

Climate Accountability Scorecard

*Insufficient Progress from Fossil Fuel
Companies*

www.ucsusa.org/climatescorecard

Appendix B: Renouncing Disinformation on
Climate Science and Policy

© October 2018

All rights reserved

TABLE 1. Renouncing Disinformation on Climate Science and Policy Scoring Guide

Climate Statements: Direct	
Consistently accurate public statements on climate science and the consequent need for swift and deep reductions in emissions from the burning of fossil fuels	
Advanced (+2)	Company meets all of the criteria for “good” and also highlights the urgency and importance of achieving global net-zero CO ₂ emissions in order to keep temperature rise well below two degrees Celsius and limit risks to society and ecosystems.
Good (+1)	Company meets all of the criteria for “fair” and also affirms the consequent need for swift and deep reductions in emissions from the burning of fossil fuels.
Fair (0)	Company consistently acknowledges the scientific evidence of climate change in all public platforms (such as company websites and statements by company executives).
Poor (-1)	Company does not address climate science on company website on a prominent, easily accessible page (e.g., a page designated specifically to address climate change) or has downplayed the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions on at least one platform.
Egregious (-2)	Company has misrepresented climate science on at least one platform (e.g., on company web page or in public statements). Such misrepresentation might take the form of denying the reality of the problem of climate change or disparaging the scientific evidence of climate change.
Climate Statements: Indirect	
Affiliations with trade associations and other industry groups that spread climate science disinformation and/or block climate action, as relevant. The following trade associations and industry groups analyzed: the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity (ACCCE), American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), American Petroleum Institute (API), National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), National Mining Association (NMA), US Chamber of Commerce (US Chamber), and Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA).	
Advanced (+2)	Company has left or never joined the association or group. In doing so, it stated explicitly that it had made the decision because the group's position on climate science is inaccurate and inconsistent with company's position.
Good (+1)	Company has left or publicly distanced itself from the association or group, or there is clear, incontrovertible evidence that the company has never been affiliated with it.
Fair (0)	Information is unavailable to determine company's affiliation with the association or group.
Poor (-1)	Company is a recent member of the association or group and has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
Egregious (-2)	Company is a recent member with a leadership role in the association or group and has not taken any steps

	to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
Policy, Governance, and Oversight	
Policy, governance systems, and oversight mechanisms to prevent climate disinformation	
Good (+1)	Company has made a public commitment to reject climate science disinformation and established a company-wide policy to avoid direct or indirect involvement in disinformation (i.e., through trade associations and other industry-affiliated groups), with clearly delineated responsibilities for board and senior management to ensure accountability.
Fair (0)	Company has made a public commitment to reject climate science disinformation, but it does not have clear accountability or systems for implementing a company-wide policy.
Poor (-1)	Company has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.
Support for climate-related shareholder resolutions	
Advanced (+2)	Company has not opposed any climate-related shareholder resolutions, has recommended support for one or more climate-related shareholder resolutions put forward by established networks of socially responsible investors (e.g., Aiming for A, As You Sow, Ceres, the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility), and is taking action to resolve issues brought forth in these resolutions.
Good (+1)	Company has not opposed any climate-related shareholder resolutions and recommended support for one or more climate-related shareholder resolutions put forward by established networks of socially responsible investors (e.g., Aiming for A, As You Sow, Ceres, the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility). However, it has not yet taken action to resolve issues raised in these resolutions.
Fair (0)	Company has not faced any climate-related shareholder resolutions put forward by established networks of socially responsible investors (e.g., Aiming for A, As You Sow, Ceres, the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility), or it has supported one or more resolutions and recommended against one or more resolutions.
Poor (-1)	Company has recommended against one or more climate-related shareholder resolutions put forward by established networks of socially responsible investors (e.g., Aiming for A, As You Sow, Ceres, the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility).
Egregious (-2)	Company has attempted to block one or more climate-related shareholder resolutions put forward by established networks of socially responsible investors (e.g., Aiming for A, As You Sow, Ceres, the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility).

DATA0 SOURCES: COMPANY WEBSITES FROM JULY 1, 2016, THROUGH JULY 31, 2018. COMPANY REPORTS, PROXY STATEMENTS, US SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FILINGS, AND SUBMISSIONS IN CLIMATE LIABILITY LITIGATION; PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY COMPANY REPRESENTATIVES; TRADE ASSOCIATION AND INDUSTRY GROUP WEBSITES; AND THIRD-PARTY SHAREHOLDER AND WATCHDOG GROUP WEBSITES FROM JULY 1, 2016, THROUGH JUNE 30, 2018; TRADE ASSOCIATION FEDERAL FILINGS FROM 2016.

TABLE 2. Trade Associations and Industry Groups: Historical and Current Disinformation

Trade Association	Historical Actions to Spread Disinformation and Block Climate Policy	Recent Actions to Spread Disinformation and Block Climate Policy
<p>American Coalition for Clean Coal Energy (ACCCE)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2009, the ACCCE subcontracted a group to send fraudulent letters—purportedly on behalf of organizations including the NAACP and the American Association of University Women—opposing the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 (i.e., the Waxman-Markey climate bill) (Perriello 2009). In the early 2010s, the coalition argued that the many benefits of carbon emissions outweigh the costs by as much as 500 to 1 (Bezdek 2014). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ACCCE spent \$1.7 million lobbying the federal government on behalf of coal and utilities in 2017 (CRP 2017a). The coalition opposed the EPA’s efforts to limit carbon pollution (ACCCE 2017). The coalition argued that the emissions reductions resulting from the proposed Clean Power Plan would have no meaningful environmental benefit (ACCCE n.d.).
<p>American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2016, ALEC’s official climate change statement characterized it as a “historical phenomenon” (ALEC 2015). The association has worked to block climate action at the federal and state levels since the 1990s and was included in the API road map memo (discussed below) (Mulvey et al. 2015). Between 2013 and 2015, ALEC sponsored 65 bills designed to roll back or repeal state standards requiring utilities to increase their use of renewable energy (Center for the New Energy Economy 2015). ALEC’s Environmental Literacy Improvement Act has provided a template for attempts to legislate content contrary to accepted climate science into school curricula (Horn 2013; Horn 2012). ALEC gave climate deniers a speaking platform at its annual meeting (Mulvey et al. 2015). Through the Energy, Environment and Agriculture Task Force, ALEC brought together state lawmakers and companies to draft sample legislation aimed at dismantling state policies that have proven effective in reducing carbon pollution and accelerating the transition to clean energy, and at obstructing state compliance with EPA limits on carbon emissions (Mulvey et al. 2015). The group engaged with state legislators in secretive meetings sponsored by fossil fuel and utility interests and has regularly given climate deniers a speaking platform at its annual meeting, as recently as 2015 (Deyette 2015). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALEC engaged with state legislators in secretive meetings sponsored by fossil fuel and utility interests and continues to question the scientific consensus on climate change (ALEC 2017). The group’s proposed December 2017 resolution calling on the Trump administration to reverse an EPA finding that global warming emissions endanger public health was co-authored by a research fellow at the Heartland Institute, a think tank known for climate denial (Grande 2017; Natter 2017).
<p>American Petroleum Institute (API)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An internal strategy memo by an API task force in 1998 (“Global Climate Science Communications Plan”) was a road map of the fossil fuel industry’s plan to deliberately cast 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The API spent \$8.5 million on federal lobbying on behalf of oil and gas companies in 2017 (CRP 2017b). API’s 2017 “Climate Change &

