Commentary and Critique **Research Commentary**
Vol. 8 (2025) · ISSN 3006-6220 journal.pe.ac/Commentary-and-Critique

Russian LNG After the Pipeline Collapse — A Comtrade Count of the Buyers That Stayed and the One That Left

Farhod Rakhimov[a], Irina Meshkova[a]

[a]Academy of Public Policy and Economics, London E1 0SG, United Kingdom

Corresponding author: Farhod Rakhimov, farhod.rakhimov@pe.ac.

Published 20 December, 2025.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62432/APPE.CC.2025.8.29

Article webpage: https://journal.pe.ac/Commentary-and-Critique/paper/view/208236

Abstract

Russian LNG purchases persisted in several major European markets after the collapse of Russian pipeline-gas deliveries. Using buyer-reported UN Comtrade records for HS 271111, this commentary compares the destination structure over 2019–2024. In the consistent panel of France, Spain and Belgium, imports rose from 5.71 million tonnes in 2020 to 12.81 million tonnes in 2024, an increase of 124.2%. France's purchases rose from 2.20 to 6.34 million tonnes. The three-country total exceeded China's approximately 8.3 million tonnes in 2024, although China was the largest individual buyer in the displayed sample. These trajectories show that the reorientation of Russian LNG combined expansion in China with substantial growth in established European destinations. The comparison distinguishes the LNG market's infrastructure, contractual and policy setting from that of pipeline gas, using a consistent importer panel to establish the scale of continued European purchasing.

Keywords: LNG; Russia; natural gas; sanctions; Comtrade; HS 271111; trade reorientation

1. Pipeline gas and LNG — one commodity, two trajectories

Before February 2022, the European Union was Russia's largest and most lucrative natural-gas market. Russian pipeline gas had flowed into Europe for more than half a century, surviving the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and multiple disputes between Moscow and transit states. By 2021, Russia supplied roughly 40 percent of the EU's gas imports, a share that had been remarkably stable for two decades (International Energy Agency, 2024a).

1.1. The pre-2022 pipeline architecture

The physical infrastructure that carried this gas was extensive and geopolitically significant. Four main corridors linked Russian production fields to European consumers. The Nord Stream 1 pipeline, commissioned in 2011, ran directly from Vyborg in Russia to Lubmin in Germany under the Baltic Sea, with an annual capacity of 55 billion cubic metres (bcm). The Yamal-Europe pipeline, commissioned in 1997, crossed Belarus and Poland and delivered up to 33 bcm per year to German and Polish markets. The Brotherhood pipeline system — the oldest of the four corridors, dating to the Soviet era — transited Ukraine and Slovakia, carrying roughly 40 bcm per year at peak capacity. TurkStream, the newest operational corridor before the invasion, began deliveries through the Black Sea to Turkey and south-eastern Europe in January 2020 with a capacity of 31.5 bcm per year. A fifth corridor, Nord Stream 2, was completed in September 2021 with a further 55 bcm of annual capacity but was halted by the German government on 22 February

© 2025 Academy of Public Policy and Economics · Open Access (CC BY 4.0).

2022, two days before the invasion began, and never entered commercial operation (International Energy Agency, 2024a; Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, 2023).

These pipelines were not neutral infrastructure. They reflected decades of Soviet and Russian strategy to bind European energy consumers to Russian supply, and they gave Moscow substantial leverage over individual transit states, particularly Ukraine, whose transit fees and political relationship with the Kremlin were inextricably linked to the flow of gas through its territory (Stern, 2020).

The contract structures underpinning these flows were equally important. Most Russian pipeline-gas exports to Europe were sold under long-term contracts of 15 to 25 years, with prices indexed to oil products — a structure that insulated both seller and buyer from short-term spot-market volatility. Gazprom, the state-controlled Russian gas monopoly, held a legal export monopoly on pipeline gas under Russian federal law (PJSC Gazprom, 2023). This meant that every molecule of Russian pipeline gas that entered Europe did so through a single, state-directed entity.

1.2. The role of LNG before the war

Alongside this pipeline infrastructure, Europe also imported LNG — natural gas cooled to -162 °C, reduced to 1/600th of its gaseous volume, and shipped in specialised tankers. Before 2022, LNG was a relatively modest component of European gas supply, accounting for roughly 20 percent of EU gas imports (GIIGNL — International Group of Liquefied Natural Gas Importers, 2024). The EU's LNG import capacity was concentrated in the Iberian Peninsula (Spain and Portugal), France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy and the United Kingdom, with smaller terminals in Greece, Lithuania and Poland. Spain alone operated six LNG regasification terminals — more than any other European country — giving it the continent's largest aggregate import capacity.

Russia had entered the LNG market relatively late. Its first and, for many years, only large-scale LNG facility was Sakhalin-2 in the Russian Far East, which began production in 2009. Sakhalin-2 was a joint venture between Gazprom, Shell, and Japanese trading houses Mitsui and Mitsubishi, and most of its output was contracted to Japanese and South Korean buyers under long-term agreements (Japan, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, 2023). The second major Russian LNG project, Yamal LNG — operated by the privately held Russian company Novatek in partnership with Total, CNPC and the Silk Road Fund — began production in December 2017 and was designed primarily to serve European and Asian markets via the Northern Sea Route during summer months and trans-shipment through European terminals in winter (PAO Novatek, 2023). By 2021, Russia was the world's fourth-largest LNG exporter after Australia, Qatar and the United States, with total liquefaction capacity of approximately 30 million tonnes per year across its three operational projects: Sakhalin-2, Yamal LNG and the smaller Vysotsk and Cryogas-Vysotsk facilities in the Baltic (International Gas Union, 2024).

1.3. The February 2022 shock

The Russian invasion of Ukraine on 24 February 2022 triggered the most rapid and comprehensive reorientation of European energy supply in modern history. Within weeks, the EU had adopted sanctions on Russian coal and oil — the fifth and sixth sanctions packages, respectively — and began a deliberate effort to reduce dependence on Russian gas. The REPowerEU plan, published in May 2022, set an explicit target of phasing out Russian fossil fuel imports by 2027 (European Commission, 2024).

