Ms. Gretchen Watkins, President, Shell Oil Company
Questions for the Record, Committee on Oversight and Reform
October 28, 2021

Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney

1. *Your prepared testimony for the October 28, 2021, hearing stated that Shell Oil Company is a member of "a wide variety of trade associations that also engage with policymakers and the public," and "[t]hese associations, by their nature, do not necessarily represent the specific view of Shell on every matter." You also explained that, in 2019, Shell chose to withdraw from at least one organization due to "identified misalignment" of policy views. However, your written testimony omitted any mention of Shell's historical funding of third parties and front groups that have publicly cast doubt on the science of climate change and spent millions of dollars to prevent climate action.*

   In order for the Committee to gain a more complete understanding of the issues raised by your testimony, please provide information detailing the total amount and itemization of all direct or indirect funding provided by Shell Oil Company to individuals, foundations, advocacy organizations, business associations, research institutions, or policy institutions, including funding intended to be transferred to other entities, from 1991 to the present, for any projects or activities related to the science, policy, or advocacy associated with climate change.

   a. *In particular, please provide (1) the identity of the individuals or organizations that received the funding, (2) the amounts of funding and the dates it was provided, and (3) a description of the activity that was funded and the results sought or achieved.*

Shell is committed to transparency regarding advocacy related to climate change. As part of that commitment, Shell has published three Industry Associations Climate Review reports that review the alignment – and misalignment – between Shell's positions on climate and those of various trade associations on a global basis.[1] The most recent reports also discuss the amount paid to those associations. These reports have been previously produced to the Committee and are publicly available on Shell's global website, along with commentary and other related documents concerning Shell's global advocacy and political activity (https://www.shell.com/sustainability/transparency-and-sustainability-reporting/advocacy-and-political-activity.html).

Additionally, I understand we are in the process of responding to the Committee's requests for additional documentation regarding funding provided to other entities related to climate change and clean energy. As one example of how we do this in the United States, Shell companies fund scientific research related to climate change, including Shell's partnership with Rice University

[1] As noted in my written testimony, Shell Oil Company is a U.S. subsidiary of Royal Dutch Shell plc, headquartered in The Hague, Netherlands. The companies that Royal Dutch Shell plc directly and indirectly owns, or in which it invests, are separate legal entities; the use of "Shell" generally is used for convenience only. As with my hearing testimony, these responses necessarily encompass activities beyond Shell Oil Company in the United States. Climate change is a challenge for all of society across the world.

to launch Carbon Hub, a research initiative with the goal of creating a net zero-emissions world by using oil and gas to create clean energy. Shell has committed to investing $10 million in the initiative, which will include 70 researchers from 20 universities, national laboratories, and research institutes.

2. *Please provide accounting records including corporate ledger or journal entries, invoices, checks, receipts, and other supporting documentation showing any and all funds provided by Shell to any groups or organizations that publicly reject climate science from 1991 to the present, including (1) the amount of such funding and (2) the date(s) such funding was provided.*

During my tenure at Shell, I am unaware of Shell supporting groups or organizations that publicly reject climate science. In fact, we have endeavored to be a leader in the industry in the energy transition to a lower-carbon future. Additionally, I understand we are in the process of responding to the Committee's requests for additional documentation regarding funding provided to other entities related to climate change and clean energy.

3. *Has Shell taken any actions to protect its facilities, assets, or operations from the impacts of climate change since the publication of the first assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in 1990?*

    a. *Please provide a list of (1) each action taken, (2) the date the action was taken, (3) the amount of warming and associated environmental changes the action was meant to prepare for, and (4) the amounts expended for each action.*

Climate change and its potential impacts have been the subject of public discussion and scientific research for many decades. Shell, like all responsible businesses, takes an adaptive approach to all of the unique environments we work in and mitigates risks so that all of our operations can continue in a safe and reliable manner.

4. *You testified that Shell is "working to increase the demand for low- and no-carbon fuels." Please identify all projects or practices Shell is currently engaged in to increase demand for low- and no-carbon fuels and renewable energy, including the amounts allocated to and expended on each project.*

In line with Shell's global target to be a net-zero energy enterprise by 2050, in step with society, and all of the related emissions reductions targets it has announced, Shell's strategy is focused on the energy transition. We are working to offer customers more, lower-carbon products while continuing to supply oil and gas the world needs as we transition to a lower-carbon economy.

