’s probably the best chance that we have had in 25 years to actually make any substantial changes,” said Richard Pombo, a former congressman from California who more than a decade ago led an attempt to rethink the act and is now a lobbyist whose clients include mining and water management companies.

He and others argue that the act has become skewed toward restricting economic development and Americans’ livelihoods rather than protecting threatened animals.

The new push to undo the wildlife protection law comes as Republicans control the White House and both chambers of Congress, and is led by a president who has made deregulation – the loosening of not only environmental protections but banking rules, car fuel efficiency standards and fair housing enforcement – a centerpiece of his administration.

The Trump administration unveiled its main effort to overhaul the Endangered Species Act on Thursday, when the Interior Department and the Commerce Department proposed fundamental changes to the law. Those include a provision that for the first time could allow the economic consequences of protecting plants or animals to be considered when deciding whether or not they face extinction.

If the proposal is finalized, species that remain on the endangered list would still see their habitats protected, but it would become more difficult to list a new species for protection and easier to remove those now on the list.

The myriad proposals reflect a wish list assembled over decades by oil and gas companies, libertarians and ranchers in Western states, who have long sought to overhaul the law, arguing that it represents a costly incursion of federal

regulations on their land and livelihoods. Until now, those efforts have largely failed, even during periods when Republicans controlled both the White House and Congress.

Advocates of the environmental law agree that the proposals signal a critical moment. "The last few weeks have seen the most coordinated set of attacks on the Endangered Species Act I've faced since I got to Washington," said Representative Raúl Grijalva of Arizona, the ranking Democrat on the House Natural Resources Committee. "This is a crucial test," he said.

The Endangered Species Act was passed by Congress in 1973, and signed by President Richard Nixon at a time when using federal authority to protect threatened species was less controversial. The act has been credited with the resurgence of the American alligator, which had been hunted to near extinction for the use of its skin in purses and other goods; the gray whale, depleted by commercial fishing in parts of the Pacific Ocean; and the bald eagle, which is flourishing again after nearly disappearing from much of the United States.

The federal Fish and Wildlife Service annually spends about \$1.4 billion to protect threatened plants and animals, according to the agency's most recent expenditure report in 2016, an amount that environmentalists say has not kept pace with the need. But industry leaders say that money is wasted protecting species that don't need it and paying green groups' litigation fees.

Take the case of the northern spotted owl, which has been a rallying cry for both sides of the debate since it was listed as threatened in 1990. The logging industry has long blamed the owl habitats for a crippling decline in timber harvests, sparking a vicious battle over restricting the economies and livelihoods of local communities.

But while opponents of the law cite an economic burden, there

has been little comprehensive analysis of the precise economic costs or benefits of either enforcing or revising it.

“Trying to put a number on the cost to industry is incredibly challenging,” said Rebecca Epanchin-Niell, an expert on the economics of the Endangered Species Act at Resources for the Future, a nonpartisan research organization in Washington. Ms. Epanchin-Niell and several other economists noted that given the economic and geographical diversity of the industries affected – oil companies, ranchers, farmers, landowners, real estate developers and others – it is difficult to put a clear price tag on the law’s overall economic effects.

As to the economic benefits of preserving an endangered species, Ms. Epanchin-Niell pointed to what advocates for the law might describe as a “moral obligation” to guard against extinction. “Economists don’t have tools to put a price on these intangible values,” she said.

Efforts in previous presidential administrations to weaken the Endangered Species Act were often met with some bipartisan resistance. But the profile of the Republican Party has changed since then. Over the past decade, opposition to environmental regulations has become a more ingrained part of the G.O.P.’s identity, particularly as exemplified by President Trump.

“This is the first time that we’ve seen an orchestrated effort by the president, the Republican leaders in the House, the industry and the Interior Department all working together in a concentrated effort to eviscerate the act,” said Bruce Babbitt, who served as the interior secretary for eight years in the Clinton administration.

Opponents of the act say the current mood is simply the fruition of decades of ignored attempts to enact reasonable modifications to the law – for instance, government compensation to offset losses when landowners are unable to

use portions of their property deemed critical habitat.

"Anyone who tries to do even modest reform is completely demagogued," said Kathleen Sgamma, president of the Western Energy Alliance, a trade association for the oil and gas industry. Ms. Sgamma said environmental activists and others have also failed to understand how the law has been hurting farmers and ranchers as well as industry.

Brad Goehring, a vineyard owner from California's Central Valley, said he is a prime example. Mr. Goehring said he can't farm on about a quarter of his property because it is considered critical habitat for a freshwater crustacean known as the fairy shrimp.

"Think of the ramifications where you owe the bank money, you have loans to pay off and you're told you can't use all your property," he said. Mr. Goehring ran for Congress as a Republican in 2010 in part on a platform of modifying the act.

While farmers like Mr. Goehring have for years urged Congress to enact changes, the recent push has been led by David Bernhardt, the deputy interior secretary, a former oil lobbyist and lawyer whose legal clients included the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

Last December, Mr. Bernhardt convened a meeting at the Interior Department between senior political appointees and career staffers, at which he laid out his plans to streamline the law. Over the course of the spring, that plan was translated into the policy proposal unveiled on Thursday.

At the same time, on Capitol Hill, the Congressional Western Caucus, a group of House lawmakers, began coordinating a strategy. On July 12, the lawmakers unveiled a package of nine bills that, if enacted, would see more permanent changes to the law than those pushed by Mr. Bernhardt's proposal. Legislation that is passed by Congress and signed into law by the president is less easily undone than regulatory changes.