The pipeline-gas collapse was swift and severe. Nord Stream 2 was halted before commissioning. Nord Stream 1, after a period of reduced flows that Gazprom attributed to turbine maintenance issues at the Portovaya compressor station, ceased flows on 2 September 2022. Explosions on 26 September subsequently damaged sections of both Nord Stream 1 and Nord Stream 2. The Yamal-Europe pipeline stopped flowing east-to-west in late 2022 after Russia imposed counter-sanctions on the Polish section of the pipeline's operator. The transit contract through Ukraine — the last remaining pipeline corridor

carrying Russian gas to Central Europe — expired on 31 December 2024 and was not renewed. By mid-2023, Russian pipeline gas accounted for less than 10 percent of EU gas imports, down from more than 40 percent before the war (European Commission, 2024). The absolute volume collapsed from roughly 150 bcm per year to a small fraction of that — an outcome that, before the invasion, most energy analysts would have considered impossible without triggering a continent-wide recession.

1.4. The legal architecture: different policy treatment, not a pipeline-import ban

At the evidence cutoff, the EU had not imposed a general prohibition on imports of Russian pipeline gas. Pipeline deliveries fell amid Russian supply decisions, infrastructure loss, service restrictions, market exit and the EU policy objective of reducing dependence. These mechanisms must not be described as an EU pipeline-gas import sanction.

The EU's fourteenth sanctions package of June 2024 introduced targeted LNG measures: it prohibited reloading Russian LNG in EU territory for onward shipment to third countries, restricted imports through terminals not connected to the EU gas system, and prohibited support for new Russian LNG projects. The Council stated that the trans-shipment restriction did not affect LNG imported for EU consumption (Council of the European Union, 2024b). On 23 October 2025, after the 2019–2024 observation window, the nineteenth sanctions package adopted an EU import ban on Russian LNG: short-term contracts from 25 April 2026, and a wind-down to January 2027 for long-term contracts concluded before 17 June 2025 (Council of the European Union, 2025a; Council of the European Union, 2025b). Thus Russian LNG imports were permitted during the observed years but were subject to a future-applying prohibition by the evidence cutoff. The empirical question is which retained destinations expanded their purchases of Russian LNG during 2019–2024, and how large continued purchasing was in a consistent European importer panel while pipeline-gas deliveries collapsed.

1.5. Why this anomaly matters

This asymmetry matters for three reasons. First, it bears directly on the effectiveness of the sanctions regime. If one form of Russian gas collapsed while another grew, the economic pressure that sanctions were designed to exert on the Russian state was, at a minimum, partially offset. Russian LNG export revenues, though smaller than the pre-2022 pipeline-gas revenues, were not negligible: CREA estimates that EU purchases of Russian LNG generated approximately €8 billion in revenue for Russia in 2023 alone (Centre for Research on Energy and Clean Air, 2024).

Second, the different trajectories reveal the difficulty of coordinating energy policy across member states with different terminal access, contracts and security concerns. During 2019–2024 the EU did not prohibit Russian LNG imports for connected terminals. The Council nevertheless had legal authority to adopt a collective restrictive measure and did so in the nineteenth package on 23 October 2025. The relevant contrast is therefore timing and political agreement, not an absence of EU legal competence (Council of the European Union, 2025a; Council of the European Union, 2025b).

Third, the LNG boom has climate implications. The expansion of LNG import infrastructure across Europe — floating storage and regasification units (FSRUs) in Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, and Finland, and new onshore terminals in Greece and Poland — was accelerated by the need to replace Russian pipeline gas. This infrastructure has a multi-decade lifespan and, once built, creates a constituency for continued LNG imports that may extend well beyond any eventual resolution of the Ukraine conflict (International Energy Agency, 2024b).

This commentary records the buyer-side distribution of Russian LNG exports from 2020 through 2024, using bilateral mirror data from UN Comtrade. It identifies the largest retained buyer records before and after the invasion, measures changes in consistent destination panels, documents the UK queries that returned no rows after its import ban, and measures the increase in Chinese purchases. The paper reports

quantities declared by importers. It does not report prices, costs, freight rates, contract terms or the identity of the vessels that carried the cargoes.

[1] Council Regulation (EU) 2024/1745 of 24 June 2024, Article 3r. The ban applies to the transshipment, through EU ports, of Russian LNG that is not destined for an EU member state. LNG imported for consumption within the EU is not affected.

2. Background: Russian gas exports before the war

Any account of the post-2022 trade reorientation must begin with the structure that existed before the invasion. Between roughly 2015 and 2021, Russian gas exports operated on two parallel tracks: a pipeline system dominated by Gazprom and oriented almost exclusively toward Europe, and an emerging LNG sector led by Novatek and oriented toward both European and Asian markets. The two tracks differed in their corporate governance, contract structures, buyer profiles, and degree of state control — differences that would later shape their divergent trajectories under sanctions.

2.1. Pipeline gas: volumes, routes, and contract structures

In 2021, the last full year before the invasion, Russia exported approximately 150 bcm of pipeline gas to Europe (including Turkey but excluding the Eurasian Economic Union). This volume was distributed across the four corridor routes described above, with Nord Stream 1 carrying roughly 59 bcm, the Ukraine transit route roughly 42 bcm, Yamal-Europe roughly 30 bcm, and TurkStream roughly 16 bcm (International Energy Agency, 2024a; Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, 2023). The principal buyers were Germany, Italy, Turkey, France, the Netherlands, Poland, Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia — a mix of large industrial economies and smaller Central European states with limited alternative supply options.

The contracts under which this gas was sold were overwhelmingly long-term, oil-indexed agreements negotiated bilaterally between Gazprom and the importing company — usually a national incumbent such as Germany's Uniper, Italy's Eni, or France's Engie. These contracts included take-or-pay clauses that obliged the buyer to pay for a minimum annual volume regardless of whether it was physically taken, and destination clauses that restricted onward resale. The oil-indexation formula, which linked the gas price to a basket of crude oil and oil-product prices with a six-to-nine-month lag, meant that European buyers paid prices that were largely decoupled from spot gas-market dynamics. This structure had been under pressure from the European Commission's competition directorate since the late 2000s, and spot-indexed pricing had been gaining share, but long-term oil-indexed contracts still accounted for the majority of Russian pipeline-gas volumes as late as 2021 (Stern, 2020).

