

BP

Detailed assessment of BP's corporate industry association review

May 2022

This document outlines a detailed breakdown of InfluenceMap's assessment of the company's corporate disclosure on industry association lobbying, using the traffic-light assessment framework summarized below. Further details on the assessment methodology is available in the Appendix, and in our April 2021 report [here](#).

Key	Explanation
■	Has broadly met investor expectations in this area.
■	Has made some progress on investor expectations in this area, but with significant deficiencies.
■	Has fallen short of investor expectations in this area.

A summary of BP's disclosures on industry associations is shown below. To date, BP has published two full reviews of its industry associations and one review update. The Review Score represents InfluenceMap's overall assessment of the quality of the company's industry association review process, where 100 would indicate that a company has met investor expectations for all criteria related to the review process.

Date of Review	Review Score
February 2020	36 / 100
May 2021 (Update)	43 / 100
April 2022	50 / 100

This assessment focuses solely on BP's disclosure on industry associations and climate policy engagement, which can be [found here](#). This assessment does not include an analysis of the company's direct climate policy engagement, which can be found on InfluenceMap's online profile of BP [here](#). Applying the traffic-light framework outlined above, the table below summarizes the company's performance under the seven indicators which form InfluenceMap's assessment.

Disclosure & Transparency	Policy Alignment Process
■ Corporate climate positions	■ Identify & Assess
■ Industry group climate positions	■ Monitor & Review
■ Alignment assessment method	■ Act
■ Framework for misalignment	

BP's Company Scorecard

The tables below highlight, for each indicator, the criteria for companies to meet investor expectations, BP's assessment, and examples of better practice by companies to date. While InfluenceMap did not find an example of best practice across the entire industry association review process, some companies have demonstrated better practice under specific metrics under the 'Disclosure & Transparency' and 'Policy Alignment Process' assessments.

Disclosure & Transparency

Corporate climate policy positions and influencing activities

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to disclose a detailed and clearly referenced breakdown of its own climate policy positions and influencing activities beyond 'top-line' climate statements. This includes descriptions of the company's positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation which are material to the company's operations, business sector, and/or the region(s) in which it operates.

<p>BP</p>	<p>In its 2022 review, BP discloses seven top-line climate positions including climate science, the Paris Agreement and energy efficiency but the company provides limited detail of its positions on, and engagement with, specific climate policies beyond a case study on US Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) methane rule, which BP strongly supported. However, the 2022 review also includes clear references to additional resources on BP's corporate website, including advocacy updates on specific government policy consultations and links to public submissions via the EU Transparency Register, US House of Representatives, and US Senate. BP has an additional webpage outlining its advocacy activities in the US including comments and testimony, public statements, and lobbying disclosures at state and federal level. As of May 2022, BP has not disclosed its <i>testimony</i> in the US House Committee on Energy and Commerce in April 2022, in which it advocated for investments in fossil fuels, (although this is too recent to impact its score under this indicator).</p>
<p>Best Practice</p>	<p><i>Shell</i> has disclosed case studies of its direct climate policy engagement in the EU and US. These case studies include Shell's positions on, and engagement with, specific items of EU and US regulation and legislation. The 2022 review also includes clear references to additional resources on Shell's corporate website, including advocacy updates on specific government policy consultations and links to public submissions via the EU Transparency Register and the US Lobbying Disclosure Act.</p>

Industry association climate policy positions and influencing activities

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to disclose a detailed and accurate account of the climate policy positions and influencing activities of each industry association actively engaged on climate change policy, including descriptions of positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation beyond 'top-line' statements.

<p>BP</p>	<p>BP has disclosed the top-line climate positions for ten industry associations identified as "partially aligned", including links to the associations' websites. However, this is largely limited to top-line climate statements and overlooks evidence of detailed lobbying on specific items of regulation and legislation. Further, there is no disclosure for 40+ industry associations determined to be "aligned". BP's review includes a case study on the US EPA's methane rule, in which the company discloses its role in pushing five industry associations to support the rule. However, the disclosure is limited overall.</p>
<p>Best Practice</p>	<p>No companies have met investor expectations in this area, although <i>BASF</i> and <i>Shell</i> exhibit current leading practice. Both companies have disclosed a detailed account of all key industry associations' climate policy positions, and a summary of their influencing activities. However, they appear to overlook detailed negative lobbying by a number of industry associations identified by InfluenceMap's database.</p>

Alignment assessment method

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to: (1) disclose a clear and detailed framework for assessing alignment with its industry associations across all relevant areas of policy engagement; (2) consistently apply this framework across *all* industry associations; and (3) provide a clear and detailed explanation behind each evaluation.