On the day of the hearing, Shell announced additional targets for absolute reductions in Scope 1 and 2 emissions. More information concerning these targets and Shell's global Powering Progress strategy can be found on the global website (https://www.shell.com/powering-progress.html). Documents detailing the energy transition plan for the United States have also been produced to the Committee, as well as documents concerning the Shell group's overarching energy transition targets and strategy.

The following are some examples of our recent efforts in the United States:

- Shell directly partners with major corporations to promote their energy transition efforts. We are collaborating with World Energy to provide six million gallons of sustainable aviation fuel to Amazon Air. We provide renewable energy to Microsoft, helping advance its efforts to reach 100% renewable energy supply by 2025. We are building hydrogen refueling infrastructure in partnership with Toyota and the State of California. And we have collaborated with General Motors to offer free overnight hours of electric vehicle charging to owners of its electric vehicles.
- We participate in a range of industry coalitions seeking to increase demand for lower-carbon fuels. In the trucking industry, Shell supports the Road Freight Zero Coalition, which works to increase the deployment of zero-emission fleets and infrastructure by 2030. Shell provided funding for the development of the Starship Project truck, a next-generation concept truck with increased fuel economy and freight efficiency that, if deployed across the U.S. trucking industry, could reduce its emissions by 71.5%.
- Shell is a founding member of the aviation industry's Clean Skies for Tomorrow Coalition. As a part of the Coalition, Shell works with airlines, airports, fuel providers, and engine manufacturers to make sustainable aviation fuel more widely available, resulting in reduced emissions across the aviation sector. Further, Shell has supported innovations like aviation fuel made from used cooking oil, municipal waste, and wood biomass.
- Shell is also a founding member of the shipping industry's Getting to Zero Coalition, which is committed to introducing commercially viable, deep-sea vessels powered by zero emission fuels by 2030. We recently agreed to charter our second LNG marine fueling barge for use in the United States. When adopted at scale, these vessels will allow shipping customers to significantly reduce emissions.
- Shell has invested in building out its portfolio of low-carbon energy options, so that we can match future consumer demand. For instance, in 2019, we acquired Greenlots, a Los Angeles-based electric vehicle charging and energy solutions company. In June, a Shell joint venture, Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind, won the right to provide 1.5 GW of renewable offshore wind energy in New Jersey. Last week, Shell announced our acquisition of Savion, a U.S.-based solar and energy storage developer with 18 GW of projects in its pipeline. And just a few days ago, Mayflower Wind Energy LLC, another Shell joint venture, was awarded the right to provide 400 MW of offshore wind energy by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Combined with its power purchase agreement of 804 MW awarded in 2019, Mayflower could deliver more than 1200 MW of clean energy to electricity customers throughout Massachusetts and New England – enough energy each day to power over half a million homes and businesses.

5. *You testified during the October 28, 2021 hearing that "[t]here are several places where [Shell is] not fully aligned with the API." Please identify all issues on which Shell is "not fully aligned" with the American Petroleum Institute.*

On a global basis, Shell has published three Industry Associations Climate Review reports that candidly review alignment – and misalignment – between Shell's positions on climate and those of various trade associations, including API. The 2021 Industry Associations Climate Review

identifies some misalignment on climate-related policy positions with API and provides a review of our alignment on certain issues. This review, which has been produced to the Committee, noted the following examples:

- Shell's ambition is to be a net-zero emissions energy business by 2050, or sooner, in step with society. The review noted that API has not stated a position in support of net-zero emissions.
- On alternative transport fuels, API and Shell differ on their respective stated positions regarding the Renewable Fuel Standard. API and Shell have a similar advocacy approach in that both parties believe the standard should be reformed.
- While API has stated positions critical of an order by the governor of California to ban internal combustion engine vehicles by 2035, Shell responded to the order by highlighting Shell's willingness to continue to help build cleaner transport infrastructure, including for electric and hydrogen vehicles.
- Shell believes carbon sinks have a crucial role to play in achieving net-zero emissions. We support policies that recognize a role for nature-based solutions in helping balance emissions from sectors that are harder to abate, such as aviation, shipping, and heavy industry. API has stated support for the use of carbon offsets, but has not stated a position in support of nature-based solutions.

Although Shell has found API to be misaligned with some of our climate-related policy positions, Shell was encouraged by API's recent statements in support of the ambitions of the Paris Agreement and the direct regulation of methane emissions. We also welcome API's Climate Action Framework, published in March 2021, which states support for carbon pricing and the direct regulation of methane emissions.