	<p>doubt on the public’s understanding of climate science by using scientists as spokespersons for the industry’s views, targeting teachers and schools, and securing funding from the fossil fuel industry and right-wing think tanks (Mulvey et al. 2015).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • API’s online briefing on climate and energy in 2016 emphasized uncertainties in climate science (API n.d.). • The group distributed curriculum material through the National Science Teachers Association to kindergarten through high school students (Walker 1998). • The API funded well known contrarian scientists such as Wei-Hock Soon, whose work sought to discredit the scientific evidence of human-caused climate change (Walker 1998). • The group attempted to undermine the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 (often known as the Waxman-Markey climate bill) by mobilizing front groups to hold staged "energy citizens" rallies designed to suggest that there was significant public opposition to regulating carbon emissions where little actually existed (Gerard 2009; Talley 2009). 	<p>Energy” primer blatantly omits the need to reduce global warming emissions, the risks of burning fossil fuels, and the science of climate change (API n.d.).</p>
<p>National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NAM questioned the validity of climate science and the burning of fossil fuels as the primary source of heat-trapping emissions (Mulvey et al. 2016). • NAM’s comment on the EPA Clean Power Plan criticized “the failure to disclose and quantify key uncertainties involved in the modeling” and “the failure to incorporate potential benefits associated with increased temperatures,” and it has joined the federal lawsuit opposing the plan (State of West Virginia et al. v. EPA et al. 2016; NAM 2014). • A recent search for “climate change” (four results) or “global warming” (no results) on NAM’s website yielded documents from 2009 and 2010, none of which address the link between burning fossil fuels and climate change, the impact of climate change, the risks to communities and ecosystems across the globe, or the global efforts to reduce emissions to avoid the most catastrophic consequences of climate change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NAM spent \$8.1 million on federal lobbying on behalf of manufacturing companies in 2017 (CRP 2017c). • The association continues its history of silence on the issue of climate change. • NAM launched the Manufacturers’ Accountability Project in 2017 to discredit lawsuits filed by cities and counties for climate change damages. • The association began backing the Main Street Investors Coalition, which aims to undermine shareholder rights (Minow 2018).
<p>National Mining Association (NMA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NMA funded an API campaign to distort the science of climate change (Goldman and Rogerson 2013). • The association joined the federal lawsuit opposing the EPA Clean Power Plan (Mulvey et al. 2016). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NMA spent \$1.9 million on federal lobbying for coal interests in 2017 (CRP 2017d). • The NMA praised the Trump administration’s efforts to repeal the Clean Power Plan, falsely claiming the plan would be costly and have “unmeasurable” climate change benefits (NMA 2017).

US Chamber of Commerce (US Chamber)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US Chamber refused, as recently as 2014, to acknowledge that global warming is caused by humans (Goldman and Carlson 2014). • The US Chamber opposed the EPA’s efforts to regulate heat-trapping emissions under the Clean Air Act and challenged the science-based finding that global warming pollution endangers public health (Mulvey et al. 2016). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US Chamber funded a report attacking the Paris climate agreement, exaggerating the costs of achieving the agreement’s goals (Steinberger and Levin 2017). • The US chamber reportedly spent \$82.2 million on federal lobbying in 2017 (CRP 2017e).
Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2015, WSPA spread false statements about California’s proposed limits on carbon emissions from cars and trucks (Siders 2015a; Siders 2015b). • WSPA employed deceptive ads on more than one occasion to block provisions of a major clean energy bill enacted by California lawmakers (Siders 2015a; Siders 2015b). • WSPA served as a key organizer of opposition to California’s groundbreaking climate policies, including the state’s low-carbon fuel standard and its AB 32 plan, which requires a sharp reduction in carbon emissions by 2020 (Siders 2015a; Siders 2015b). • In 2014, WSPA president Catherine Reheis-Boyd delivered a presentation that showcased 16 fake grassroots groups and campaigns orchestrated and funded by WSPA and its allies in response to the AB 32 plan (Wieners 2014). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2017, the association reportedly spent \$6.2 million lobbying on behalf of the oil industry in California alone (Bacher 2018). • WSPA serves as a key organizer of opposition to California’s groundbreaking climate policies, including the state’s low-carbon fuel standard and its AB 32 plan requiring a sharp reduction in carbon emissions by 2020 (California ARB 2018). • WSPA heads the No on I-1631 campaign against Washington’s 2018 carbon pricing proposal, with funding from BP, Chevron, and Shell (PDC 2018).

TABLE 3. Renouncing Disinformation on Climate Science and Policy Scoring Bands

Area Aggregate Score	Definition	Point Range
Advanced	Company is demonstrating best practices in the area	+10 – +15
Good	Company is meeting emerging societal expectations in this area	+4 – +9
Fair	Company’s performance in this area is neither positive nor negative	(-3) – +3
Poor	Company is falling short of emerging societal expectations in this area	(-9) – (-4)
Egregious	Company is acting very irresponsibly in this area	(-15) – (-10)

TABLE 4. Renouncing Disinformation on Climate Science and Policy 2016 v 2018 Scores

Company	2016 Area Score	2018 Area Score
Arch Coal	Poor	Poor
BP	Poor	Poor
Chevron	Egregious	Egregious
ConocoPhillips	Poor	Egregious
CONSOL Energy	Poor	Poor
ExxonMobil	Egregious	Egregious
Peabody Energy	Poor	Poor
Royal Dutch Shell	Fair	Poor

Arch Coal

ACCURACY AND CONSISTENCY OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND THE CONSEQUENT NEED FOR SWIFT AND DEEP REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS FROM THE BURNING OF FOSSIL FUELS

SCORE:

Egregious (-2)

RATIONALE:

Arch Coal’s public statements on climate change misinform the public on and disparage the scientific evidence by downplaying the certainty of carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels as the primary cause of global climate change.

SOURCE DATA

- Carbon dioxide, which is considered to be a greenhouse gas, is a by-product of burning coal. Global climate issues, including with respect to greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide and the relationship that greenhouse gases may have with perceived global warming, continue to attract significant public and scientific attention. (Arch Coal n.d.)
- Global warming, including the role and impact of man-made greenhouse gas emissions, is an issue of significant focus among domestic and international policymakers. On the policy side, Arch advocates an aggressive timeline for technology research and development that will reduce greenhouse gases from man-made sources, including the use of coal. On the operations side, Arch is continually evaluating how to reduce our own greenhouse gas emissions and increase the efficiency of our fuel use, while also assessing the most effective approaches for managing our business in a carbon-constrained economy. (Arch Coal n.d.)

AFFILIATIONS WITH TRADE ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER INDUSTRY GROUPS THAT SPREAD CLIMATE SCIENCE DISINFORMATION AND/OR BLOCK CLIMATE ACTION

TABLE 5. Arch Coal’s Trade Association and Industry Group Affiliations

Trade Association or Industry Group	Score	Rationale
American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity (ACCCE)	Good (+1)	The company left the ACCCE in 2016 but made no public announcement regarding the reason for its departure (Sheppard 2016).
American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)	Fair (0)	Arch Coal was a member in 2016. However, we were unable to confirm membership during the current study period.
National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)	Egregious (-2)	Chairman and CEO John W. Eaves is on the NAM board of directors as of 2018, and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from the group’s climate deception (NAM n.d.).
National Mining Association (NMA)	Egregious (-2)	Chairman and CEO John W. Eaves is on the NMA board of directors as of 2016, and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from the group’s climate deception (NMA 2016).

Arch Coal cont.

US Chamber of Commerce	Fair (0)	No evidence of membership.
Affiliations Total	-3	

POLICY, GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS, AND OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS TO PREVENT DISINFORMATION

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

Arch Coal has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SOURCE DATA

- Arch Coal has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SUPPORT FOR CLIMATE-RELATED SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTIONS

SCORE:

Fair (0)

RATIONALE:

Arch Coal did not face any climate-related shareholder proposals during the study period.

SOURCE DATA:

- 2018: No Environmental, Social, and Governance shareholder proposals
- 2017: No Environmental, Social, and Governance shareholder proposals

RENOUNCING DISINFORMATION ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND POLICY TOTAL SCORE: POOR (-6)

BP

ACCURACY AND CONSISTENCY OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND THE CONSEQUENT NEED FOR SWIFT AND DEEP REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS FROM THE BURNING OF FOSSIL FUELS

SCORE:

Good (1)

RATIONALE:

Following engagement with Barnard College over its divestment evaluation and with UCS over our 2018 scorecard findings, BP removed from its website a statement that misrepresented climate science. The phrase “possible impact on global climate via the ‘greenhouse effect’” implied that BP questioned the scientific consensus that climate change is happening and whether emissions of heat-trapping gases from the burning of fossil fuels are the primary cause. The revised text, citing the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, brings the company’s communications back in line with the scientific consensus on climate change and reflects the consequent need for swift and deep reductions in emissions from the burning of fossil fuels.