While it is unclear if the lawmakers' individual bills could become law this year, they also worked to add amendments to two must-pass spending bills, including the National Defense Authorization Act, which specifies the annual budget for the Pentagon.

The House-passed version of that spending bill includes provisions that would prohibit the Interior Department from putting two species of land birds, the sage grouse and the greater prairie chicken, on the endangered species list for at least 10 years. That would ensure that the habitat of those birds, encompassing millions of acres across 11 states, could remain open for oil and gas development. (The Interior Department is also moving forward with a separate regulatory plan to roll back sage grouse protections.)

In past years, such provisions would likely have died in the Senate, chiefly because they were opposed by Senator John McCain, the Republican of Arizona.

But Mr. McCain today is recuperating from brain cancer and has not been active in Washington for several months. Shepherding the measure in his stead is Senator James Inhofe, the Republican of Oklahoma who has made a signature issue of advocacy on behalf of the oil industry and denying the established science of human-caused global warming.

It is expected that Mr. Inhofe will champion a provision in the House defense bill that would remove endangered species protections for the American burying beetle. The insect has a protected habitat in just four states – but one of them is Mr. Inhofe's home state of Oklahoma.

"I think the Endangered Species Act is endangered," said Andrew Rosenberg, director of the Union of Concerned Scientists. "They haven't been able to do this for 20 years, but this looks like their one chance."

Republicans also added at least nine endangered species-

related amendments to the spending bill that funds the Interior Department. Among other provisions, that bill would remove the gray wolf from the endangered species list. It would also prohibit the Interior Department from reintroducing the endangered grizzly bear into the North Cascades ecosystem of Washington State, something lawmakers from the region say could threaten the area's recreation livelihood.

Senator John Barrasso, the Republican of Wyoming who chairs the Environment Committee, introduced a draft bill that overlaps with many of the House proposals.

"We're all aware that the Endangered Species Act hasn't undergone any significant updates in over 40 years," said Representative Rob Bishop, Republican of Utah and chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, in a statement. "Now is the time to modernize this antiquated law to simultaneously benefit both endangered species and the American people."

The UAE Lobby: Subverting British democracy?



A Public Interest Investigation by Spinwatch

On the 17th of July 2018, Public Interest Investigations (PII) presented a report at the House of Commons, publicised on its website Spinwatch, that focused on the UAE's lobbying efforts within the UK. The report illustrated how through the UAE's Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Anwar Gargash and the lobbying firm Quiller Consultants, the UAE initiated a comprehensive campaign of targeting journalists, policymakers,

academics, businessmen, civil servants and MPs between 2011 and 2013. This campaign was designed to, and culminated in, two main policy changes within the UK government between 2011 and 2013. Firstly, the UK's official position vis-à-vis the Morsi regime in Egypt changed from what was tacit support to a more ardently anti-Morsi campaign that served to undermine his presidency and offer support to the Sisi-led coup against him. Secondly, the UK's position against the Muslim Brotherhood and Qatar was made more aggressive as a result of the UAE's lobbying. Both of these policy changes were enforced through the weaponisation of UAE-UK trade deals, such as the BAE's Eurofighter Typhoon jet deal with the UAE.

Aside from the ways in which UAE lobbying influenced UK governmental policy directly, it has also been made clear by the report that the UAE's efforts to affect the British milieu also extend to the dissemination of information via media. Here, there were continuous attempts to both silence supposed Muslim Brotherhood sympathisers in the BBC, BBC Arabic, and in Chatham House. Through multiple complaints, and delegations, sent by the UAE to Number 10 Downing Street, the UAE managed to obtain some tangible results in the obtainment of a reduction, or removal from position, of those critical of the UAE's human rights record and who displayed sympathetic views towards the Muslim Brotherhood. Additionally, aside from the BBC, there has been a general shift in the rhetoric of a number of journalists in the UK as a result of the lobbying. Through briefings between Anwar Gargash and a range of different journalists and academics, including but not limited to individuals such as Con Coughlin and Andrew Gilligan, the UAE managed to fashion an anti-Muslim Brotherhood, anti-Iran, and anti-Qatar echo chamber that spans across a range of different media organisations at the forefront of the provision of news in the UK.

Furthermore, the UAE campaign to penetrate UK political life has also, as noted in the report, extended to efforts to

designate and label senior members of the Qatari royal family as 'terrorists'. As the report notes, the UAE sought to generate research exemplifying the links between the Qatari royal family and terrorism through ICSR and King's College London professor Shiraz Maher. The lobbying firm Quiller discussed a £20,000 a month payment for this research. In turn, this research was intended to be operationalised in order for the government to officially list members of the Qatari royal family as 'terrorists'.

Collectively, therefore, Spinwatch's report provides damning evidence of the ways in which the UAE has penetrated democracy and stifled debate within UK political and social life. This penetration represents a clear breach of our parliamentary democracy and the human right to civil and political freedoms and transparency. The report also calls into question a number of issues so as to ensure a lack of continuity in the tactics used by the UAE. For example, it exemplifies the need for lobbying reform, a closer examination of press regulation, and a more in-depth investigation into the links between governmental pressure and the rhetoric espoused by the BBC. That said, the AOHR UK welcomes these calls for reform and commends Spinwatch and the PII on this ground-breaking report. The report has indeed served to saliently highlight the ways in which democracy in the UK is being eroded by outside entities with clear politicised agendas that contravene the principles of democracy and democratic freedom.