Shell plans to continue to review its alignment with industry associations and will be transparent about where we find significant differences. We will also continue to engage the association in areas where we have different views.

6. Your prepared testimony for the October 28, 2021, hearing explains, "A recent review identified some misalignment with . . . the Chamber of Commerce." Please identify all issues on which Shell is "misaligned" with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Shell's global 2021 Industry Associations Climate Review identifies some misalignment on climate-related policy positions with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and provides a review of our alignment on certain issues. This review, which was produced to the Committee, notes the following examples:

- Shell's ambition is to be a net-zero emissions energy business by 2050, or sooner, in step with society. The Chamber has not stated a position on net-zero emissions.
- Shell views government-led carbon pricing mechanisms as key to meeting the goals outlined in the Paris Agreement. The Chamber has not explicitly stated a position in support of carbon pricing. It has stated that it supports a market-based approach to accelerate greenhouse gas emission reductions across the U.S. economy.
- On transport, the Chamber's stated support for reform of the vehicle fuel economy standards is not consistent with Shell's position.

- Shell believes carbon sinks have a crucial role to play in achieving net-zero emissions. We support policies that recognize a role for nature-based solutions in helping balance emissions from sectors that are harder to abate, such as aviation, shipping, and heavy industry. The Chamber has stated support for carbon capture, utilization, and storage, but has not stated a position on nature-based solutions.

Shell plans to continue to review its alignment with industry associations and will be transparent about where we find significant differences. We will also continue to engage the association in areas where we have different views.

7. *Your prepared testimony for the October 28, 2021, hearing explains that in 2019, "Shell elected to leave the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers Association after having identified misalignment." Please identify all issues on which Shell "identified misalignment" with American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers Association that resulted in Shell withdrawing from the organization.*

Shell found material misalignment with the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, and Shell Oil Company left the association as a result. Shell's 2019 review noted the following areas of misalignment, which in the aggregate, amounted to a significant difference in positions prompting Shell's departure:

- AFPM had not stated support for the goal of the Paris Agreement. Shell supports the goal of the Paris Agreement.
- AFPM had stated that it did not support carbon pricing. Shell supports carbon pricing initiatives at the state and federal level, such as the California cap-and-trade program.
- AFPM opposed government action that increases the cost of energy. This included, in AFPM's view, a carbon tax and the mandated use of certain fuels. In another example, AFPM supported the EPA's proposed rollback of fuel economy standards in the United States, which Shell opposed. In 2015, AFPM and others mounted a legal challenge to the EPA's Clean Power Plan over whether it was compliant with the Clean Air Act. Shell did not join the legal challenge. We focused our own advocacy on other elements of the Plan, such as the use of natural gas and emission-reduction targets.
- AFPM did not take a position on the role of natural gas. Shell supports the use of natural gas in helping society transition to low-carbon energy.
- AFPM did not take a position on the reduction of methane emissions. Shell supports direct regulation to address methane emissions.

In 2019, Shell Oil Company decided not to renew its AFPM membership.

8. *Please describe, in detail, the steps Shell will take to become a net-zero company by 2050 through emission reductions in particular.*

    a. *Please identify fossil fuel resources that Shell will divest from or decrease extraction and development of, as well as exploration Shell will permanently suspend, to avoid 1.5- and 2-degree Celsius warming and meet the company's goal of net-zero by 2050.*

b. Please explain whether Shell will increase investment in zero-carbon and renewable energy sources if carbon capture and sequestration technology is not feasible or scalable at interim target dates, including what those target dates and development benchmarks are, and whether Shell has planned to strand more fossil fuel resources in this scenario.

Shell believes climate change is one of the most pressing issues of our time for all of society. That is why we have set our target to become a net-zero emissions energy business globally by 2050, in step with society. Further details on moving toward this target are available in our current Shell Energy Transition Strategy report, which was produced to the Committee. Shell is also expecting to release an updated report in early 2022 that takes into account the additional strategy changes announced in October 2021. Shell will make this update publicly available.

In broad terms, Shell sees six levers to help Shell and our customers decarbonize energy in the short, medium, and long term, including: (1) pursuing operational efficiency in our assets, (2) shifting to natural gas, (3) growing our low-carbon power business, (4) providing low-carbon fuels such as biofuels and hydrogen, (5) developing carbon capture and storage, and (6) using natural sinks. Shell seeks to avoid, reduce, and only then mitigate any remaining emissions.