SOURCE DATA:

- In recent years, the issue of global climate change has come to the fore as evidence has grown of rising atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and the possible impact on global climate via the 'greenhouse effect'. The combustion of fossil fuels is one of the main contributors of man-made CO₂ emissions (BP PLC 2018a).
- According to the IPCC, anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions – including CO₂ – are now higher than ever, and the effects of atmospheric concentrations of GHGs, together with those of other anthropogenic drivers, are extremely likely to have been the dominant cause of observed warming since the mid-20th century. The combustion of fossil fuels is one of the main contributors of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions (BP PLC 2018b). Note: website language changed in July 2018.
- Around 5% of all manmade greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions come from global oil and gas industry operations. That includes everything from finding, extracting and processing of hydrocarbon resources, to transforming and delivering these resources to customers. During these processes, the most significant GHG emissions, including carbon dioxide and methane, come from the combustion of fossil fuels for energy and the flaring and venting of gas (BP PLC 2016).
- BP’s position on climate change is long-standing and well-known: we believe that meeting the climate challenge will require efforts by all – governments, companies and consumers. BP is playing its part. We are calling for a price on carbon, increasing gas in our upstream portfolio, investing in renewables and low carbon innovation, and pursuing energy efficiency (BHRRC 2017).

TABLE 6. BP’s Trade Association and Industry Group Affiliations

Trade Association or Industry Group	Score	Rationale
American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)	Good (+1)	The company left ALEC in 2015 but did not specifically cite climate change as its reason for leaving (Westervelt 2015).
American Petroleum Institute (API)	Egregious (-2)	Chairman and President of BP America, John Minge, is on the API board of directors as of 2018 (API 2016; University of Houston n.d.). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate

		disinformation spread by the group.
National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)	Egregious (-2)	John Mingé was also on the NAM board of directors as of 2017 (NAM n.d.). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
US Chamber of Commerce	Egregious (-2)	While there was no evidence of BP’s membership in the US Chamber during the 2016 scorecard study period, BP America’s chairman and president John Mingé is on the US Chamber board of directors as of 2018 (US Chamber 2018). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA)	Egregious (-2)	BP refinery manager Bob Allendorfer was on the WSPA board of directors as of 2016 (WSPA 2016). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
Affiliations Total	-7	

POLICY, GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS, AND OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS TO PREVENT DISINFORMATION

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

BP has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SOURCE DATA

- BP has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SUPPORT FOR CLIMATE-RELATED SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTIONS

SCORE:

Fair (0)

RATIONALE:

After supporting a climate-related shareholder proposal during the 2016 scorecard study period, BP did not face any climate-related shareholder proposals during the study period.

SOURCE DATA:

- 2018: No Environmental, Social, and Governance shareholder proposals
- 2017: No Environmental, Social, and Governance shareholder proposals

RENOUNCING DISINFORMATION ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND POLICY TOTAL SCORE: POOR (-7)

Chevron

ACCURACY AND CONSISTENCY OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND THE CONSEQUENT NEED FOR SWIFT AND DEEP REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS FROM THE BURNING OF FOSSIL FUELS

SCORE:

Egregious (-2)

RATIONALE:

Chevron downplayed the role of human activity and the need to reduce emissions of heat-trapping gases, stressed uncertainties regarding climate impacts, and continued to insist that only global climate action is constructive or effective. Chevron’s 2018 climate risk report mischaracterized the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change finding that humans are “extremely likely” to be the dominant cause of global warming since the mid-20th century, admitting only that warming of the climate system is “due in part” to human activity.

SOURCE DATA:

- The IPCC Fifth Assessment Report concludes that there is warming of the climate system and that warming is due in part to human activity. Chevron does not conduct original climate research. We align our activity with the principles noted above and with the processes for governance, risk management and strategy outlined in this report (Chevron Corporation 2018a).
- "Chevron accepts the scientific consensus regarding climate change," Theodore J. Boutrous Jr., an attorney for the California-based oil giant, said last month at the Federal District Courthouse in San Francisco. Then he dodged blame, telling the court that it's not energy companies driving global warming, but "how people are leading their lives" (Mark 2018).
- Chevron shares the concerns of governments and the public about climate change and believes that encouraging practical, cost-effective actions to address climate change risks while promoting economic growth is the right thing to do (Chevron Corporation 2018b).
- Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a global issue that requires global engagement and action. (GHGs) do not recognize sovereign borders. Climate change risks stem from the cumulative effect of GHG emissions from all nations. By 2040, about one-quarter of global energy-related GHG emissions are projected to come from OECD nations and three-quarters from non-OECD nations, the single largest being China, alone accounting for nearly one-quarter of projected global energy-related GHG emissions. With emissions rising fastest in the broader developing world, climate change risks cannot be addressed by actions taken in the developed world alone. Global engagement is required. Unilateral action by any country or jurisdiction could result in unintended consequences that could distort markets, reduce competitiveness of trade-exposed industries and undermine intended environmental objectives – without reducing climate change risks to that country or jurisdiction (Chevron Corporation 2018c).

AFFILIATIONS WITH TRADE ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER INDUSTRY GROUPS THAT SPREAD CLIMATE SCIENCE DISINFORMATION AND/OR BLOCK CLIMATE ACTION

TABLE 7. Chevron’s Trade Association and Industry Group Affiliations

Trade Association or Industry Group	Score	Rationale
American Legislative Exchange	Egregious (-2)	Chevron was a “Director Level” sponsor of the 2017 ALEC Annual Meeting (SourceWatch 2018a) and has not taken any steps to

Council (ALEC)		distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
American Petroleum Institute (API)	Egregious (-2)	Chevron CEO Michael Wirth is on the board API as of 2018 (Chevron Corporation n.d.), and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)	Poor (-1)	Chevron is a member of NAM as of 2018 (NAM n.d.), and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
US Chamber of Commerce	Poor (-1)	Chevron is a member of US Chamber of Commerce as of 2018 (Chevron Corporation n.d.) and has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA)	Egregious (-2)	Chevron global vice president of joint ventures and affiliates, Brant Fish, was on the board of directors of WSPA as of 2016 (WSPA 2016), and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
Affiliations Total	-8	

POLICY, GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS, AND OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS TO PREVENT DISINFORMATION

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

Chevron has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SOURCE DATA

- Chevron has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SUPPORT FOR CLIMATE-RELATED SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTIONS

SCORE:

Egregious (-2)

RATIONALE:

Chevron attempted to block climate-related shareholder proposals in 2018, including one filed by As You Sow and Arjuna Capital calling for a company plan on possible transition to a low-carbon economy and another by As You Sow asking for a report on efforts to reduce methane emissions. The company’s board recommended that shareholders vote against all climate-related shareholder resolutions in 2017 and 2018.

SOURCE DATA:

- Today, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) released a crucial decision holding that Chevron Corp. must respond to shareholders’ climate risk related shareholder proposals and cannot exclude them from the ballot at the company’s annual meeting. The first proposal asks Chevron to report how it plans to transition its business model to remain successful in a rapidly decarbonizing energy economy. The low carbon business model resolution was filed by shareholder representatives *As You Sow* and Arjuna Capital along with co-filers American Baptist Home Mission Society and Zevin Asset Management. (*As You Sow* 2018; *As You Sow* n.d.)
- The SEC further upheld a shareholder proposal asking the company to report on its actions to reduce fugitive methane emissions. Methane is 86 times more climate intensive than carbon dioxide over a 20-year period, so reducing emissions from oil and gas operations is crucial to maintaining global warming below 2 degrees Celsius. *As You Sow* filed the methane proposal along with co-filers Dominican Sisters of Hope, Congregation of St. Joseph, Adrian Dominican Sisters, and Dignity Health. (*As You Sow* 2018)

RENOUNCING DISINFORMATION ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND POLICY TOTAL SCORE: EGREGIOUS (-13)

ConocoPhillips

ACCURACY AND CONSISTENCY OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND THE CONSEQUENT NEED FOR SWIFT AND DEEP REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS FROM THE BURNING OF FOSSIL FUELS.

SCORE:

Egregious (-2)

RATIONALE:

In a March 2018 court filing related to a climate liability lawsuit, ConocoPhillips stated that it defers to the scientific consensus on climate change as reflected in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) scientific assessments. However, on its website, ConocoPhillips states that increased concentrations of greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere “can lead” (rather than “are leading”) to adverse climate effects, emphasizes uncertainties, and talks about managing (rather than reducing) emissions.