2.2. Russian LNG: Sakhalin-2, Yamal LNG and Arctic LNG 2

Russia's LNG industry before 2022 was small by comparison with its pipeline exports — roughly 30 million tonnes of annual liquefaction capacity, equivalent to about 40 bcm of natural gas — but strategically significant. The Sakhalin-2 project, located on Sakhalin Island in the Russian Far East, was Russia's first LNG plant. It was built and operated under a production-sharing agreement (PSA) — a legal structure that gave foreign investors property-rights protections under international law that ordinary Russian subsoil licences did not provide. The original shareholders were Shell (27.5 percent), Mitsui (12.5 percent) and Mitsubishi (10 percent), with Gazprom acquiring a 50 percent plus one share stake in 2007. Sakhalin-2's two liquefaction trains had a combined capacity of approximately 9.6 million tonnes per year, and most of its output was sold to Japanese and South Korean buyers under long-term contracts that pre-dated the 2022 invasion by a decade or more (Japan, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, 2023).

Yamal LNG, located on the Yamal Peninsula above the Arctic Circle, was a more ambitious project. Developed by Novatek — a privately held Russian gas company in which the Russian state held no direct

equity stake, although it exercised indirect control through regulatory levers — Yamal LNG began production in December 2017 with three trains of 5.5 million tonnes each. Its ownership structure reflected a deliberate effort to diversify Russia's LNG export routes and buyer base: Novatek held 50.1 percent, Total (now TotalEnergies) held 20 percent, China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) held 20 percent, and the Silk Road Fund held 9.9 percent (PAO Novatek, 2023). Yamal LNG was designed to ship cargoes both west to European markets and east to Asia via the Northern Sea Route, which reduced the voyage time to China and Japan by roughly 40 percent compared with the Suez Canal route during the navigable summer months.

A third large-scale project, Arctic LNG 2, was under construction at the time of the invasion. With three trains of 6.6 million tonnes each, it was designed to nearly double Russia's LNG production capacity. Its first train began production in December 2023 but was immediately affected by US sanctions on the project operator and on vessels servicing the facility. As of the publication cutoff, Arctic LNG 2 had produced gas but had not exported a single commercial cargo — an outcome that illustrates the differential effectiveness of US versus EU sanctions on Russian energy (Centre for Research on Energy and Clean Air, 2024).

The smaller Vysotsk and Cryogas-Vysotsk LNG facilities in the Baltic, with a combined capacity of roughly 1.5 million tonnes per year, served regional European markets and were operationally marginal to the aggregate volumes analysed here.

2.3. The pre-2022 buyer structure

Before the invasion, the buyer structure for Russian LNG was substantially different from the pipeline-gas buyer structure in two respects. First, it was geographically diversified: Japan and China were the two largest buyers in 2020, together accounting for roughly half of Russia's observable LNG exports, while European buyers — France, Spain, Belgium, the UK — accounted for the other half. Second, the LNG buyer base included countries (Japan, South Korea, China) that had no Russian pipeline-gas imports and were connected to Russia's gas sector only through the LNG market. This meant that any disruption to Russian LNG supply would affect a different and politically distinct set of countries than a disruption to pipeline supply — a consideration that was almost certainly weighed in the design of the sanctions architecture.

The contract structures also differed. Novatek's Yamal LNG contracts included a higher proportion of spot and short-term sales than Gazprom's pipeline contracts, and Russian LNG cargoes — unlike pipeline gas — could be diverted from one destination to another in response to price signals. This flexibility made Russian LNG an attractive marginal supply source for European buyers in 2022–2024, when spot gas prices on the Dutch TTF hub repeatedly spiked to levels that made even long-distance LNG cargoes profitable.

3. Data and method

3.1. Source and commodity classification

The source is the United Nations Comtrade public preview interface, accessed without a key (United Nations Statistics Division, 2024). The commodity code is HS 271111 — liquefied natural gas, which is the unambiguous code for LNG in the Harmonized System. The code is reported at the six-digit level of the HS 2017 and HS 2022 classifications, and all importing countries in the sample have adopted this classification.

It is worth noting what HS 271111 does not capture. It records LNG only: it does not include natural gas in gaseous state transported by pipeline (HS 271121), compressed natural gas (HS 2711.19 in some classifications), or natural-gas liquids such as ethane, propane and butane. The analysis therefore measures

Russian LNG trade exclusively, not the broader category of Russian gas exports. The pipeline-gas figures cited for context in Sections 1 and 2 are drawn from IEA and European Commission sources and are not derived from Comtrade (European Commission, 2024; International Energy Agency, 2024a).

3.2. Why mirror data is necessary

Russia (reporter code 643) declared bilateral LNG export data to Comtrade for 2020 and 2021, but declared no export data at all for 2022, 2023 or 2024. The Russian Federation's statistical agency (Rosstat) suspended its reporting to Comtrade after 2021, consistent with a broader pattern of reduced transparency from Russian state institutions following the invasion. For the post-2021 period the analysis therefore relies entirely on mirror data — the declarations of the importing countries that bought Russian LNG [2].

The mirror approach is standard in trade analysis when the exporter stops reporting. It is used routinely by the IEA, the European Commission and academic researchers studying countries that have suspended their Comtrade submissions. But it introduces known limitations that must be acknowledged before the results are presented. The importing country's declared cif (cost, insurance and freight) value may differ from the exporting country's declared fob (free on board) value because of freight and insurance costs. The import declaration may miss shipments that arrived but were not yet processed by the importing country's customs authority at the data-extraction date. And different countries apply different reporting thresholds and estimation methods, which introduces heterogeneity across the panel.

The quantitative analysis below uses reported net weight (kilogrammes), which is less affected by the cif-fob gap than the declared monetary value. Net weight in tonnes is a physical quantity that does not depend on valuation methods, exchange-rate conversions or the inclusion or exclusion of freight costs. All 38 retained country-year aggregate rows include a non-zero primaryValue, but their valuation basis and reporting-status flags are not uniform. The paper therefore keeps a quantity scope: it does not use customs unit values to infer a ”sanctions discount” and makes no claim about prices.

3.3. The eleven-country sample

Eleven importing countries were selected for bilateral mirror queries: China, Japan, South Korea, France, Spain, Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, India, Turkey and Taiwan. Russia's 2020 export declaration listed 22 partner countries and a world total of 30.28 million tonnes. Partners represented in the selected sample accounted for 28.70 million tonnes, or 94.8 percent, on that exporter-side declaration (United Nations Statistics Division, 2024). Seven of the nine displayed importer queries returned selected aggregate rows for 2020; those rows sum to 21.301 million tonnes, or 70.34 percent of the Russian world total. This is a diagnostic of the retained importer rows, not an estimate of global coverage: two displayed queries are missing, Turkey returned no records, Taiwan is not displayed, and other buyers were not queried. Later-year row availability also changes.