BP	BP has disclosed a clear and detailed explanation of its alignment assessment methodology based on the seven high-level policy positions, including what constitutes a finding of alignment, partial alignment and misalignment. The company has disclosed detailed explanations of this methodology has been applied for the ten “partially aligned” industry associations, but has not disclosed any explanation for the 40+ “aligned” associations.
Best Practice	<i>BASF</i> has also disclosed a clear explanation of its alignment assessment method along with a clear and detailed explanation of how it has been applied to each industry association. The company also provided specific alignment indicators for EU climate policy such as the EU ETS to assess the alignment of key European industry associations.

Framework for addressing misalignment

To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company must disclose a clear and detailed framework for addressing misalignments with its industry associations including escalation steps and clear deadlines for industry associations which do not amend misaligned practices.

BP	In its 2022 review, BP disclosed clear and detailed actions under three categories: misaligned, partially aligned, aligned. These include active engagement to promote and influence closer alignment, public statement of differences of opinion, formal communication of identified misalignments, setting specific expectations for change, and consider leaving the association. However, there are no timelines attached to this framework for industry associations which do not reform misaligned practices.
Best Practice	<i>BHP</i> has disclosed clear and detailed steps for addressing potential misalignment, including an escalation strategy and clear timelines attached. The company states it will communicate material differences, request that the industry association develop a position or refrain from advocacy in certain areas, and review the membership if there has been no action within 12 months.

Policy Alignment Process

Identify & Assess	
<p>To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to identify all cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement in line with InfluenceMap’s <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying.</p>	
BP	<p>In its 2022 review, BP did not identify any cases of misalignment. However, the company identified ten cases of partial misalignment with Advanced Biofuels Association, American Petroleum Institute, Business Leadership South Africa, Electric Power Supply Association, Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, National Association of Manufacturers, National Ocean Industries Association, Oil Companies International Marine Forum, Texas Oil and Gas Association, and US Chamber of Commerce.</p> <p>InfluenceMap analysis indicates that the company likely has memberships to 15 industry associations with climate policy engagement misaligned with the Paris Agreement (<i>American Petroleum Institute, US Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, Australian Institute of Petroleum, Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, International Air Transport Association, APPEA, BusinessEurope, Natural Gas Supply Association, Japan Chemical Industry Association, South African Petroleum Industry Association, Verband der Chemischen Industrie (VCI), Australian Industry Greenhouse Network, FuelsEurope, International Association of Oil and Gas Producers</i>).</p> <p>InfluenceMap analysis indicates that the company likely has memberships to 11 industry associations with climate policy engagement potentially misaligned with the Paris Agreement (<i>Gas Energy Australia, Offshore Energies UK, Business Roundtable, Business Leadership South Africa, Business Council of Australia, CEFIC, VNO-NCW, American Chemistry Council, European Roundtable for Industry, Hydrogen Europe, Confederation of British Industry</i>).</p>
Best Practice	<p>No companies have met investor expectations in this area. InfluenceMap analysis indicates that all companies have missed key cases of misalignment with industry associations lobbying counter to the goals of the Paris Agreement.</p>
Monitor & Review	
<p>To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to publish a review of industry associations on an annual basis, commit to do so at least once a year, or commit to disclose regular updates on its review and alignment process. Updates should accurately report on relevant material and on-going lobbying activities of potentially misaligned industry associations, as well as the company’s alignment and engagement with the industry association concerning these activities.</p>	
BP	<p>BP has published two full industry association reviews in 2020 and 2022, and also published an update review in 2021 on misaligned industry associations which included details of engagement, changes in position, and next steps. BP has committed to provide another progress update in 2023, followed by a full assessment in 2024.</p>
Best Practice	<p><i>Shell</i> publishes detailed assessments of its industry association memberships at two-year intervals, with detailed updates on misaligned industry associations each year. Shell has published two full reviews of its industry associations (2019, 2021) and two review updates (2020, 2022). The review updates include actions taken within each industry association, key changes to the associations’ climate positions, and detailed next steps. Shell has committed to publish its next update in 2023.</p>