SOURCE DATA:

- "We recognize that human activity, including the burning of fossil fuels, is contributing to increased concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere that can lead to adverse changes in global climate. While uncertainties remain, we continue to manage GHG emissions in our operations and to integrate climate change-related activities and goals into our business planning." (ConocoPhillips 2018a)
- In response to the Court’s March 21, 2018 order, ConocoPhillips Company states that it does not conduct research on global warming and climate change science but defers to the scientific community’s consensus views on the science as reflected in, inter alia, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) science assessments. (The People of the State of California v. BP P.L.C.; et al. 2018)

AFFILIATIONS WITH TRADE ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER INDUSTRY GROUPS THAT SPREAD CLIMATE SCIENCE DISINFORMATION AND/OR BLOCK CLIMATE ACTION

TABLE 8. ConocoPhillips’s Trade Association and Industry Group Affiliations

Trade Association or Industry Group	Score	Rationale
American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)	Good (+1)	ConocoPhillips confirmed in 2013 that it was no longer a member of ALEC but did not specifically cite climate change as its reason for leaving (Source Watch 2018b).
American Petroleum Institute (API)	Egregious (-2)	ConocoPhillips chair and chief executive officer, Ryan Lance, serves on the API executive committee as of 2018 (API 2016; ConocoPhillips n.d.). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)	Egregious (-2)	ConocoPhillips senior vice president of government affairs, Andrew Lundquist, is on the NAM board of directors as 2018 (NAM n.d.). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
US Chamber of Commerce	Egregious (-2)	Andrew Lundquist is also on the US Chamber board of directors as of 2018 (US Chamber 2018). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.

Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA)	Poor (-1)	ConocoPhillips is a member of WSPA as of 2018, and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group (WSPA n.d.).
Affiliations Total	-6	

POLICY, GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS, AND OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS TO PREVENT DISINFORMATION

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

ConocoPhillips has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SOURCE DATA

- ConocoPhillips has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SUPPORT FOR CLIMATE-RELATED SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTIONS

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

In 2017, ConocoPhillips recommended that shareholders vote against a calling for a report on how senior executive incentives align with company efforts to promote resilience in low-carbon scenarios. While the resolution received relatively low support, the company disclosed that it had taken the action requested, removing fossil fuel reserves as an incentive metric for executive compensation.

SOURCE DATA:

- Stockholder Proposal: Report on Executive Incentive Compensation Alignment with Low-Carbon Scenarios Board Recommendation AGAINST (ConocoPhillips 2017)
 - “The Committee is confident that the Company’s incentive programs are appropriate and well aligned with our long-term strategy. The Board does not believe that an annual report to stockholders on the extent to which our executive incentive compensation programs align with low-carbon scenarios as described in this proposal is either necessary or in the best interests of the Company. Therefore, the Board recommends that you vote AGAINST this proposal.” (ConocoPhillips 2017)

RENOUNCING DISINFORMATION ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND POLICY TOTAL SCORE: EGREGIOUS (-10)

CONSOL Energy

ACCURACY AND CONSISTENCY OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND THE CONSEQUENT NEED FOR SWIFT AND DEEP REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS FROM THE BURNING OF FOSSIL FUELS

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

CONSOL Energy does not address climate science on its company website, and the company did not make any public statements on climate science during the study period.

SOURCE DATA:

- There is no source data for this metric.

AFFILIATIONS WITH TRADE ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER INDUSTRY GROUPS THAT SPREAD CLIMATE SCIENCE DISINFORMATION AND/OR BLOCK CLIMATE ACTION

TABLE 9. CONSOL Energy’s Trade Association and Industry Group Affiliations

Trade Association or Industry Group	Score	Rationale
American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity (ACCCE)	Good (+1)	The company left ACCCE in 2016 but made no public announcement regarding the reasons for its departure (Sheppard 2016).
American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)	Fair (0)	No evidence of membership (SourceWatch 2018a).
National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)	Fair (0)	No evidence of membership.
National Mining Association (NMA)	Egregious (-2)	CONSOL Energy’s CEO, Coal James A. Brock, was on the NMA board of directors (NMA 2016). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from the group’s disinformation.
US Chamber of Commerce	Fair (0)	CONSOL Energy was on the board of directors of the US Chamber of Commerce in 2016. However, we were unable to confirm membership during current study period
Affiliations Total	-1	

CONSOL cont.

POLICY, GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS, AND OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS TO PREVENT DISINFORMATION

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

CONSOL Energy has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SOURCE DATA

- CONSOL has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SUPPORT FOR CLIMATE-RELATED SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTIONS

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

CONSOL Energy recommended against a shareholder proposal filed by the State of New York requesting disclosure on political contributions in 2017.

SOURCE DATA:

- CONSOL’s Statement in Opposition to the Shareholder Proposal No. 5: Your Board of Directors carefully considered this proposal and believes that it is not in the best interests of the Corporation or our shareholders at this time to prepare and publish a report containing the information in the form and manner requested by the proposal (Seeking Alpha 2017).
- No Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Shareholder proposals in 2018

RENOUNCING DISINFORMATION ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND POLICY TOTAL SCORE: POOR (-4)

ExxonMobil

ACCURACY AND CONSISTENCY OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND THE CONSEQUENT NEED FOR SWIFT AND DEEP REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS FROM THE BURNING OF FOSSIL FUELS

SCORE:

Egregious (-2)

RATIONALE:

With public statements that stress uncertainty (such as “current scientific understanding provides limited guidance on the likelihood, magnitude, or time frame of these events”), ExxonMobil misrepresents climate science. The company also downplays the urgency of addressing climate change by promoting a false choice between climate solutions and economic development.

SOURCE DATA:

- While most scientists agree climate change poses risks related to extreme weather, sea-level rise, temperature extremes, and precipitation changes, current scientific understanding provides limited guidance on the likelihood, magnitude, or time frame of these events. Anticipating the likelihood of an event at the regional or local level in comparison to global averages is even more difficult (ExxonMobil Corporation 2018a).
- Addressing climate change, providing economic opportunity and lifting billions out of poverty are complex and interrelated issues requiring complex solutions. There is a consensus that comprehensive strategies are needed to respond to these risks (ExxonMobil Corporation 2018b).
- Further, the Petition also seeks remedies that are outside the scope of this Honorable Commission’s authority. What the Petition really asks this Honorable Commission to do goes far beyond the Honorable Commission's limited authority to investigate or making findings of fact and asks this Honorable Commission to determine whether or not the Respondents "must account for" the *alleged* "human rights implications of climate change." The requested relief thus inappropriately seeks for this Honorable Commission to adjudicate the parties’ legal rights, which is clearly outside the scoop of the Honorable Commission’s investigative function. For example, without any basis and contrary to this Honorable Commission’s specific function as an investigative body tasked to receive evidence and ascertain facts, the Petition asks this Honorable Commission to take "official or administrative notice" of certain Respondents' supposed 'contribution to carbon dioxide emissions and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights,' the supposed 'bases of the petition concerning the human rights implications of climate change and ocean acidification and the estimated responsibility of the Carbon Majors... (Greenpeace 2016).

AFFILIATIONS WITH TRADE ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER INDUSTRY GROUPS THAT SPREAD CLIMATE SCIENCE DISINFORMATION AND/OR BLOCK CLIMATE ACTION

TABLE 10. ExxonMobil’s Trade Association and Industry Group Affiliations

Trade Association or Industry Group	Score	Rationale
American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)	Good (+1)	In December 2017, ExxonMobil successfully pressured ALEC to drop an anti-climate science resolution that sought to undermine EPA action to curb global warming emissions (Cama 2017). The company left ALEC in July 2018 (outside our study period), but it refused to specify whether the group’s climate disinformation played a role in that decision (Reuters 2018).

American Petroleum Institute (API)	Egregious (-2)	ExxonMobil CEO Darren Woods is the chair of the board of API as of 2018 (API 2018), and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)	Egregious (-2)	ExxonMobil senior vice president Neil A. Chapman serves on NAM's executive committee as of 2018 (NAM n.d.), and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
US Chamber of Commerce	Poor (-1)	ExxonMobil reported contributing \$1 million to the US Chamber in 2016 and has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group (ExxonMobil 2016).
Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA)	Egregious (-2)	The refinery manager at ExxonMobil Refining and Supply, Max Ocansey, was on the WSPA board of directors as of 2016 (WSPA 2016), and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
Affiliations total	-6	

POLICY, GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS, AND OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS TO PREVENT DISINFORMATION

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

ExxonMobil has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SOURCE DATA

- ExxonMobil has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SUPPORT FOR CLIMATE-RELATED SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTIONS

SCORE:

Egregious (-2)

RATIONALE:

ExxonMobil sought to block a climate-related shareholder resolution co-filed by the Church Commissioners for the Church of England and the New York State Common Retirement Fund in 2017, and it successfully blocked a climate-related shareholder resolution filed by Arjuna Capital and As You Sow in 2018. The company's board recommended that shareholders vote against all climate-related shareholder resolutions in 2017 and 2018.