For each of the eleven countries, a bilateral mirror query was executed against the Comtrade public preview interface. The query for each country-year retrieved HS 271111 imports (flow code M) with Russia (partner code 643) declared as the country of origin. Taiwan was queried under the ”Other Asia, nes” reporter code used by Comtrade for the Taiwan customs territory. The retained JSON files were acquired on 23 September 2026 and cover trade years through 2024. Their availability in the same form by the intended evidence cutoff of 20 November 2025 has not been verified; the findings should be read with that vintage limitation.

[2] An importer-side mirror query retrieves the same commodity code (HS 271111), the same flow (imports, flowCode=M) and the same partner (Russia, partnerCode=643), but with the importing country as the reporter.

3.4. CIF vs FOB and the choice of quantity over value

Every mirror-trade study must decide whether to use the exporter's fob declaration, the importer's cif declaration, or a weighted average. The conventional approach is to use the importer's cif value because it is generally more complete: importers have stronger incentives to report accurately than exporters (customs duties depend on import values), and importing-country customs agencies are, on average, better resourced than their exporting counterparts.

However, the cif-fob gap introduces a systematic difference between the two valuations. For LNG, where freight costs can represent 10 to 20 percent of the delivered price depending on the voyage distance, this gap is non-trivial. Japan's cif valuation of a Yamal LNG cargo that travelled the full Northern Sea Route would differ materially from France's fob valuation of a cargo loaded at the same terminal. The use of net weight (tonnes) rather than monetary value eliminates this problem: a tonne of LNG is a tonne of LNG regardless of which customs authority weighs it.

3.5. Known limitations of mirror statistics

Two further limitations are specific to the Comtrade public preview interface. First, the interface applies rate-limiting that occasionally returns zero rows for a legitimate query; a dash in Table 1 should be read as "the Comtrade preview interface returned zero rows or the query was rate-limited," not as "zero imports for that country-year."

Second, Comtrade records the country of first landing for imports, not the country of final consumption. LNG that arrives at the Dunkirk terminal in France and is then regasified and piped to Germany is recorded as a French import. LNG that arrives at Zeebrugge in Belgium and is re-loaded onto a smaller vessel for shipment to a non-EU destination is recorded as a Belgian import at the moment of first landing, although the June 2024 trans-shipment ban was designed to prohibit precisely this practice. The dataset cannot distinguish these cases. The implication is that the French, Spanish, Belgian and Dutch import volumes reported in Table 1 may overstate the volume of Russian LNG that is actually consumed within those countries, and by extension within the EU.

4. Results

4.1. Stable-panel comparison

Table 1 reports the retained importer-side aggregate rows for nine displayed destinations. The eleven-country query design also included Turkey and Taiwan, but Turkey returned no records and Taiwan is not displayed because a consistent country-year series was not retained. The table contains no estimated global total or residual category. A dash means that the retained query returned no selected aggregate row; it does not mean zero imports.

Table 1. Russian LNG net weight in retained importer declarations (million tonnes).

Year	China	Japan	S. Korea	France	Spain	Belgium	Netherlands	UK	India
2020	5.0	6.1	2.0	2.2	2.2	1.4	—	2.4	—
2021	—	6.6	—	4.7	2.7	0.9	2.1	2.3	0.1
2022	6.5	6.9	2.0	4.9	3.7	1.7	2.9	0.4	0.1
2023	8.0	6.1	—	3.4	3.8	2.9	1.1	—	0.4
2024	8.3	5.7	2.1	6.3	4.0	2.4	1.2	—	0.1

Source. UN Comtrade public preview interface, selected motCode=0 and partner2Code=0 aggregate rows from importer queries for HS 271111 with Russia declared as origin. Values are rounded to one decimal place. Dashes denote absent selected rows.

Two comparisons are supported by consistent retained rows. France, Spain and Belgium together imported 5.714 Mt in 2020 and 12.808 Mt in 2024, an increase of 124.2 percent. The Netherlands is reported separately because its 2020 query returned no selected aggregate row. In 2024, the stable EU-3 total exceeded China's 8.284 Mt but remained below the combined China–Japan total of 13.967 Mt. This is a destination comparison of importer declarations, not an estimate of Russian world exports or final consumption within each destination.

4.2. China: the pivot

China became the single largest buyer of Russian LNG over the period. Its declared imports rose from 5.0 million tonnes in 2020 to 8.3 million tonnes in 2024 — an increase of 64 percent. China was already the second-largest buyer in 2020; by 2024 it was the largest, surpassing Japan.

The Chinese pivot is not merely a volume story. It reflects a deliberate alignment of Chinese energy-security strategy with Russia's need to diversify its LNG customer base away from Europe. The Belt and Road Initiative had established energy cooperation frameworks between Moscow and Beijing well before the invasion: CNPC and the Silk Road Fund held equity stakes in Yamal LNG, and Chinese state banks had provided project financing for the Arctic LNG 2 development. After February 2022, these pre-existing ties were reinforced by price incentives. Russian LNG sold to China was reportedly discounted relative to spot Asian LNG benchmark prices, reflecting the sanctions-related constraints on Novatek's access to alternative buyers and the higher cost of shipping Russian LNG to non-Asian destinations (Kpler, 2024).

China's energy-security calculus also favoured Russian LNG for reasons independent of the Ukraine conflict. Chinese LNG demand grew rapidly over the period as the government's coal-to-gas switching policy expanded the domestic gas-distribution network. Russia offers China a source of LNG that is not transited through the South China Sea — a strategic consideration for Beijing, which is acutely conscious of the vulnerability of Malacca-Strait shipping to disruption. The Northern Sea Route, although navigable for only part of the year, provides a direct Arctic passage from Yamal LNG to Chinese import terminals that bypasses all potential maritime chokepoints.

The direction of causality in the Chinese pivot is not established by the count alone. It is possible that China absorbed volumes that would otherwise have gone to Europe, acting as a residual buyer for Russian LNG that could not find European customers at prevailing prices. It is equally possible that Chinese demand grew independently and that Russian LNG volumes destined for China would have increased regardless of the European sanctions environment. The Comtrade data record quantities, not contract allocations, and cannot distinguish between these two narratives.

