

Message

From: Ellis, Joe [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]
Sent: 06/09/2016 13:42:29
To: Stout, Robert [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]
Subject: RE: CPTF - Latest draft for review

Sensitivity: Company Confidential

Thanks. My only thought is whether this should say “responsible” rather than “sound” science in bullet 4. I remember discussions about the use of those terms during DWH, and I believe we settled on “responsible” because it implies an expectation that the rigor of the scientific method underlies any assertions.

From: Stout, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 9:36 AM
To: Streett, Mary; Ellis, Joe; Sidoti, Elizabeth; Stutz, Rachel; Dempsey, Ray C; Guinn, Shanan
Cc: Nash, Mike A (Legal); Nolan, James; van Hoogstraten, David Jan; Morrell, Geoff
Subject: FW: CPTF - Latest draft for review
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

FYI. Reporting directly to JCM on this but do let me know if you have other (or different) major comments/concerns. I plan to send this redline today but will have plenty of opportunity to bring up anything else at the next ALL DAY meeting we have at API next Wed!

Hope all had a nice Labor Day w/e.

Bob

From: Stout, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 9:31 AM
To: Jefferiss, Paul H.; Minge, John C
Cc: van Hoogstraten, David Jan; [REDACTED]@bp.com; [REDACTED]@bp.com; Khalilov, Seymour; 'Yeilding, Cindy'; Okonek, Kellie
Subject: RE: CPTF - Latest draft for review
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

All:

I am attaching for your information and review the few changes I currently plan to submit in redline today to Kyle Isakower of API on the draft API climate principles. I think we should keep these changes as brief and focused as we can.

My changes are on top of Kyle’s and are identified as “SR-#”. In each case I have explained the reason for the proposed change. I likely will also share this privately with a few key colleagues from XOM, Shell and Chevron so they are aware of our thoughts and hopefully we can align on some of these points.

In some ways one of the smallest proposed revisions may loom largest symbolically. Specifically, the lead-in language to the broad principles refers to “the long-term challenge of POTENTIAL climate change.” (emphasis supplied by me).

This is the same language from the original API draft of 2008, but it could easily be misinterpreted now as casting doubt on the existence of climate change. I have suggested that either the word “potential” be deleted or that we use the more neutral term “issue” of climate change as used previously in the document. It shouldn’t be, but I do worry that this change could be controversial with some members. We’ll see.

All comments welcome but I would like to send this along today to meet API's deadline. We always can suggest other or different changes at the meeting itself, which is set for all day next Wednesday at API.

Thanks,

Bob Stout

Robert L. Stout, Jr.
Vice President & Head of Regulatory Affairs
BP America Communications & External Affairs

Office: [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]

From: Stout, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 3:11 PM
To: Jefferiss, Paul H.; Minge, John C
Cc: van Hoogstraten, David Jan; [REDACTED]@bp.com; [REDACTED]@bp.com'; Khalilov, Seymour; 'Yeilding, Cindy'; Stout, Robert
Subject: FW: CPTF - Latest draft for review
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

Attached for your review is the latest draft of the API climate principles reflecting our task force meeting last week.

Principles 1-9 in the draft, which have been simplified and clarified a fair bit versus the prior drafts, were heavily discussed and negotiated during the meeting. Thus, while we can propose changes to the draft language of these, we should only do so if there's something that causes major heartburn or requires correction.

The opening narrative and the back end of the document, on the other hand, can still be edited. To my ear the opening is still too long and too defensive and could benefit from some editing. But at the same time this is not designed for external messaging and there may not be much harm in leaving it as is. A number of the task force members are keen to include a very full-throated defense of the industry and the importance of fossil fuels before the document gets into climate change policy.

I will be looking at this more closely but welcome any comments you have in the interim. Comments are due back to API by next Tuesday and since Monday is a holiday, I would appreciate receiving any major comments back later this week.

Best,

Bob

From: Kyle Isakower [mailto:[REDACTED]@api.org]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 3:27 PM
To: [REDACTED]@listserve.api.org'; [REDACTED]@murphyoilcorp.com'; [REDACTED]@exxonmobil.com'; Kate Fay; Brian Woodard; Jesse Sandlin; "Doucette, Paul (GE Corporate)"; [REDACTED]@oxy.com'; 'Schaaff, Lesley'; Fiji George; Susan Blevins; [REDACTED]@aramcoservices.com'; 'Lindsay Hamminga'
Subject: CPTF - Latest draft for review
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

I have attached the latest draft of the broad (evergreen) policy document for review. Please send me any additional thoughts by COB next Tuesday (9/6). As always, please treat this document as confidential.

The attached document includes the following edits:

- Using the MPC draft as a basis, I pared down the introductory text (by about 120 words). New language is highlighted as replacement text while old text is eliminated for readability. [Note that I left in most of the content here, including the natural gas language that was a stated preference of the Executive Committee – further cuts will likely require a true change in approach to this section]
- I accepted all changes in the “principles” section of the document, as agreed upon at our meeting on the 25th.
- I added in draft language regarding the 4 points from the tax document:
 - Transparent signal to consumers (added as a principle)
 - Use of revenue (added to the “elements”)
 - Level playing field for imports/exports (added to the “elements”)
 - Pre-emption of state rules (added to the “elements” and combined with existing pre-emption bullet)

At our next meeting (9/14; 8:00 – 4:00 eastern time; @API Washington), we will review the introductory and “elements” sections of the document, as well as review any outstanding issues (including those “parked” issues at the end of the document). We should also make time at the end of the meeting to at least begin a discussion of a TF recommendation on the future of the carbon tax principles document.

Feel free to contact me with any questions regarding the document or our next meeting. Best,

Kyle