SOURCE DATA:

- Business Plan for 2C Warming Scenario: "Shareholders request that, beginning in 2019, ExxonMobil publish an annual assessment of the long term portfolio impacts of technological advances and global climate change policies... This resolution aims to ensure that ExxonMobil fully evaluates and discloses to investors risks to the viability of its assets as a result of the transition to a low carbon economy, including a 2 degrees scenario, in line with sector good practice" (ICCR 2018).
 - We hereby request confirmation that the Staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Staff") will not recommend enforcement action it in reliance on Rule 14a,8, the Company omits the Proposal from the 2018 Proxy Materials (SEC 2018).

- Shareholders request that, beginning in 2018, ExxonMobil publish an annual assessment of the long term portfolio impacts of technological advances and global climate change policies... This resolution aims to ensure that ExxonMobil fully evaluates and discloses to investors risks to the viability of its assets as a result of the transition to a low carbon economy, including a 2 degrees scenario, in line with sector good practice" (ExxonMobil 2017).
- In *ExxonMobil Corporation*, 2017 BL 76009 (March 7, 2017), ExxonMobil Corp. ("Exxon") asked the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") to permit the omission of a shareholder proposal submitted by Arjuna Capital/Baldwin Brothers Inc. on behalf of Susan B. Inches(collectively, "Shareholder") requesting Exxon increase the amount authorized for capital distributions in order to prevent the climate change related risk of losses stemming from unburnable carbon. The SEC denied the requested no-action letter under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) (Race to the Bottom 2017).

RENOUNCING DISINFORMATION ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND POLICY TOTAL SCORE: EGREGIOUS (-11)

Peabody Energy

ACCURACY AND CONSISTENCY OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND THE CONSEQUENT NEED FOR SWIFT AND DEEP REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS FROM THE BURNING OF FOSSIL FUELS

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONAL:

Peabody Energy’s “Position Statement on Energy and Climate Change” includes no information on or reference to climate change (other than the title). Instead, it emphasizes the “essential” role of fossil fuels in general, and coal in particular, in the global energy mix. The statement also frames emissions from the burning of fossil fuels as a “concern” and part of the “global political, societal, and regulatory landscape,” rather than acknowledging that swift and deep reductions in heat-trapping emissions are necessary to avoid catastrophic climate impacts.

SOURCE DATA:

- Peabody believes that coal is a key contributor to affordable, reliable energy and fossil fuels will continue to play a significant role in the global energy mix. The company also recognizes that these fuels contribute to greenhouse gas emissions, and concern regarding these emissions has become part of the global political, societal and regulatory landscape in which we operate” (Peabody Energy Corporation 2018a).
- Within the energy mix, fossil fuels are essential, and satisfy approximately 80 percent of the world’s primary energy demand. Coal plays a fundamental role in generating electricity and is a required component in new steel production (Peabody Energy Corporation 2018a).
- We question the conclusions of the study (Ekwurzel, et al 2017) around this complex issue and have long advocated technology as the proper approach for addressing society’s interest in managing greenhouse gas emissions. Greater use of technology can help meet the world’s need for energy security, economic growth and environmental solutions through high-efficiency low emissions coal-fueled power plants today and research and development funding for carbon capture over time (Peabody Energy Corporation 2017).

AFFILIATIONS WITH TRADE ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER INDUSTRY GROUPS THAT SPREAD CLIMATE SCIENCE DISINFORMATION AND/OR BLOCK CLIMATE ACTION

TABLE 11. Peabody Energy’s Trade Association and Industry Group Affiliations

Trade Association or Industry Group	Score	Rationale
American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity (ACCCE)	Poor (-1)	Peabody Energy was a member of ACCCE as of 2018, and the company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group (ACCCE n.d.).
American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)	Egregious (-2)	Peabody Energy director of state government relations, Michael Blank, was a member of ALEC’s Private Enterprise Council as of 2016 (SourceWatch 2018b). Peabody Energy has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by ALEC.

National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)	Fair (0)	The study found no evidence of membership.
National Mining Association (NMA)	Egregious (-2)	While there was no evidence that Peabody Energy held a leadership role in the NMA during the 2016 scorecard study period, its president and chief executive officer, Glenn Kellow, is a director and executive committee member of the NMA as of 2018 (Peabody Energy Corporation 2018b; NMA 2016). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
US Chamber of Commerce	Egregious (-2)	Peabody Energy senior vice president of global government affairs, Michael Flannigan, joined the board of directors of the US Chamber in July 2016 (after the 2016 scorecard study period) and is still serving in 2018. The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group (US Chamber 2018).
Affiliations Total	-7	

POLICY, GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS, AND OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS TO PREVENT DISINFORMATION

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

Peabody has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SOURCE DATA

- Peabody has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SUPPORT FOR CLIMATE-RELATED SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTIONS

SCORE:

Fair (0)

RATIONALE:

Peabody Energy did not have an annual meeting in 2017 due to bankruptcy proceedings and did not face any climate-related proposals in 2018.

SOURCE DATA:

- Peabody 2018 Proxy Statement (Peabody Energy Corporation 2018c)

RENOUNCING DISINFORMATION ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND POLICY TOTAL SCORE: POOR (-9)

Royal Dutch Shell

ACCURACY AND CONSISTENCY OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND THE CONSEQUENT NEED FOR SWIFT AND DEEP REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS FROM THE BURNING OF FOSSIL FUELS

SCORE:

Advanced (2)

RATIONALE:

Shell consistently acknowledges the scientific evidence of climate change, affirms the consequent need for swift and deep reductions in emissions from the burning of fossil fuels, and highlights the urgency and importance of achieving global net-zero CO₂ emissions to keep temperature rise well below two degrees Celsius and limit risks to society and ecosystems.

SOURCE DATA:

- We recognise the significance of climate change, along with the role energy plays in helping people achieve and maintain a good quality of life. A key role for society – and for Shell – is to find ways to provide much more energy with less carbon dioxide (Royal Dutch Shell Corporation 2018a).
- As the world experiences more extreme weather conditions linked to climate change – such as flooding and water shortages caused by droughts – governments, businesses and local communities need to think seriously about their adaptation strategies. Adaptation reduces the vulnerability of assets, infrastructure, environmental systems and communities to extreme variability in weather due to climate change. Within our operations we take steps at our facilities around the world so that we are more resilient to climate change (Royal Dutch Shell Corporation 2018b).
- If society is to meet the aims of Paris, we believe it will have to stop adding to the stock of CO₂ from energy in the atmosphere by 2070. That will require the world to significantly reduce the amount of CO₂ produced for each unit of energy used by 2050. Shell plans to keep pace and catch up with society's progress towards the Paris goals. That will likely mean we need to reduce the Net Carbon Footprint of our energy products by around half by the middle of the century (Royal Dutch Shell Corporation 2018c).
- In 2015, governments came together in Paris and achieved a landmark agreement to tackle climate change. We fully support the Paris Agreement's goal to keep the rise in global average temperature this century to well below two degrees Celsius (2°C) above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 °C. In pursuit of this goal, we also support the vision of a transition towards a net-zero emissions energy system (Royal Dutch Shell Corporation 2017a).

AFFILIATIONS WITH TRADE ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER INDUSTRY GROUPS THAT SPREAD CLIMATE SCIENCE DISINFORMATION AND/OR BLOCK CLIMATE ACTION

TABLE 12. Shell's Trade Association and Industry Group Affiliations

Trade Association or Industry Group	Score	Rationale
American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)	Advanced (+2)	Shell left ALEC in 2015, stating explicitly that it was leaving because ALEC's position on climate science is inaccurate and inconsistent with the company's position (Mathiesen and Pilkington 2015).
American Petroleum Institute (API)	Egregious (-2)	Shell Oil Company president and US country chair, Bruce Culpepper, was on the API board of directors as of 2016 (API 2016). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.

Royal Dutch Shell cont.