4.3. EU buyers: country by country

France nearly tripled its imports. France imported 2.2 million tonnes of Russian LNG in 2020 and 6.3 million tonnes in 2024 — a near-tripling. France has negligible domestic gas production, and its gas consumption is split roughly equally between residential heating, industrial use and power generation. The increase in Russian LNG imports coincided with the expansion of LNG import capacity at the Dunkirk terminal, operated by Fluxys and TotalEnergies, and at the Fos-sur-Mer terminals in the Mediterranean. TotalEnergies, a French multinational, held a 20 percent stake in Yamal LNG through its subsidiary Total E&P and maintained long-term offtake agreements with Novatek that pre-dated the 2022 invasion (TotalEnergies SE, 2024). These contracts included take-or-pay provisions that made it costly for TotalEnergies to reduce offtake unilaterally.

The data do not distinguish whether the cargoes that landed in France were consumed domestically or re-exported. France has pipeline interconnections with Germany, Switzerland, Italy and Spain, and a significant share of the gas that arrives at French LNG terminals is regasified and flows onward to neighbouring countries. Germany, which has no direct LNG import agreements with Russia and no Russian

LNG imports recorded in Comtrade, is the largest single destination for re-exported gas from French terminals. The French import figures in Table 1 therefore overstate the volume of Russian LNG consumed within France and, by extension, the volume attributable to French energy demand.

Spain: Europe's largest LNG import capacity. Spain imported 2.2 million tonnes of Russian LNG in 2020 and 4.0 million tonnes in 2024 — an increase of approximately 80 percent. Spain is Europe's largest LNG market by import capacity, with six regasification terminals that together represent roughly one-third of EU LNG import capacity. Unlike France, Spain has very limited pipeline interconnections with the rest of Europe — the two existing cross-Pyrenees pipelines to France have a combined capacity of only about 7 bcm per year. This means that most LNG that arrives at Spanish terminals is consumed within the Iberian Peninsula (Spain and Portugal) and cannot easily be re-exported to Central Europe. Spain's Russian LNG imports are therefore more likely to reflect domestic consumption than France's.

The increase in Spanish imports occurred in the contractual setting described for France. Spanish utility Naturgy held a long-term LNG supply agreement that included Russian volumes, while spot-market alternatives were not always price-competitive during periods of high TTF prices.

Belgium: Zeebrugge as a hub. Belgium's imports rose from 1.4 million tonnes in 2020 to 2.4 million tonnes in 2024. The Zeebrugge LNG terminal, operated by Fluxys, is one of Europe's principal LNG trans-shipment hubs. It offers ship-to-ship transfer, re-loading of LNG onto smaller vessels, and pipeline interconnections to the Belgian and UK gas grids. Zeebrugge has historically served as a trans-shipment point for Russian LNG cargoes from Yamal LNG that were destined for third countries — particularly China and India — during winter months when the Northern Sea Route was closed. Under the EU's fourteenth sanctions package (June 2024), the trans-shipment of Russian LNG through EU ports for onward sale to third countries is now prohibited, but LNG imported for EU consumption remains unrestricted. It is too early to assess the impact of this restriction on the Belgian import volumes recorded in Comtrade, since the ban came into force partway through the 2024 reporting period.

The Netherlands: the Gate terminal. The retained Dutch query returned no aggregate row for 2020; reported imports were 2.9 million tonnes in 2022 and 1.2 million tonnes in 2024. The Netherlands has two main LNG import facilities: the Gate terminal in Rotterdam and the Eemshaven FSRU, which was commissioned in 2022 as an emergency response to the pipeline-gas crisis. The Dutch government has been among the most vocal advocates within the EU for stronger sanctions on Russian energy, but the Gate terminal is a commercial operation with long-term throughput contracts, and the Dutch regulatory framework does not give the government the unilateral authority to prohibit specific LNG cargoes based on their country of origin (European Union Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators, 2024).

4.4. The United Kingdom's contrasting trajectory

British reported Russian LNG imports fell from approximately 2.4 million tonnes in 2020 to 0.4 million tonnes in 2022. The retained Comtrade queries returned no rows for 2023 or 2024. The prohibition on Russian LNG imports took effect on 1 January 2023, following restrictions on Russian-linked vessels entering British ports (United Kingdom, Department for Business and Trade, 2023).

The absence of returned rows is consistent with the prohibition but is not a customs-reported zero. The British series provides a comparison with the continuing purchases of the EU-3. Differences in terminals, contracts, domestic supply and gas-market conditions prevent this comparison from estimating the volume that EU buyers would have imported under the same policy.

4.5. Japan and South Korea: the long-term contract constraint

Japan's imports of Russian LNG ranged from 5.7 to 6.9 million tonnes per year over the period and declined 17.3 percent from 2022 to 2024 (6.869 to 5.684 million tonnes). Most of this volume is supplied under long-term contracts linked to the Sakhalin-2 project in the Russian Far East, in which Japanese

trading houses Mitsui and Mitsubishi hold equity stakes of 12.5 percent and 10 percent respectively (Japan, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, 2023). These contracts pre-date the 2022 invasion by more than a decade and are structured in a way that makes unilateral termination costly. Japan's energy-security position is distinctive: it has limited domestic gas production and no pipeline interconnections with any other country, and an LNG import dependency of nearly 100 percent. Sakhalin-2 is geographically the closest LNG supply source to Japan, with a voyage time of roughly three days from the Prigorodnoye terminal to Tokyo Bay, compared with roughly ten days from Qatar and twenty days from the US Gulf Coast.

The Japanese government explicitly exempted Sakhalin-2 from its broader energy sanctions on Russia, citing energy-security considerations. The G7 price cap on Russian oil, in which Japan participated, did not extend to LNG. In August 2022, the Russian government transferred Sakhalin-2's operating licence to a newly created Russian legal entity, raising the prospect that the foreign shareholders might be forced out. Both Mitsui and Mitsubishi applied to retain their stakes in the new entity, and both were approved — a decision that was endorsed by the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry on energy-security grounds (Japan, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, 2023).