Shell believes our emissions peaked in 2018 and oil production peaked in 2019, and we expect a gradual decline of about 1% to 2% a year in total oil production through to 2030, including divestments. We will also reduce annual spending on exploration from around $2.2 billion in 2015 to around $1.5 billion per year between 2021 and 2025. After 2025, we do not anticipate new frontier exploration, which is part of our effort to transform our portfolio and thrive throughout the energy transition.

Shell seeks to access 25 mtpa of carbon capture and storage capacity by 2035. We also recognize the scale of the challenge in developing CCS globally as quickly and as widely as needed. We plan to offer more low-carbon products and solutions, such as biofuels, charging for electric vehicles, and hydrogen and renewable power, in addition to investing in carbon capture and nature-based offsets.

The recent acquisition of U.S.-based solar and energy storage developer Savion provides just one example of how Shell companies in the United States are growing the renewable energy portfolio. Additional details are provided as part of Shell's Energy Transition Strategy and the annual reports and sustainability reports, which have been produced to the Committee.

More information on the Shell group of companies' overarching strategy and emissions reductions targets can be found on the global website (https://www.shell.com/powering-progress.html).

Chairman Ro Khanna

1. In your written testimony to the Oversight Committee, you explained "[a]s early as 1991, the annual reports of Shell Oil Company's parent company discussed concerns about climate change" and that your company produced a video that "described the possibility of 'climatic changes with adverse consequences for us all.'" These actions described in your written testimony appear at odds with evidence that your company engaged in

activities or were participants in organizations that publicly cast doubt on the science for decades in order to prevent meaningful steps to address the climate crisis.

Please provide all internal memoranda, analyses, and reports prepared by or on behalf of Shell Oil Company or its predecessor companies from 1991 to the present, that:

a. Contain predictions of possible negative impact of climate change or global warming on the planet, humans, or the company's business activities; or

b. Evaluate the veracity or scientific validity of public-facing Shell Oil Company statements related to the reality or effect of climate change or global warming on the planet, the human race, or the company's business activities.

During my tenure at Shell, I have not experienced any effort to cast doubt on the climate science or prevent meaningful steps to address climate change issues. Indeed, my experience is the opposite – we have worked with policymakers to support legislative action, developed lower-carbon energy solutions, and worked with our sectoral customers to identify sustainable pathways to decarbonization.

2. For the same reasons, please provide all documents from 1991 to the present related to concerns or objections raised by Shell employees or board members about the veracity or scientific validity of public-facing Shell statements related to the reality or effect of climate change or global warming on the planet, humans, or the company's business activities.

Shell has long publicly recognized that greenhouse gas emissions from human activity, including the use of fossil fuels, are contributing to global warming. Shell is working with the Committee on its various document requests.

3. Ms. Watkins, during the hearing you told Rep. Bush that you were "glad my company's been involved in the science research and involved with these discussions for decades," in response to a question about Shell's internal knowledge of the potentially devastating consequences of climate change.

a. When did Shell first start to study climate change and its potential impacts?

I have only been at Shell since 2018 and do not know when Shell first became involved in the science research.

b. When did Shell first adapt or modify any projects, facilities, or operations to protect the company from potential impacts of climate change?

Shell, like all responsible businesses, takes actions to identify and mitigate risks so our operations can continue in a safe and reliable manner. I am not aware of whether or when Shell first took actions to adapt or modify projects to protect the company from potential impacts of climate change before my tenure.

c. Has the company ever incorporated climate projections in decisions on exploration and development of oil and gas resources? If so, when did Shell first start doing so?

Shell has long included potential carbon costs as a factor in the assessment of potential investment decisions. After 2025, we do not anticipate new frontier exploration, which is part of our effort to transform our portfolio and thrive throughout the energy transition. Additionally, as detailed in our Energy Transition Strategy, Shell is working to achieve its net-zero target, in part, by reducing annual spending on exploration from around $2.2 billion in 2015 to around $1.5 billion per year between 2021 and 2025.

4. In 2019, an Internal Revenue Service inspector general investigation revealed that ten taxpayers claimed 99.9% of the 45Q tax credits between 2010 and 2019. The investigation also revealed that:

> *for TYs 2010 through 2019, a total of $893,935,025 (87 percent) worth of I.R.C. § 45Q credits were claimed by these 10 taxpayers when they were not in compliance with the EPA (i.e., they did not have an approved MRV Plan in place at the time the credit was claimed).*

a. Did your company claim 45Q tax credits between 2009 and 2018?

b. How much did your company accrue in 45Q tax credits annually during that period? And for the period as a whole?

c. Please submit the corresponding monitoring, reporting, and verification plan approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

d. During this time, was the company aware that 87% worth of I.R.C. § 45Q credits were claimed by taxpayers when they were not in compliance with EPA?

e. What percentage of the 45Q tax credits your company claimed/accrued during that period were for captured carbon (di)oxide used in enhanced oil or natural gas recovery? How much does that amount to in total credit value?

f. Have you repaid any claimed credits ("recapture") due to leakage or intentional removal?