Act	
<p>To meet investor expectations under this indicator: The company has to show evidence of action to address all cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement, in line with InfluenceMap’s <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying. The investor expectations outlined by <i>PRI</i>, <i>IIGCC</i> and <i>Ceres</i> include several steps companies can take to address misalignment. Steps should include terminating memberships or taking specific action to reform the detailed and material lobbying activities undertaken by misaligned organizations.</p>	
<p>BP</p>	<p>BP has shown evidence of action to address misalignment by terminating its membership to the AFPM, WEA and WSPA in 2020. In its 2021 update, BP also outlined its ongoing engagement with the five industry associations identified as “partially aligned”, including actions taken within each association. In its 2022 review, BP provided a detailed update on its engagement with the American Petroleum Institute, and a case study on how it directly advocated with its industry associations to support the US EPA’s methane rule. On its corporate website, BP has also published two letters from 2020 with the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers and VNO-NCW, addressing specific misalignments.</p> <p>However, the company does not appear to have addressed key cases of material and potential misalignment with the Paris Agreement identified by InfluenceMap’s database (see Identify & Assess).</p>
<p>Best Practice</p>	<p>No companies have met investor expectations in this area by showing evidence of action to address all cases of misalignment identified by InfluenceMap’s database, although some companies have made more progress. <i>Total</i> announced in January 2021 that it had decided not to renew its membership to the American Petroleum Institute due to divergences on climate positions. <i>BHP</i> suspended its membership to Queensland Resources Council in 2020 following its ‘Vote Greens Last’ advertising campaign and outlined detailed actions to be taken at four "partly aligned" industry associations. <i>Chevron</i> has not left any industry associations but has disclosed its engagement on specific climate change policy issues with seven industry associations, including details of the results of this engagement. Similarly, <i>General Motors</i> has disclosed that it has not financially contributed to advocacy campaigns against the Build Back Better Act by the Business Roundtable and US Chamber, and has publicly advocated a supportive position to ensure its stance is differentiated from them.</p>

Appendix A: Methodologies for Assessment

Scoring Disclosures and Policy-Alignment

Key	Explanation
	Has broadly met investor expectations in this area.
	Has made some progress on investor expectations in this area, but with significant deficiencies.
	Has fallen short of investor expectations in this area.

Assessing Disclosures

Since BHP’s 2017 industry association review, around 40 major global corporates have delivered similar, specific disclosures on their industry association links in response to investor pressure. This positive momentum is undermined, however, if the resulting disclosures are of poor quality.

In its *‘Investor Expectations on Corporate Climate Lobbying’* report, the PRI highlights the need for disclosure on the company’s positions and activities on climate change policy engagement, as well as the positions and activities of the industry groups it supports. The PRI further requests information on the governance processes and actions taken to ensure alignment between these activities and the company’s stated climate goals. *IIGCC* and *Ceres* articulate similar expectations, also requiring companies to disclose a material impact assessment of lobbying by an organization that opposes their public position. InfluenceMap uses the following assessment criteria to test the clarity, accuracy and scope of information provided by companies against four key issues.

Disclosure Item	Score	InfluenceMap’s Assessment Criteria
Corporate climate policy positions and influencing activities		The company has disclosed a detailed and clearly referenced breakdown of its own climate policy positions and influencing activities beyond ‘top-line’ climate statements. This includes descriptions of the company’s positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation which are material to the company’s operations, business sector, and/or the region(s) in which it operates.
		The company has disclosed a breakdown of its own climate policy positions and influencing activities. However, the company’s description of its positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation lacks detail, and/or the company has not disclosed its position and engagement activities on key items of regulation and legislation which are material to its operations, business sector, and/or the region(s) in which it operates.
		The company has made no attempt to disclose its climate policy positions and influencing activities, or the company’s disclosure is limited to a brief overview of its ‘top-line’ climate statements and operational commitments without reference to specific items of regulation and legislation.