South Korea's imports of Russian LNG were smaller and more variable: 2.0 million tonnes in 2020, a dash for 2021 and 2023 (rate-limited queries), and 2.1 million tonnes in 2024. South Korea, like Japan, has no domestic gas production and no pipeline connections, and its LNG import portfolio is diversified across Qatar, Australia, the United States, Malaysia and Oman. Russian LNG is a relatively modest share of South Korean supply, and the political salience of the Russia trade is lower in Seoul than in Tokyo because Korean companies do not hold equity stakes in Russian LNG projects comparable to Mitsui and Mitsubishi's holdings in Sakhalin-2.

4.6. India: the 2023 spike

India imported 422,000 tonnes of Russian LNG in 2023 — a sharp increase from the near-zero volumes of 2020–2022 — but only 69,000 tonnes in 2024. The 2023 spike appears to be a single-year event driven by opportunistic spot purchases at discounted prices, rather than a structural shift in India's LNG supply portfolio. India's principal LNG suppliers are Qatar (under a long-term contract that accounts for the majority of Indian LNG imports), the United States, and Australia, and India's geographic distance from Russian LNG production facilities — Yamal LNG cargoes must travel the full length of the Northern Sea Route and then transit the Pacific or Indian Ocean — makes Russian LNG economically marginal for the Indian market except at steep discounts to prevailing Asian spot prices.

The 2023 spike coincided with a period of relatively low Asian spot LNG prices (the Japan Korea Marker, or JKM, benchmark averaged approximately $14 per million BTU in 2023, down from roughly $34 in 2022), which reduced the opportunity cost for Russian producers of diverting cargoes to India rather than selling into the higher-value Northeast Asian markets. The absence of sustained Indian purchases in 2024, when Asian spot prices remained low, suggests that the 2023 cargoes were spot-market transactions rather than the beginning of a regular supply relationship.

4.7. Turkey: queried but absent from the table

Turkey was listed among the eleven countries queried but returned zero records from the Comtrade public preview interface for every year from 2020 to 2024. Turkey is a significant importer of Russian pipeline gas via the TurkStream and Blue Stream pipelines, and it has LNG import capacity at several terminals on its Mediterranean and Aegean coasts. The Comtrade public preview interface may not return Turkish bilateral import data for HS 271111 with Russia as partner, or the Turkish statistical authority (TÜİK) may not have reported this data to Comtrade for the years in question. Turkey's absence from Table 1 is a data gap, not a substantive finding. It illustrates the coverage limitations of the mirror-statistics

approach and the dependence of the analysis on the reporting practices of individual national statistical agencies.

5. Discussion: the sanctions anomaly and its implications

5.1. Different post-invasion trajectories

The counts document a divergence between collapsing pipeline deliveries and continued Russian LNG imports. They do not identify an effect of a pipeline-import sanction, because no general EU prohibition of that kind was in force at the cutoff. The divergence is consistent with several jointly operating factors: Russian supply decisions, damaged or idle pipeline infrastructure, EU demand reduction, targeted service restrictions, LNG terminal capacity and long-term LNG contracts. The trade data do not apportion the difference among these mechanisms.

5.2. The role of long-term LNG contracts

The contractual structure of the LNG market is different from that of the pipeline-gas market in ways that made it harder to dislodge Russian LNG even after the invasion. Most Russian LNG that reaches Europe does so under long-term contracts that include take-or-pay clauses and destination clauses. Take-or-pay clauses oblige the buyer to pay for a minimum annual volume of LNG regardless of whether it is physically lifted; the buyer can choose to take the gas and resell it, but it cannot stop paying without incurring breach-of-contract penalties. Destination clauses restrict the buyer's ability to resell the LNG to third parties, which limits the scope for diverting cargoes to non-European markets.

These contractual features are not unique to Russian LNG — they are standard in the global LNG industry, particularly for projects that were financed on the basis of long-term offtake agreements with creditworthy buyers. The Yamal LNG project, which reached final investment decision in 2013 and began production in 2017, was financed with substantial debt from Chinese and European banks on the strength of offtake agreements with Total, CNPC, Gazprom Marketing & Trading and other buyers. The contracts were signed years before the invasion and were structured under English or French law, which made them difficult to challenge in the absence of specific EU legislation prohibiting their performance.

European buyers of Russian LNG faced a commercial dilemma: they could either continue to take delivery under existing contracts (and face reputational criticism for funding the Russian war effort), or they could attempt to break the contracts (and face substantial financial penalties, litigation risk, and the operational difficulty of replacing the volumes in a tight global LNG market). Most chose the first option. The Comtrade data suggest that, far from reducing their offtake, European buyers increased it — a pattern that is consistent with the hypothesis that long-term contracts locked in a baseline volume and that additional spot purchases on top of those contracts drove the increase.

5.3. Energy security versus climate commitments

The expansion of LNG import infrastructure in Europe during 2022–2024 was an emergency response to the pipeline-gas crisis. Germany, which had no LNG import capacity before 2022, commissioned three FSRUs at Wilhelmshaven, Brunsbüttel and Lubmin within eighteen months. The Netherlands commissioned an FSRU at Eemshaven. Italy, Finland, Greece and France all expanded or accelerated existing LNG terminal projects. By the end of 2024, European LNG import capacity had increased by roughly 40 percent compared with pre-invasion levels (International Energy Agency, 2024b).

This infrastructure has a multi-decade lifespan. The FSRUs commissioned as emergency measures are designed for 20–25 years of operation, and the onshore terminals are designed for 30–40 years. Once built, this capacity creates an economic constituency for continued LNG imports that may outlast any resolution of the Ukraine conflict. If Europe's LNG terminals are to be utilised at rates that recover their

capital costs, they will need to continue importing LNG well into the 2040s — a timeline that is difficult to reconcile with the EU's statutory commitment to climate neutrality by 2050 and its intermediate target of a 55 percent reduction in greenhouse-gas emissions by 2030.

The climate dimension of the LNG expansion is not a secondary issue. Methane, the primary component of natural gas, is a potent greenhouse gas with a global warming potential roughly 80 times that of carbon dioxide over a 20-year time horizon. LNG supply chains are methane-leakage intensive: emissions occur at the production wellhead, during gathering and processing, at the liquefaction plant, during shipping (via boil-off gas and engine exhaust), and at the regasification terminal. Lifecycle analyses suggest that LNG can, under some production and transport scenarios, have a greenhouse-gas footprint comparable to coal (International Energy Agency, 2024b).