It is my understanding that Shell did not claim a 45Q tax credit between 2010 and 2018.

Rep. Cori Bush

1. Did you know before 1988 that communities of color would be hit earliest and disproportionately hard by climate change? Before 1980?

Shell recognizes the impacts of climate change will necessarily be different across different communities and geographic areas. Your question predates my time at Shell. During my tenure at Shell, we have been taking action to address climate change by working with policymakers to

support legislative solutions, developing lower-carbon energy solutions, and supporting our customers in identifying pathways that would allow their business or an entire sector to decarbonize. We are also working to expand communities' access to reliable energy, even as we work to participate in and accelerate the energy transition.

Ultimately, Shell's societal and regulatory ability to operate is affected by our capability to operate safely and responsibly in the communities in which we live and work, and we are proud of our history of respecting our neighbors in the communities in which we operate.

2. *Do you have modeling that has not been shared that suggests that certain places would and will flood and burn?*

As noted in response to a similar question during the hearing, I am not familiar with what you are referencing. If more information or guidance can be provided, we would be happy to get back to you.

3. *Is an oil refinery more likely to be sited in a predominantly Black or a predominantly white community?*

In my experience, refineries are located where necessitated by operational considerations, such as proximity to ports, distribution facilities, and customers. Sometimes, a refinery is located in a remote area and a community later develops around the jobs and economic activity created by the refinery. At Shell, we are proud to support local economic and community development in a wide variety of communities neighboring our facilities.

4. *Have you ever targeted people of color with marketing campaigns concerning climate change and energy of any sort?*

Shell's energy products are used by Americans of all backgrounds, and it has long been our practice that energy advertising should be directed to all consumers, or groups of consumers, who use our products. During my time at Shell, and in support of the energy transition, we have broadly communicated about lower-carbon opportunities available to all customers through our advertising.

Rep. Ayanna Pressley

1. *Please provide the annual dollar amount and percentage of revenue allocated to and expended on training and up-skilling workers for a net-zero economy, with specific attention on jobs in the renewable energy sector, since 2015.*

As part of our efforts to support the energy transition, Shell has undertaken a wide range of initiatives to support our employees in developing the skills necessary to work in the new energy environment. The following are a few examples:

- Shell frequently takes experienced technical workers from our traditional businesses and embeds them into ventures that have the potential to produce lower-carbon products. For example, in our Gulf of Mexico operations, expertise in offshore oil production is being transferred to the Atlantic Ocean in pursuit of a scalable offshore wind business.

- We have developed programs with universities to attract, retain, and build capacity for current and future talent needs. This includes work with the Colorado School of Mines, MIT, Michigan State, Rice, University of Colorado at Boulder, and University of Texas at Austin. The programs supported include engineering, science, and math camps; mentoring programs; minority and women student organizations and associations; and field trip learning experiences, among others.
- We recognize that solving our future energy challenges will require the knowledge and expertise of the next generation in the fields of math, science, and technology. With that in mind, we have focused on supporting STEM education initiatives that ultimately will support development of a workforce tailor-made for the energy transition. For instance, Shell has made substantial social investments supporting, among other things, workshops hosted by the National Energy Education Development Project, technical scholarships for underserved students seeking to attend Xavier University, and skills conferences hosted by the North American Process Technology Alliance for university professors, workforce professionals, and other labor and economic groups. Shell has also partnered with the League of United Latin American Citizens to support the enrollment of 100 to 200 Houston-area middle school students annually in STEM education programs.

Rep. Mike Quigley

1. *In January of this year, Total, a French multinational fossil fuel company, withdrew from the American Petroleum Institute (API) because of the organization's support for weakening methane emissions standards, opposition to electric vehicles, and other issues.*

   Your company's association with API has the appearance of undermining more forward-looking stances you may have publicly taken. In your written testimony, you alluded to differences you have with trade associations such as API.

   a. *Please characterize your relationship with API and what you expect of API in terms of public policy advocacy.*

   b. *Specifically, what are the differences between your company and API on climate policy?*

   c. *What specific actions are you taking to encourage API to take meaningful policy stances to combat climate change?*

Shell has transparently discussed its relationship with API in our Industry Associations Climate Review, which has previously been produced to the Committee. API sets safety, environmental, and technical standards for oil and natural gas companies and creates certification programs for people working in the industry and for products, allowing us to safely bring them to market. API is also a leading voice on key issues that affect our customers, including standards for biofuels.