National Association of Manufacturers (NAM)	Egregious (-2)	Shell Downstream executive vice president of global manufacturing, Lori Ryerkerk, is on the NAM board of directors as of 2018 (NAM n.d.). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
US Chamber of Commerce	Egregious (-2)	While there was no evidence of Shell’s membership in the US Chamber during the 2016 scorecard study period, Bruce Culpepper is on the US Chamber board of directors as of 2018 (US Chamber of Commerce 2018). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA)	Poor (-1)	Shell is a member of WSPA as of 2018 (WSPA n.d.). The company has not taken any steps to distance itself from climate disinformation spread by the group.
Affiliations Total	-5	

POLICY, GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS, AND OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS TO PREVENT DISINFORMATION

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

Royal Dutch Shell has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SOURCE DATA

- Royal Dutch Shell has no policy or commitment on record to avoid direct or indirect involvement in spreading climate science disinformation.

SUPPORT FOR CLIMATE-RELATED SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTIONS

SCORE:

Poor (-1)

RATIONALE:

After supporting a climate-related shareholder proposal in the 2016 scorecard study period, Shell’s board of directors recommended that shareholders vote against proposals filed in 2017 and 2018 by the nongovernmental organization Follow This requesting that the company set public global warming targets aligned with the goal of the Paris climate agreement.

SOURCE DATA:

- Resolution 21: Shareholders support Shell to take leadership in the energy transition to a net-zero-emission energy system. Therefore, shareholders request Shell to set and publish targets for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that are aligned with the goal of the Paris Climate Agreement to limit global warming to well below 2°C (Royal Dutch Shell Corporation 2017b).
 - Your Directors consider that Resolution 21 is not in the best interests of the Company and its shareholders as a whole and unanimously recommend that you vote against it. Shell welcomes and strongly supports the Paris Agreement, and supports the aspiration of transitioning towards a net-zero emissions world by 2050. We will work together with governments and stakeholders towards meeting this aspiration and we commit to report on steps taken (Royal Dutch Shell Corporation 2017b).
- Resolution 19: Shareholders support Shell to take leadership in the energy transition to a net-zero-emission energy system. Therefore, shareholders request Shell to set and publish targets that are aligned with the goal of the Paris Climate Agreement to limit global warming to well below 2°C (Royal Dutch Shell 2018d).

- While we may share the objective of Follow This for Shell to take leadership in the energy transition, we consider the resolution unnecessary given that we have already outlined an approach that is wider-ranging and more progressive than that proposed by Follow This. We believe shareholders should show their support for our industry-leading net carbon footprint ambition by voting against this resolution (Royal Dutch Shell 2018d).

RENOUNCING DISINFORMATION ON CLIMATE SCIENCE AND POLICY TOTAL SCORE: POOR (-5)

[REFERENCES]

American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity (ACCCE). No date. Members. Online at www.americaspower.org/about-accce/members, accessed June 25, 2018.

American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC). 2017. ALEC energy principles. Online at www.alec.org/model-policy/alecenergy-principles, accessed August 15, 2018.

American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC). 2015. Position statement on renewables and climate change. Online at www.alec.org/position-statement-renewables-climate-change, accessed March 3, 2015.

American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC). No date. Ken Freeman. Online at www.alec.org/person/ken-freeman, accessed June 25, 2018.

American Petroleum Institute (API). 2018. API president and CEO Jack Gerard to depart in August. Online at www.api.org/news-policy-and-issues/news/2018/01/17/api-president-and-ceo-jack-gerard-to-depart-in-august, accessed June 25, 2018.

American Petroleum Institute (API). 2016. Internal Revenue Service Form 990. Online at <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/130433430/201743199349303904/IRS990>, accessed June 25, 2018.

American Petroleum Institute (API). No date. Climate change and energy: Energy and climate. Online at www.climatechangeandenergy.com/#/?section=energy-climate, accessed August 17, 2016.

Arch Coal. 2018a. United States Securities and Exchange Commission Form 10-K. Online at www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1037676/000162828018002109/aci-20171231x10k.htm, accessed May 21, 2018.

Arch Coal. No date. Get the facts. Online at www.archcoal.com/environment/getthefacts.aspx, accessed May 22, 2018.

As You Sow. 2018. SEC says Chevron must address climate risk shareholder proposal filed by As You Sow, Arjuna Capital. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522155307/https://www.asyousow.org/press-releases/2018/4/3/sec-says-chevron-must-address-climate-risk-shareholder-proposal-filed-by-as-you-sow-arjuna-capital>, accessed May 22, 2018.

As You Sow. No date. Chevron. Online at <https://archive.asyousow.org/companies/chevron>, accessed September 11, 2018.

Bacher, D. 2018. Big Oil's top 3 spenders lavish \$17.6 million in lobbying "hush money" in 2017. *Consumer Watchdog*, February 3. Online at www.consumerwatchdog.org/news-story/big-oils-top-3-spenders-lavish-176-million-lobbying-hush-money-2017, accessed August 15, 2018.

Bezdek, R.H. 2014. *The social costs of carbon? No, the social benefits of carbon*. Prepared for the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity by Management Information Services, Inc. Online at www.americaspower.org/sites/default/files/Social_Cost_of_Carbon.pdf, accessed August 17, 2016.

BP PLC. 2018a. Energy and the environment. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180726132105/https://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/energy-economics/statistical-review-of-world-energy/primary-energy/energy-and-the-environment.html>, accessed May 22, 2018.

BP PLC. 2018b. Energy and the environment. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180621204641/https://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/energy-economics/statistical-review-of-world-energy/primary-energy/energy-and-the-environment.html>, accessed July 27, 2018.

BP PLC. Sustainability report. 2016. Online at www.bp.com/content/dam/bp/en/corporate/pdf/sustainability-report/group-reports/bp-sustainability-report-2016.pdf, accessed June 29, 2018.

Business and Human Rights Resource Center. 2017. BP response re Union of Concerned Scientists' study. Online at https://web.archive.org/web/20180522154243/https://www.business-humanrights.org/sites/default/files/documents/BP%20response_UCS%20report_18%20September%202017.pdf, accessed May 22, 2018.

California Air Resources Board (California ARB). 2018. AB 32 scoping plan. Online at www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scopingplan.htm, accessed September 6, 2018.

Cama, T. 2017. ExxonMobil opposes ALEC's attempt to fight EPA climate policy. *The Hill*, December 5. Online at <http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/363389-exxon-opposes-alecs-attempt-to-fight-epa-climate-policy>, accessed July 27, 2018.

Center for the New Energy Economy. 2015. *Advanced energy legislation tracker: Summary of state renewable portfolio standard legislation in 2015*. Fort Collins: Colorado State University. Online at www.aeltracker.org/graphics/uploads/2015-Trends-in-Renewable-Portfolio-Standard-Legislation_4_15.pdf, accessed June 1, 2015.

Center for Political Accountability (CPA). 2017. The 2017 CPA-Zicklin Index of Corporate Political Disclosure and Accountability: Sustained growth among S&P 500 companies signals commitment to political disclosure and accountability. Online at <http://files.politicalaccountability.net/index/2017%20Index.pdf>, accessed July 27, 2018.

Chevron Corporation. 2018a. Climate change resilience: A framework for decision making. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522155149/https://www.chevron.com/-/media/shared-media/documents/climate-change-resilience.pdf>, accessed May 22, 2018.

Chevron Corporation. 2018b. Climate change. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522154838/https://www.chevron.com/corporate-responsibility/climate-change>, accessed May 22, 2018.

Chevron Corporation. 2018c. Policy principles for addressing climate change. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522155006/https://www.chevron.com/corporate-responsibility/climate-change/policy-principles>, accessed May 22, 2018.

Chevron Corporation. No date. Board of directors, governance and ethics. Online at www.chevron.com/corporate-responsibility/our-approach/board-of-directors-governance-and-ethics, accessed June 25, 2018.

Climate Wire. 2018. Thursday politics: U.S. coal alliance is only a "conversation"—DOE official. May 17. Online at www.eenews.net/climatewire/2018/05/17/stories/1060081953, accessed June 27, 2018.

ConocoPhillips. 2018a. Climate change. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522155438/http://www.conocophillips.com/environment/climate-change>, accessed May 22, 2018.

ConocoPhillips. 2017. Proxy statement. Online at http://static.conocophillips.com/files/resources/conocophillips_2017proxystatment.pdf, accessed June 29, 2018.