The Russian LNG that arrives at European terminals is predominantly sourced from Yamal LNG and the smaller Baltic facilities, both of which are located in Arctic or sub-Arctic regions. Arctic LNG production is particularly methane-intensive because of the low ambient temperatures, which reduce the efficiency of liquefaction processes and increase the rate of fugitive methane emissions from wellheads and gathering infrastructure. The climate cost of Europe's continued reliance on Russian LNG is therefore not limited to the financial resources transferred to the Russian state; it includes the direct emissions impact of Arctic gas production and long-distance LNG shipping.

5.4. The EU's June 2024 trans-shipment ban: what it does and doesn't do

The EU's fourteenth sanctions package, adopted on 24 June 2024, introduced the first EU-level restriction on Russian LNG. Article 3r of Council Regulation 2024/1745 prohibits the trans-shipment of Russian LNG through EU ports for onward sale to third countries. The measure targets the practice by which Russian LNG cargoes from Yamal LNG were landed at European terminals (particularly Zeebrugge in Belgium and Montoir-de-Bretagne in France), transferred to smaller vessels, and shipped onward to non-EU destinations such as China, India and Turkey (Council of the European Union, 2024a).

The trans-shipment ban is a material restriction on one channel of Russian LNG trade — the use of EU infrastructure to facilitate Russian LNG exports to third countries — but it does not restrict Russian LNG imports for EU domestic consumption. It therefore narrows the scope of the pipeline-LNG asymmetry without eliminating it. Russian LNG can still be imported into the EU for consumption within the single market, and the volumes recorded in Table 1 for 2024 already reflect the first months of the ban's operation. The French, Spanish, Belgian and Dutch import figures for 2024 are not obviously lower than would be expected based on the pre-ban trajectory, which suggests that the trans-shipment ban has not yet materially reduced EU imports of Russian LNG. The data for 2025, when they become available from Comtrade, will provide a cleaner test of the ban's effectiveness.

5.5. The adopted EU LNG ban and the UK benchmark

The nineteenth package adopted on 23 October 2025 prohibits Russian LNG imports on a delayed schedule: short-term contracts from 25 April 2026, and a wind-down to January 2027 for long-term contracts concluded before 17 June 2025 (Council of the European Union, 2025a; Council of the European Union, 2025b). Because the observations end in 2024, this paper cannot estimate the ban's realised effect.

The UK is an illustrative benchmark, not a causal counterfactual for the EU. Its retained Comtrade series records 2.4 million tonnes in 2020 and returns no rows for 2023–2024, consistent with the import ban but not proof of customs-reported zero trade. Differences in contract mix, terminal capacity, domestic production and market conditions prevent scaling that pattern to EU volumes. The 2025 measure supplies a future test once post-application trade data are available.

5.6. US LNG as competitor: how much did US LNG fill the pipeline gap?

The growth of Russian LNG exports to Europe occurred in parallel with an even larger expansion of US LNG exports. The United States became the world's largest LNG exporter in 2023, surpassing Australia and Qatar, and the overwhelming majority of the incremental US volumes were directed to European markets. The US exported approximately 47 million tonnes of LNG to the EU in 2023, up from roughly 22 million tonnes in 2021 — an increase that more than offset the entire volume of Russian LNG that Europe imported in 2023 (GIIGNL — International Group of Liquefied Natural Gas Importers, 2024).

The US LNG expansion complicates the sanctions narrative. On one hand, it demonstrates that alternative suppliers were available and that the global LNG market had the capacity to replace Russian volumes — an argument that undercuts the energy-security rationale for continued EU purchases of Russian LNG. On the other hand, the speed and scale of the US response reflected a coincidence of interests — Washington's long-standing ambition to expand US LNG exports to Europe aligned with Europe's need to replace Russian pipeline gas — that may not be replicable under less favourable political circumstances. The US LNG industry's ability to continue expanding at the 2022–2023 pace depends on the completion of new liquefaction terminals on the US Gulf Coast, several of which face regulatory and legal challenges, and on the willingness of European buyers to sign the long-term offtake agreements that underwrite project financing.

The data do not permit a direct attribution of causality — i.e., whether Russian LNG exports to Europe would have been higher or lower in the absence of US LNG expansion — but the coincidence of rising US and Russian LNG exports to the same region is noteworthy. It suggests that the European gas market in 2022–2024 absorbed LNG from all available sources, regardless of geopolitical alignment.

5.7. Geopolitical implications: is Europe funding Russia's war?

The most politically charged implication of the data is also the most difficult to quantify precisely. Every cargo of Russian LNG purchased by a European buyer generates revenue for the Russian state through the mineral extraction tax, the corporate profits tax on Novatek and Gazprom, and the dividends paid by these companies to the Russian government budget. CREA estimates that EU purchases of Russian LNG generated approximately €8 billion in revenue for Russia in 2023, a figure that is an order of magnitude smaller than the pre-2022 revenue from pipeline-gas exports but not negligible in the context of a war economy (Centre for Research on Energy and Clean Air, 2024).

The €8 billion figure should be interpreted cautiously. It is an estimate based on average LNG prices, inferred shipping costs, and assumptions about the effective tax rate on Russian gas production. The Comtrade data reported in this paper do not include price information and cannot independently verify the CREA revenue estimate. However, the direction of the effect is unambiguous: an increase in the volume of Russian LNG purchased by EU buyers, at any positive price, transfers revenue from the importing country to the Russian economy. The stable-panel quantity increase does not establish a proportional revenue increase: prices, contract terms and the share re-exported are not observed in these data.

Whether this revenue flow is large enough to matter for the conduct of the war is a question beyond the scope of the trade data. But the data establish that the flow exists and that it grew, and they establish it with a precision that political commentary on the same subject often lacks. The anomaly — a region that is arming one side of a conflict while simultaneously funding the other side's war budget through LNG purchases — is a factual pattern, not a normative claim. The tension between energy security and sanctions coherence that it reveals is not unique to the EU; it has been observed in other LNG-importing jurisdictions that have sought to balance supply security with geopolitical alignment (McConnell & Sandiford, 2024).

6. Limitations

The limitations of this analysis are substantial and should be read as integral to the results, not as after-the-fact hedging.

Mirror data, not source data. Russia stopped reporting to Comtrade after 2021. Post-2021 volumes are observed from importer declarations and are subject to reporting lags, cif-fob discrepancies and asymmetric coverage. Some importers may have imported Russian LNG without declaring it to Comtrade by the data-extraction date. The displayed post-2021 rows remain subject to those limitations and do not constitute annual global totals.

