Message

Sent: 06/03/2019 22:57:18

To: Clanton, Brett [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=

CC: Ryan, Jason [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=; Harrison, Tara

[/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=

Subject: RE: INSERT: 2 Qs and As on CCUS, as requested (vetted by Poh)

Good stuff. Will add to the TPs doc now.

Bob Stout

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

Office: Mobile:		

From: Clanton, Brett

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:44 PM **To:** Stout, Robert < @bp.com>

Cc: Ryan, Jason < @bp.com>; Harrison, Tara < @bp.com>

Subject: INSERT: 2 Qs and As on CCUS, as requested (vetted by Poh)

: Former U.S. Vice President AI Gore recently dismissed CCUS as "nonsense," saying it was simply cheaper and easier to move away from fossil fuels and shift more quickly to renewable energy. What do you say to that?

A: We respectfully disagree — and so do many experts and scientists who have looked closely at this issue. That includes a United Nations scientific panel who issued a report last fall, finding that CCUS technology is critical to keeping temperatures below a level that would avoid the worst impacts of climate change. At BP, we believe CCUS technologies are proven, reliable and ready, and that the scaling up of this technology needs to be accelerated.

Additional background if needed:

- The IPCC (2014) reported that 2° C scenarios which use alternatives to CCUS would on average cost more than twice as much (138% increase).
- Also, IEA analysis (2017) show that an CCUS has a role to play; CCUS will need to provide 14% of all global cumulative CO2 reductions by 2060 to meet the IEA's 2ºC (2DS) scenario.

Redacted - First Amendment

Brett Clanton