ConocoPhillips. No date. Ryan Lance. Online at www.conocophillips.com/about-us/leadership/ryan-lance, accessed June 25, 2018.

Center for Responsive Politics (CRP). 2017a. American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity. Online at www.opensecrets.org/lobby/clientsum.php?id=D000046880&year=2017, accessed August 24, 2018.

Center for Responsive Politics (CRP). 2017b. American Petroleum Institute. Online at www.opensecrets.org/orgs/summary.php?id=D000031493&cycle=2017, accessed August 24, 2018.

Center for Responsive Politics (CRP). 2017c. National Association of Manufacturers. Online at www.opensecrets.org/lobby/clientsum.php?id=D000054156&year=2017, accessed August 24, 2018.

Center for Responsive Politics (CRP). 2017d. National Mining Assn. Online at www.opensecrets.org/lobby/clientsum.php?id=D000000308&year=2017, accessed August 24, 2018.

- Center for Responsive Politics (CRP). 2017e. US Chamber of Commerce. Online at www.opensecrets.org/lobby/clientsum.php?id=D000019798&year=2017, accessed August 24, 2018.
- Deyette, J. 2015. ALEC's annual meeting to feature more attacks on successful clean-energy policies. *The Equation*. Cambridge, MA: Union of Concerned Scientists. Blog, July 21. Online at <http://blog.ucsusa.org/jeff-deyette/alecs-annual-meeting-to-feature-more-attacks-on-successful-clean-energy-policies-813>, accessed August 17, 2016.
- Ekwuzel, B., J. Boneham, M. W. Dalton, R. Heede, R. J. Mera, M. R. Allen, P. C. Frumhoff. 2017. The rise in global atmospheric CO₂, surface temperature, and sea level from emissions traced to major carbon producers. *Climatic Change* 144:579–590. Online at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10584-017-1978-0>, accessed July 25, 2018.
- ExxonMobil Corporation. 2018a. Meeting global needs—managing climate change business risks. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522175057/http://corporate.exxonmobil.com/en/current-issues/climate-policy/climate-perspectives/managing-climate-change-business-risks>, accessed May 22, 2018.
- ExxonMobil Corporation. 2018b. Our position on climate change. Online at <https://corporate.exxonmobil.com/en/current-issues/climate-policy/climate-perspectives/our-position>, accessed August 24, 2018.
- ExxonMobil Corporation. 2017. Notice of 2017 annual meeting and proxy statement. Online at https://cdn.exxonmobil.com/~media/global/files/investor-reports/2017/2017_proxy_statement.pdf, accessed July 27, 2018.
- ExxonMobil Corporation. 2016. 2016 worldwide giving report: Public information and policy research. Online at https://cdn.exxonmobil.com/~media/global/files/worldwide-giving/2016_ww_giving_public_information_and_policy_research.pdf, accessed September 6, 2018.
- Gerard, J.N. 2009. Email to membership, August 12. Washington, DC: American Petroleum Institute. Online at www.greenpeace.org/international/Global/international/planet-2/report/2009/8/oil-memo.pdf, accessed May 10, 2015.
- Goldman, G., and C. Carlson. 2014. *Tricks of the trade: How companies anonymously influence climate policy through their business and trade associations*. Cambridge, MA: Union of Concerned Scientists. Online at www.ucsusa.org/center-for-science-and-democracy/tricks-of-the-trade.html, accessed September 10, 2018.
- Goldman, G., and P. Rogerson. 2013. Assessing trade and business groups' positions on climate change. Cambridge, MA: Union of Concerned Scientists. Online at www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/legacy/assets/documents/center-for-science-and-democracy/trade-and-business-groups-climate-change.pdf, accessed August 17, 2016.
- Grande, B. 2017. Letter to ALEC energy, environment, and agriculture task force members about withdrawing resolution on endangerment findings. Heartland Institute. Online at www.heartland.org/publications-resources/publications/letter-to-alec-energy-environment-and-agriculture-task-force-members-about-withdrawing-resolution-on-endangerment-finding, accessed September 6, 2018.
- Greenpeace International. 2016. ExxonMobil response to the Commission on Human Rights. Online at https://web.archive.org/web/20180522174549/http://www.greenpeace.org/seasia/ph/PageFiles/735291/Corporate_Responses_and_Comments/Exxon_Response.pdf, accessed May 22, 2018.
- Horn, S. 2013. Three states pushing ALEC bill to require teaching climate change denial in schools. *DeSmogBlog*. Vancouver, British Columbia: DeSmog. Blog, January 31. Online at www.desmogblog.com/2013/01/31/three-states-pushing-alec-bill-climate-change-denial-schools, accessed May 8, 2015.
- Horn, S. 2012. ALEC model bill behind push to require climate denial instruction in schools. *DeSmogBlog*. Vancouver, British Columbia: DeSmog. Blog, January 26. Online at www.desmogblog.com/alec-model-bill-behind-push-require-climate-denial-instruction-schools, accessed June 2, 2015.
- Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR). 2018. *Proxy resolutions and voting guide*. New York, NY.
- Mark, J. 2018. Will courts hold oil companies accountable for climate change disasters? *Los Angeles Times*, April 22. Online at www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-mark-climate-litigation-20180422-story.html, accessed June 27, 2018.

Mathiesen, K., and E. Pilkington. 2015. Royal Dutch Shell cuts ties with ALEC over rightwing group's climate denial. *Guardian*, August 7. Online at www.theguardian.com/business/2015/aug/07/royal-dutch-shell-alec-climate-change-denial, accessed July 30, 2018.

Minow, N. 2018. The Main Street Investors Coalition is an industry-funded effort to cut off shareholder oversight. *Harvard Law School Forum on Corporate Governance and Financial Regulation*, June 14. Online at <https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2018/06/14/the-main-street-investors-coalition-is-an-industry-funded-effort-to-cut-off-shareholder-oversight>, accessed August 17, 2018.

Mulvey, K., J. Piepenburg, G. Goldman, P. Frumhoff. 2016. *The climate accountability scorecard: Ranking major fossil fuel companies on climate deception, disclosure, and action*. Cambridge, MA: Union of Concerned Scientists. Online at www.ucsusa.org/cliamtescorecard, accessed September 30, 2018.

Mulvey, K., S. Shulman, D. Anderson, N. Cole, J. Piepenburg, and J. Sideris. 2015. *The climate deception dossiers: Internal fossil fuel industry memos reveal decades of corporate disinformation*. Cambridge, MA: Union of Concerned Scientists. Online at www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2015/07/The-Climate-Deception-Dossiers.pdf, accessed October 10, 2018.

National Association of Manufacturers (NAM). 2014. Comments in standards of performance for greenhouse gas emissions from existing sources: Utility generating units submitted by the American Chemistry Council, American Forest and Paper Association, American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Petroleum Institute, American Wood Council, Brick Industry Association, Corn Refiners Association, Council of Industrial Boiler Owners, Electricity Consumers Resource Council, National Association of Manufacturers, National Lime Association, National Oilseed Processors Association, Portland Cement Association, Fertilizer Institute, and US Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of their members (EPA document EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0602). Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency.

National Association of Manufacturers (NAM). No date. Board of directors. Online at www.nam.org/About/Board-of-Directors, accessed June 25, 2018.

National Mining Association. 2017. LinkedIn blog: A new era of American energy has begun. Online at <https://nma.org/2017/03/29/linkedin-blog-a-new-era-of-american-energy-has-begun>, accessed May 25, 2018.

National Mining Association. 2016. Internal Revenue Service Form 990. Online at https://ucsusa.sharepoint.com/programs/CE/ProjectsandCampaigns/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fprograms%2FCE%2FProjectsandCampaigns%2FAccountability%2FReportsProducts%2FScorecard%202018%2FData%2FTrade%20Associations%2FNMA%20Form%20990_2016%2Epdf&parent=%2Fprograms%2FCE%2FProjectsandCampaigns%2FAccountability%2FReportsProducts%2FScorecard%202018%2FData%2FTrade%20Associations, accessed June 25, 2018.

Natter, A. 2017. Koch-backed business group splinters in climate-change dispute. *Bloomberg*, December 8. Online at www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-12-08/corporate-revolt-has-business-group-at-a-crossroads-over-climate, accessed September 6, 2018.

Peabody Energy Corporation. 2018a. Position statement on energy and climate change. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522181703/https://www.peabodyenergy.com/Sustainability/Energy-Carbon>, accessed May 22, 2018.