Industry association climate policy positions and influencing activities		The company has disclosed a detailed and accurate account of the climate policy positions and influencing activities of each industry association actively engaged on climate change policy, including descriptions of positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation beyond 'top-line' statements.
		The company has disclosed an account of the climate policy positions and influencing activities of each industry association actively engaged on climate change policy, beyond 'top-line' statements. However, the disclosure lacks detail on positions and policy engagement activities on specific items of regulation and legislation, and/or does not disclose evidence of negative climate lobbying by one or more of its industry associations.
		The company has not disclosed the climate policy positions and influencing activities of each industry association actively engaged on climate change policy, and/or the company's disclosure is limited to a brief overview of 'top-line' climate statements without reference to specific items of regulation and legislation.
Alignment assessment method		The company has: (1) disclosed a clear and detailed framework for assessing alignment with its industry associations across all relevant areas of policy engagement; (2) consistently applied this framework across <i>all</i> industry associations; and (3) provided a clear and detailed explanation behind each evaluation.
		The company has disclosed a framework for assessing alignment with its industry associations but the disclosure lacks detail regarding <i>one</i> of the above steps (1-3).
		The company has not disclosed a framework for assessing alignment with industry associations, or it has disclosed a framework but the disclosure lacks detail regarding <i>more than one</i> of the above steps (1-3).
Framework for addressing misalignment		The company has disclosed a clear and detailed framework for addressing misalignments with its industry associations including escalation steps and clear deadlines for industry associations which do not amend misaligned practices.
		The company has disclosed a clear and detailed framework for addressing misalignments with its industry associations including escalation steps, but there is no clear deadlines for industry associations which do not amend misaligned practices
		The company has not disclosed a framework for addressing misalignments with its industry associations, or the company has disclosed a framework but the steps are ambiguous and lack sufficient detail.

Assessing Policy Alignment Process

As well as transparent disclosures on industry group links and lobbying activities, the investor expectations communicated by IIGCC, CERES and the UN PRI also set out the need for robust processes to ensure alignment between the company's stated policy positions and the positions and lobbying activities of their industry groups. These processes consist of the following three elements:

Alignment Process	Score	InfluenceMap's Assessment Criteria
Identify & Assess	Green	The company has identified all cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement in line with InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying.
	Yellow	The company has not identified key cases of misalignment with the Paris Agreement in line with InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying. Companies are scored in this category if they miss up to three cases of "potential" misalignment (industry associations with Organization Scores 51-75 in InfluenceMap's database).
	Red	The company has not identified key cases of misalignment with the Paris Agreement in line with InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying. Companies are scored in this category if they miss one case of misalignment (industry associations with Organization Scores 0-50) or more than three cases of "potential" misalignment (industry associations with Organization Scores 51-75 in InfluenceMap's database).
Monitor & Review	Green	The company has published a review of industry associations on an annual basis, has committed to do so at least once a year, or is/has committed to disclose regular updates on its review and alignment process. Updates should accurately report on relevant material and on-going lobbying activities of potentially misaligned industry associations, as well as the company's alignment and engagement with the industry association concerning these activities.
	Yellow	The company has committed to publish an update to its review of industry associations but not an annual basis or not specified a timeframe.
	Red	The company has not committed to any follow-up processes as part of its review of industry associations.
Act	Green	The company has shown evidence of action to address all cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement, in line with InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying. The investor expectations outlined by <i>PRI</i> , <i>IIGCC</i> and <i>Ceres</i> include several steps companies can take to address misalignment. Steps should include terminating memberships or taking specific action to reform the detailed and material lobbying activities undertaken by misaligned organizations.
	Yellow	The company has shown some evidence of action to address cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement, but has not addressed key cases of misalignment or "potential" misalignment identified by InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying, i.e. industry associations with Organization Scores 0-75 in InfluenceMap's database. The investor expectations outlined by <i>PRI</i> , <i>IIGCC</i> and <i>Ceres</i> include several steps companies can take to address misalignment. Steps should include terminating memberships or taking specific action to reform the detailed and material lobbying activities undertaken by misaligned organizations.
	Red	The company has shown no or limited evidence of action to address cases of misalignment with its industry associations and the Paris Agreement, missing key cases of misalignment or potential misalignment identified in InfluenceMap's <i>database</i> on corporate lobbying, i.e. industry associations with Organization Scores 0-75. The investor expectations outlined by <i>PRI</i> , <i>IIGCC</i> and <i>Ceres</i> include several steps companies can take to address misalignment. Action will be scored under this category if it does not include terminating memberships or taking specific action to reform the detailed and material lobbying activities undertaken by misaligned organizations.

To assist this assessment, InfluenceMap will be applying its database on corporate and industry group climate change lobbying. This tracks in real-time the detailed climate policy lobbying of around 350 companies and 150 industry associations globally, allowing like-for-like comparisons of organizations' positions on climate policy that are compared to a benchmark of Paris-aligned climate policy. This system can track the evolution of corporate and industry group climate lobbying positions over time.