

To: Stout, Robert [REDACTED]@bp.com]
From: Jefferiss, Paul H. [/O=MSXBP/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[REDACTED]]
Sent: Thur 09/06/2016 10:38:54 AM (UTC)
Subject: FW: Confidential: Ford proposal for US vehicle regulation

Bob,

We will need to decide on BP participation.

I strongly support Rod Davies presence as he knows chapter and verse about technology costs in the different areas.

I don't know Jorge Bastos, but don't feel a strategic relationship owner is essential for this focused purpose. If he did attend, either you or I would need to bow out, or we'd need to check if we could have four places, which might be overkill.

What do you think?

Paul

From: Strank, Angela RE
Sent: 09 June 2016 10:14
To: Eyton, David G P; Haton, Emmanuel; Jefferiss, Paul H.; Sanyal, Dev; Emery, Dominic; Naughton, Eamonn J.; Henshaw, Peter; Rogers, Liz; Nash, Mike A (Legal); Stout, Robert; Moy, Edlyn
Subject: RE: Confidential: Ford proposal for US vehicle regulation

Redacted - First Amendment

Best regards

Angela

Dr Angela Strank
Head of Technology, Downstream and BP Chief Scientist

[REDACTED] (Mobile); +[REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]@bp.com

BP p.l.c. Registered office: [REDACTED] Registered in England and Wales, number 102498.

The information contained in this electronic transmission may be confidential and/or privileged. Access to this electronic transmission by anyone other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorised. If you have received it in error please notify the sender immediately. Please then delete the e-mail and do not disclose its contents to any person.

BPA_HCOR_00300600

From: Eyton, David G P

Sent: 09 June 2016 08:43

To: Haton, Emmanuel; Jefferiss, Paul H.; Sanyal, Dev; Emery, Dominic; Naughton, Eamonn J.; Henshaw, Peter; Strank, Angela RE; Rogers, Liz; Nash, Mike A (Legal); Stout, Robert; Moy, Edlyn

Subject: RE: Confidential: Ford proposal for US vehicle regulation

Importance: High

Dear All,

This looks like an important workshop, and there should be technology representation at it who is familiar with both the ETI's work and the LTTV - most probably Rod Davies. Indeed this input would ideally have been reflected in the various briefs attached.

Most of the issue floated here are covered in the Technology Outlook, and the outcome of the analysis resonates with the ETI's ESME modelling, which is far more comprehensive in its handling of future technologies for the UK than Ford's simple analysis. The ETI's analysis for the UK, which achieves the 80% decarbonisation target, backs very little oil out of transport. The big difference is that the ETI's work clearly shows that if the carbon price rises to \$200/te equivalent, then CCS and the use of a wider array of biomass is economically robust. In other words simply leveraging the low cost of CO2 abatement in the power sector, excluding CCS, is by no means the most cost effective route to decarbonisation.

David Eyton

Telephone: [REDACTED]

BP plc [REDACTED]

Registered in England and Wales No 102498

From: Haton, Emmanuel

Sent: 08 June 2016 15:40

To: Jefferiss, Paul H.; Sanyal, Dev; Emery, Dominic; Eyton, David G P; Naughton, Eamonn J.; Henshaw, Peter; Strank, Angela RE; Rogers, Liz; Nash, Mike A (Legal); Stout, Robert; Moy, Edlyn

Subject: RE: Confidential: Ford proposal for US vehicle regulation

Thanks a lot Paul for this.

In the EU, it is worth to note that this is not really a new idea as some members of ACEA has been pushing for including transport into the ETS (not renewable certificate) for a while now. There is no political appetite for this.

We need to remember that the CO2/Km regulation prime objective was to force more efficient vehicle into the market to:

- 1) Reduce the bill of Imported fuel
- 2) Provide an incentive to diesel which is still offering a barrier of entry into the EU market as diesel engines manufacturers leaders are still - mostly - Europeans (even if this barrier of entry has largely diminished over time and diesel is not anymore seen as the panacea)
- 3) Force EU manufacturers to invest in innovation to reduce fuel consumption (reduce fuel bill and technology leadership to remain in the EU)
- 4) Lastly..... to reduce GHG emissions

I don't believe that the EU politicians are ready to diminish the pressure on EU car manufacturers by permitting an offsetting of their emission with the power sector.

I tend to think the pressure will remain - although may be more carefully since the VW scandal (*) - and we may well see tighter regulation in the power sector - to discourage coal ? - and this may happen outside the ETS hence the risk on the future of the ETS if another set of regulation is decided outside its scope.

As you know in BP we have been reluctant to lobby for such an approach in the power sector - although it may help our gas agenda - as we are not too keen to have a form of emission performance standards

applying to our industrial units like refineries and pet chem.

Last but not least you must be aware that we have some good Renewable Certificate that we could sell to Ford since we are getting those for blending palm oil in our Frontignan terminal in France!

(*) the focus in Brussels today is more about Real Driving Emission enforcement and control

Apologies for the length of this message but I hope this will provide fuel for thought.

Best wishes

Emmanuel

Emmanuel HATON

BP

Tel : [REDACTED]

Mobile : [REDACTED]

Assistant : Bea Van Hool

[REDACTED]@bp.com

Tel : [REDACTED]

From: Jefferiss, Paul H.

Sent: 08 June 2016 15:53

To: Sanyal, Dev; Emery, Dominic; Haton, Emmanuel; Eyton, David G P; Naughton, Eamonn J.; Henshaw, Peter; Strank, Angela RE; Rogers, Liz; Nash, Mike A (Legal); Stout, Robert; Moy, Edlyn

Subject: Confidential: Ford proposal for US vehicle regulation

All,

Attached are three documents:

- A Ford powerpoint detailing their proposal
- A Ford summary of the proposal and plan for a workshop to discuss it – in DC June 27.

Redacted - First Amendment

Best wishes

Paul

<<...>> <<...>> <<...>>