Peabody Energy Corporation. 2018b. Leadership team. Online at www.peabodyenergy.com/Investor-Info/Corporate-Governance/Leadership-Team, accessed June 27, 2018.

Peabody Energy Corporation. 2017. Statement to UCS. Online at https://web.archive.org/web/20180522181630/https://www.business-humanrights.org/sites/default/files/documents/Peabody%20Energy%20response_UCS_Sept%202017.pdf, accessed May 22, 2018.

Perriello, T. 2009. Testimony before the US House of Representatives Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, October 29. Online at <https://house.resource.org/111/gov.house.sgw.20091029.1.pdf>, accessed February 23, 2015.

Public Disclosure Commission (PDC). 2018. No on 1631 (sponsored by Western States Petroleum Assn). Online at www.pdc.wa.gov/reports/debt_download?filer_id=NO1631%20507&election_year=2018, accessed September 5, 2018.

Race to the Bottom. 2017. No-action letter for ExxonMobil denied exclusion of proposal concerning increasing shareholder distributions to prevent losses from climate change related risks of stranded carbon assets. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522181300/http://www.theracetothetbottom.org/home/2018/2/6/no-action-letter-for-exxonmobil-denied-exclusion-of-proposal.html>, accessed May 22, 2018.

Reuters. 2018. Exxon Mobil joins exodus of firms from lobbying group ALEC. July 12. Online at www.reuters.com/article/us-exxon-mobil-alec/exxon-mobil-joins-exodus-of-firms-from-lobbying-group-alec-idUSKBN1K231R, accessed August 15, 2018.

Royal Dutch Shell Corporation. 2018a. Climate change and energy transitions. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522182137/https://www.shell.com/sustainability/environment/climate-change.html>, accessed May 22, 2018.

Royal Dutch Shell Corporation. 2018b. Adapting to climate change. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522182355/https://www.shell.com/sustainability/environment/climate-change/adapting-to-climate-change.html>, accessed May 22, 2018.

Royal Dutch Shell Corporation. 2018c. Energy transition. Online at www.shell.com/energy-and-innovation/the-energy-future/shell-energy-transition-report/_jcr_content/par/toptasks.stream/1524757699226/f51e17dbe7de5b0eddac2ce19275dc946db0e407ae60451e74acc7c4c0acdbf1/web-shell-energy-transition-report.pdf, accessed July 10, 2018.

Royal Dutch Shell Corporation. 2018d. Notice of annual general meeting. Online at https://web.archive.org/web/20180522182703/https://www.shell.com/investors/retail-shareholder-information/annual-general-meeting/_jcr_content/par/textimage_1328904083.stream/1523547663423/591160a18417d3a0a345be40193229f56c7f7f8b8e521f1153890af7158d7820/notice-of-general-meeting-22-may-2018.pdf, accessed May 22, 2018.

Royal Dutch Shell Corporation. 2017a. Sustainability report. Online at https://reports.shell.com/sustainability-report/2017/servicepages/downloads/files/download.php?file=shell_sustainability_report_2017.pdf, accessed July 10, 2018.

Royal Dutch Shell Corporation. 2017b. Notice of annual general meeting. Online at https://web.archive.org/web/20180522182529/https://www.shell.com/investors/retail-shareholder-information/annual-general-meeting/_jcr_content/par/expandablelist/expandablesection_f2.stream/1492595235065/09f2af788de91bf1e7a360e95ec7d6455e5c4774fa4ce3e60cab195955e779e9/2017-notice-of-meeting-shell-agm.pdf, accessed May 22, 2018.

Seeking Alpha. 2017. CNX Resource Corporation (CNX) Form DEF 14A proxy statement. Online at <https://seekingalpha.com/filing/3487562>, accessed July 18, 2018.

Sheppard, K. 2016. King coal is losing its lobbying edge. *HuffPost*, August 17. Online at www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/coal-lobby-washington_us_57b4c3cbe4b0fd5a2f40f90c, accessed July 30, 2018.

Siders, D. 2015a. Adwatch: Oil interests mislead about vehicle monitoring. *Sacramento Bee*, August 31. Online at www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/election/california-elections/poligraph/article33015918.html, accessed September 30, 2018.

Siders, D. 2015b. Fact check: Ad misleads on gas reduction law. *Sacramento Bee*, August 22. Online at www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/election/california-elections/poligraph/article31851906.html, accessed September 30, 2018.

SourceWatch - Center for Media and Democracy. 2018a. ALEC corporations. SourceWatch, May 25. Online at www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/ALECCorporations, accessed May 25, 2018.

SourceWatch Center for Media and Democracy. 2018b. ALEC “private enterprise” board of directors. *SourceWatch*, April 13. Online at www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/ALEC_%22PrivateEnterprise%22_Board_of_Directors, accessed August 15, 2018.

State of West Virginia et al. v. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) et al. 2016. USCA case 15-1363. Initial reply brief of intervenors Dixon Bros., Inc., Nelson Brothers, Inc., Wesco International, Inc., Norfolk Southern Corp., Joy Global Inc., Gulf Coast Lignite Coalition, and Peabody Energy Corp. supporting petitioners. Online at

[www.ago.wv.gov/publicresources/epa/Documents/Peabody%20Intervenor%20Brief%20-%20file-stamped%20\(M0119624xCECC6\).pdf](http://www.ago.wv.gov/publicresources/epa/Documents/Peabody%20Intervenor%20Brief%20-%20file-stamped%20(M0119624xCECC6).pdf), accessed September 7, 2016.

Steinberger, K., and A. Levin. 2017. Chamber inflates costs, ignores benefits of climate action. *NRDC*, March 22. Online at www.nrdc.org/experts/kevin-steinberger/chamber-inflates-costs-ignores-benefits-climate-action, accessed September 10, 2018.

Talley, I. 2009. Lobby groups to use town hall tactics to oppose climate bill. *Wall Street Journal blog*, August 11. Online at <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2009/08/11/lobby-groups-to-use-town-hall-tactics-to-oppose-climate-bill>, accessed May 10, 2015.

The People of the State of California v. BP P.L.C., Chevron Corporation, ConocoPhillips Company, ExxonMobil, and Royal Dutch Shell. 2018. ConocoPhillips Company's response to court order. Online at http://blogs2.law.columbia.edu/climate-change-litigation/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/case-documents/2018/20180404_docket-317-cv-06011_response-5.pdf, accessed September 10, 2018.

United States Securities and Exchange Commission (US SEC). 2018. Exxon Mobil rule 14a-8 no-action letter. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180522181111/https://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/cf-noaction/14a-8/2018/arjunacapital032318-14a8.pdf>, accessed May 22, 2018.

University of Houston. No date. John Minge. Online at www.uh.edu/uh-energy/about-uh-energy/advisory-board/john-minge, accessed at April 19, 2018.

US Chamber of Commerce. 2018. Board of directors. Online at <https://web.archive.org/web/20180625172702/https://www.uschamber.com/about/board-of-directors>, accessed June 25, 2018.

Walker, J. 1998. Draft global climate science communications plan, memo to Global Climate Science Team. Washington, DC: American Petroleum Institute. Online at www.euronet.nl/users/e_wesker/ew@shell/API-prop.html, accessed February 25, 2015.

Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA). 2016. Internal Revenue Service Form 990. Online at https://ucsusa.sharepoint.com/programs/CE/ProjectsandCampaigns/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fprograms%2FCE%2FProjectsandCampaigns%2FAccountability%2FReportsProducts%2FScorecard%202018%2FData%2FTrade%20Associations%2FWSPA%20Form%20990_2016%2Epdf&parent=%2Fprograms%2FCE%2FProjectsandCampaigns%2FAccountability%2FReportsProducts%2FScorecard%202018%2FData%2FTrade%20Associations, accessed June 25, 2018.

Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA). No date. Responsible energy. Online at www.wspa.org/about, accessed June 25, 2018.

Westervelt, A. 2015. BP joins list of companies fleeing ALEC. *Guardian*, March 23. Online at www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2015/mar/23/alec-bp-british-petroleum-companies-conservative-lobbyist, accessed July 30, 2018.

Wieners, B. 2014. Leaked: The oil lobby's conspiracy to kill off California's climate law. *Bloomberg Business*, November 25. Online at www.bloomberg.com/bw/articles/2014-11-25/revealed-the-oil-lobbys-playbook-against-californias-climate-law%23p1, accessed February 20, 2015.