

Message

From: Eyton, David G P [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]
Sent: 12/01/2016 22:41:18
To: Emery, Dominic [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Jefferiss, Paul H. [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Sanyal, Dev [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Evans, Jonathan [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Henshaw, Peter [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Naughton, Eamonn J. [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Haton, Emmanuel [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Nash, Mike A (Legal) [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Strank, Angela RE [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]
CC: Stout, Robert [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Mannion, Kathrina [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]; Rogers, Liz [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN= [REDACTED]]
Subject: RE: Revised OGCI governance

A word of caution - achieving 2°C will either take draconian action such as the imposition of an extraordinarily high price on carbon, one that would create winners and losers to the extent that countries could not pay the price politically or economically, or technology developments that are at best unproven at present. Whatever 'credible' pathway OGCI come up with, there will be observers who say it is not credible. I quote from an article from the MIT Technology Review by Richard Martin yesterday (BP is an ILP member so I can share this with you but please do not forward outside BP):-

While many scientists and climate change activists hailed December's Paris agreement as a historic step forward for international efforts to limit global warming, the landmark accord rests on a highly dubious assumption: to achieve the goal of limiting the rise in global average temperature to less than 2 °C (much less the more ambitious goal of 1.5 °C), we don't just need to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide to essentially zero by the end of this century. We also must remove from the atmosphere huge amounts of carbon dioxide that have already been emitted (see "[Paris Climate Agreement Rests on Shaky Technological Foundations](#)").

Doing so will involve "negative emissions technologies"—systems that capture carbon dioxide and store it, usually deep underground. Such technologies are theoretical at best, but they are considered critical for achieving the Paris goals. Of the [116 scenarios reviewed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) to achieve stabilization of carbon in the atmosphere at between 430 and 480 parts per million (the level considered necessary for a maximum 2 °C rise in temperature), 101 involve some form of negative emissions.

and later in the article

Bioenergy plus carbon capture and storage represents the marriage of two technologies, neither of which has proven to be viable on its own. The technology's "credibility as a climate change mitigation option is unproven," concluded [a September 2014 study in Nature Climate Change](#) led by Sabine Fuss, a scientist at the Mercator Research Institute on Global Commons and Climate Change in Berlin, "and its widespread deployment in climate stabilization scenarios might become a dangerous distraction."

The 'credibility' risk talks about greenwash and the need for a transparent process, but I am not sure it really gets at the issue of presumed technology breakthroughs, which are themselves difficult to predict and/or substantiate.

David Eyton
Telephone: [REDACTED]

From: Emery, Dominic

Sent: 12 January 2016 21:21

To: Jefferiss, Paul H.; Sanyal, Dev; Evans, Jonathan; Henshaw, Peter; Naughton, Eamonn J.; Haton, Emmanuel; Nash, Mike A (Legal); Strank, Angela RE; Eyton, David G P

Cc: Stout, Robert; Mannion, Kathrina; Rogers, Liz

Subject: RE: Revised OGCI governance

Paul

No showstoppers from me. I would recommend adding the UK ETI as an organisation to leverage as their ESME model is probably the most sophisticated 2°C one out there at the moment.

Other suggestions on tracked changes.

Best regards

Dominic

From: Jefferiss, Paul H.

Sent: 12 January 2016 15:35

To: Sanyal, Dev; Evans, Jonathan; Emery, Dominic; Henshaw, Peter; Naughton, Eamonn J.; Haton, Emmanuel; Nash, Mike A (Legal); Strank, Angela RE; Eyton, David G P

Cc: Stout, Robert; Mannion, Kathrina; Rogers, Liz

Subject: RE: Revised OGCI governance

The 2 degree roadmap proposal just in.

Feedback asap (if showstopping) or by noon Thursday otherwise.

Thanks

Paul

From: Jefferiss, Paul H.

Sent: 12 January 2016 14:35

To: Sanyal, Dev; Evans, Jonathan; Emery, Dominic; Henshaw, Peter; Naughton, Eamonn J.; Haton, Emmanuel; Nash, Mike A (Legal); Strank, Angela RE; Eyton, David G P

Cc: Stout, Robert; Mannion, Kathrina; Rogers, Liz

Subject: Revised OGCI governance

All,

Please find attached:

1. A cover note and revised membership and governance proposal for the OGCI.
2. The existing charter, which could be appended to the proposal.
3. A revised Paris Agreement briefing.

On OGCI I have radically simplified to laid down the membership and governance rules bang bang bang, no discussion and no options. I have also reflected the specific changes we discussed yesterday.

I have also reflected WEF feedback received yesterday afternoon, which was significant. They felt:

1. We must specify detailed rules of procedure, because this interacts with the decision mechanism and will lead to chaos if we don't.
2. Decisions must only be taken only at meetings, not outside. This is to prevent protracted and chaotic debate post-meeting – and to give CEO meetings a purpose.
3. This requires defining a meeting quorum for decision making. I have proposed a 75% quorum with 75% agreement of members present to carry decisions. This still equates to a majority (at least 56%) of all members to carry a decision.
4. CEOs should not be able to delegate decision making. They must attend meetings (by phone or in person) to vote. This is to preserve CEO-led initiative and provide incentive to attend.

In addition:

1. I have not complicated things with an Excom appeals process – the CEOs can overrule an Excom decision if they wish.
2. I have not mentioned communicating or labelling OGCI work to distinguish between activities that all or only some members support. This seems counter to an aligned decision making process which is OGCI or nothing. OK?
3. I have not included the CIV chair as non-voting Excom member – but this could be added easily.
4. To shorten the document the Excom governance rules could be cut – but they interact directly with Steering Committee and it would be good to get CEO agreement to revise them too.

I suggest the final document is not circulated to CEOs until COB Friday – to avoid the possibility of objections being raised at Excom on Friday. To get a final version circulated to CEOs by COB Friday we will need to agree this amongst ourselves and with WEF by COB tomorrow, to get Bob's sign off on Thursday/Friday.

On Paris I have made changes requested – OK to go?

I have not yet received any of the other OGCI workstream proposals. No surprise. I will share them as they come in.

Thanks for inputs.

Best wishes

Paul