Shell's 2021 Industry Associations Climate Review found API to be misaligned with some of our climate-related policy positions. Shell plans to continue to review its alignment with industry associations and will be transparent about where we find significant differences. We will continue to engage the association in areas where we have different views.

In particular, Shell continues to urge API to take a more proactive and constructive approach to climate-related policy and advocacy, in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement. We have also publicly urged API to support carbon pricing and the direct regulation of methane emissions. We are encouraged by API's recent publication of its Climate Action Framework, and welcome its significant policy advancements in 2021.

2. *The Department of Defense (DOD) refers to climate change as a "threat multiplier," and recent reports from the Department of Homeland Security, the Intelligence Community, the National Security Council, and the armed services outline the emerging threat of climate change and its ability to wreak economic havoc and destabilize regions, initiate and fuel conflicts, and help foment violence.*

   DOD has highlighted the emergence of the increasingly accessible Arctic as a new geopolitical theater. It has also noted the increased strain on the budget and personnel of the National Guard wrought by the transformation of "wildfire season" into "wildfire year."

   While Exxon's internal reports confirmed human-caused global warming, publicly it took the opposite view, with a 2017 study of Exxon's communications concluding that the company systematically misled non-scientific audiences about climate science. Shell, meanwhile, in 1994 suggested that policymakers focus on the "weakness in climate science." And API funded an infamous and scientifically questionable 2003 climate study that downplayed the magnitude and scope of climate change. All the while, the consensus of climate scientists was that climate change is real, it is human caused, and it will have catastrophic consequences.

   a. *Would it be appropriate for the U.S. to treat this disinformation campaign as an active and ongoing threat to national security?*

   b. *How should Congress, the military, and the rest of the executive branch respond to the wealth of information that has come to light on this subject?*

I respectfully disagree with the premise of the question because, during my time at Shell, we have been openly and actively discussing the urgent need to address climate change and the need for an acceleration of the energy transition to ensure a lower-carbon future. We have worked with policymakers to support legislative action related to climate change. We continue to support putting a price on carbon in the United States and have publicly supported various measures to address climate change, including legislation meant to curb emissions and proposals for net-zero targets in specific markets.

I am not in a position to comment on the Department of Defense's conclusions related to climate change, though we recognize the national security importance of ensuring that U.S. consumers and businesses have secure and reliable access to energy, even as we collectively pursue pathways that would allow the United States to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement.

Rep. Ilhan Omar

1. *In 1998, the "Global Climate Science Communication Team" wrote a memo that stated that "Victory Will Be Achieved When" the "[m]edia" and "[a]verage citizens 'understand' (recognize) uncertainties in climate science." The plan's architects were Exxon, Chevron, API, utilities, and various front groups like the Advancement of Sound Science Coalition. Shell was, and still is, a member of API.*

    a. *Has Shell, or any of its subsidiaries, ever worked together with other companies in the oil and gas industry to develop public relations strategies related to climate change?*

    b. *Has Shell, or any of its subsidiaries, ever strategized or sought, either directly or through third parties, to emphasize, exaggerate, or otherwise focus public attention on uncertainties concerning climate science, its interpretation, or its implications?*

    c. *Has Shell, or any of its subsidiaries, ever strategized or sought, either directly or through third parties, to deny, downplay, or otherwise reduce public awareness of mainstream scientific consensus concerning climate science, its interpretation, or its implications?*

    d. *Please provide written documentation to substantiate your answers above.*

Shell has both worked independently and with various organizations to highlight the urgent need to address climate change and pursue pathways that would lead to a lower-carbon future. For example, Shell is part of the Road Freight Zero Coalition in the trucking industry, the Clean Skies for Tomorrow Coalition in the aviation industry, and the Getting to Zero Coalition in the shipping industry.

During my tenure at Shell, I am not aware of efforts to downplay or reduce awareness of climate change. In fact, my experience has been the opposite – Shell is seeking to lead the industry in highlighting the urgent need to address climate change and identify pathways to achieve a lower-carbon future.