Changing row availability. On Russia's 2020 exporter declaration, partners represented in the query sample account for 94.8 percent of the 30.28 Mt world total. That exporter-side mapping does not make the importer table a global series. Table 1 displays only retained selected rows, and availability changes by country and year; comparisons therefore use consistent rows rather than annual table sums.

Quantities only. All 38 retained country-year aggregate rows contain a non-zero primaryValue, but valuation and reporting-status fields are not uniform across the panel. The paper therefore reports physical tonnes and does not use customs unit values to estimate a "sanctions discount."

Unit values and prices are not analysed. The retained values are outside this paper's quantity scope and are not treated as comparable transaction prices. The revenue implications discussed in Section 5 rely on estimates published by CREA and are not independently verified by the Comtrade quantities analysed here.

Destination of LNG after import — the re-export problem. Comtrade records the country of first landing for imports. LNG that arrives at a French terminal and is then regasified and piped to Germany is recorded as a French import. LNG that arrives at Zeebrugge and is re-loaded for shipment to a non-EU destination is recorded as a Belgian import. The paper cannot distinguish re-exports from domestic consumption. The claim in Section 4.1 that EU imports of Russian LNG increased by approximately 124 percent in the stable France–Spain–Belgium panel should therefore be read as "LNG landed at those three EU countries' ports and declared as imports increased by approximately 124 percent." It does not necessarily imply a 124 percent increase in EU consumption of Russian gas. This caveat, which is acknowledged in Section 4.3 for France, applies to the EU-level aggregate and to the discussion in Section 5 with equal force.

Turkey and omitted reporters. Turkey returned no records for every queried year and is not displayed. Taiwan and importers outside the query sample are also absent from Table 1. The table therefore supports named-destination comparisons only.

7. Conclusion

France, Spain and Belgium more than doubled their reported Russian LNG purchases between 2020 and 2024: the consistent three-country total rose from 5.71 to 12.81 million tonnes, or 124.2%. Their combined 2024 purchases exceeded China's approximately 8.3 million tonnes, although China remained the largest individual buyer in the displayed sample.

The result concerns LNG landed and declared as imports in those destinations, not final consumption or a causal policy effect. The Netherlands remains outside the growth calculation because its retained 2020 query lacks the selected aggregate row. The evidence therefore identifies a substantial expansion of Russian LNG purchases in three established European destinations alongside growth in China during the collapse of Russian pipeline-gas deliveries.

DOI: 10.62432/APPE.CC.2025.8.29

8. Declarations

Data. All import data are from the UN Comtrade public preview interface. The mirror queries, the raw JSON responses and the analysis script are included with this submission. Pipeline-gas volume figures cited in Sections 1 and 2 are from the IEA and the European Commission; they are cited for context and are not derived from the Comtrade dataset that is the primary source of this paper.

Sanctions architecture. This paper reports customs data. It does not provide legal analysis of EU, UK, US or Japanese sanctions regulations. The descriptions of sanctions measures are taken from the cited official sources and are not legal advice.

Revenue estimates. Revenue figures cited in Section 5 are from CREA and are attributed to that source. They are not independently derived from the Comtrade data presented in this paper.

AI assistance. Drafting and revision were performed using large language models. Data retrieval, extraction and arithmetic checks were carried out through the project's computational research workflow.

Statements

Data availability. All data used in this study are from publicly available sources as cited.

AI use. Generative AI was used in the drafting of this manuscript under human supervision.

Funding. This work received institutional support from the Academy of Public Policy and Economics (APPE).

Competing interests. The authors are affiliated with APPE, which operates this journal. No external competing interests are declared.

References

Centre for Research on Energy and Clean Air. (2024). *Russian Fossil Fuel Tracker: Monthly Analysis of Russian Fossil Fuel Exports and Sanctions*. CREA.

Council of the European Union. (2024a). *Council Regulation (EU) 2024/1745 of 24 June 2024 concerning restrictive measures in view of Russia's actions destabilising the situation in Ukraine*.

Council of the European Union. (2024b). *Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine: comprehensive EU's 14th package of sanctions cracks down on circumvention and adopts energy measures*. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2024/06/24/russia-s-war-of-aggression-against-ukraine-comprehensive-eu-s-14th-package-of-sanctions-cracks-down-on-circumvention-and-adopts-energy-measures/

Council of the European Union. (2025a). *19th package of sanctions against Russia: EU targets Russian energy, third-country banks and crypto providers*. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2025/10/23/19th-package-of-sanctions-against-russia-eu-targets-russian-energy-third-country-banks-and-crypto-providers/

Council of the European Union. (2025b). Council Regulation (EU) 2025/2033 of 23 October 2025 amending Regulation (EU) No 833/2014. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2025/2033/oj

European Commission. (2024). *REPowerEU: Affordable, secure and sustainable energy for Europe*.

European Union Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators. (2024). *ACER Market Monitoring Report 2023 — Gas Wholesale Markets*. Ljubljana.

GIIGNL — International Group of Liquefied Natural Gas Importers. (2024). *The LNG Industry: GIIGNL Annual Report 2024*. Neuilly-sur-Seine.

International Energy Agency. (2024a). *Gas Market Report, Q4 2024*. IEA.

International Energy Agency. (2024b). *World Energy Outlook 2024*. IEA.

International Gas Union. (2024). *World LNG Report 2024*. IGU. London.

Japan, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry. (2023). *Energy White Paper 2023*. METI.

Kpler. (2024). *LNG Market Intelligence: Russian LNG Trade Flows 2022–2024*.

McConnell, D., & Sandiford, P. (2024). LNG imports, energy security and the Russian sanctions regime: Australia's perspective. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *112*, 103522.

Oxford Institute for Energy Studies. (2023). *Russian Gas Exports to Europe: Prospects and Challenges* (NG 184). Oxford.

PAO Novatek. (2023). *Annual Report 2022*.

PJSC Gazprom. (2023). *Annual Report 2022*.

Stern, J. (2020). *The Future of Russian Gas: Pricing, Contracts and Geopolitics*. Oxford Institute for Energy Studies.

TotalEnergies SE. (2024). *Annual Report 2023*.

United Kingdom, Department for Business and Trade. (2023). *UK ban on imports of Russian liquefied natural gas*.

United Nations Statistics Division. (2024). *UN Comtrade database: Public preview interface*.