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Abstract

This report investigates inconsistencies in climate policy engagement of 16 major corporations in five industrial sectors and analyses which problem areas are significant in the inconsistency of their engagement. The purpose of this report was to scope the area of inconsistent climate policy engagement on behalf of the company GES International – Global Engagement Services, who offers advisory services in responsible investment. This report has been performed through a literature review and is partly based on a report on corporate carbon policy footprint by the independent organisation InfluenceMap.

All companies investigated in this report are to some extent supporting the climate agenda of the Paris Agreement, including limiting global warming to below two degrees. Nevertheless, 14 of the 16 companies are at the same time showing a negative climate policy engagement. The problem areas leading up to this inconsistency that have been detected in this report are; when companies are taking part in organisational relationships that are unsupportive of climate change mitigation strategies, when companies are against climate legislation, the unwillingness of companies to change their own industrial sector and companies showing mixed signals on the same policy topic.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this report is that there are substantial inconsistencies in the climate policy engagement of companies and it can be difficult to assess what the company’s true stance on climate engagement is. Some measures to improve on consistency is for companies to review their policy engagement and be transparent on what their actual stance climate engagement is, however this transition can take time.
Sammanfattning

Den här rapporten undersöker inkonsekvenser inom klimatpolicy engagemang hos 16 av världens största företag, inom fem olika sektorer, och analyser vilka problemområden som är betydande inom motsägande klimatengagemang hos företagen. Syftet med rapporten är att granska området kring inkonsekvent klimatpolicy engagemang på uppdrag av företaget GES International – Global Engagement Services, som erbjuder rådgivning inom hållbara investeringar. Rapporten har utförts genom en litteraturstudie som delvis är baserad på en rapport om företags påverkan på klimatet genom policies som är utgiven av den oberoende organisationen InfluenceMap.

Samtliga företag som undersöks i den här rapporten visar sig till viss del stödja klimatagendan i enlighet med Parisavtalet, vilket inkluderar en höjd global temperatur på max två grader. Trots detta visar sig 14 av de 16 företagen ha en distinkt negativ klimatpolicy engagemang som strider mot deras erkännande av Parisavtalet. De identifierade problem i den här rapporten som leder till motsägande klimatengagemang hos företagen är; när företagens organisatoriska relationer som arbetar strategiskt mot att förbättra klimatförändringar, när företagen strategiskt arbetar för att motverka lagstiftande om klimat, när företag är emot att inkludera sin egen sektor i klimatarbetet och när företagen visar olika åsikter inom samma ämne.

Slutsatsen som kan dras från den här rapporten är att det finns substantiella motsägelser i företagens klimatpolicy engagemang och det kan vara svårt att avgöra vilken som är den sanna inställningen hos företagen. För att för att göra företagens klimatengagemang mer konsekvent kan företagen till exempel granska sina egna engagemang och vara transparenta med vad deras egentliga inställning till klimatet är. Omställning till ett mer konsekvent klimatengagemang hos företagen kan ta lång tid.
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1 Introduction

1.1 INCONSISTENT CLIMATE POLICY ENGAGEMENT

Climate policy engagement of companies has become more common since sustainability has risen to the global agenda (UNFCCC, 2016). Companies can engage by for example establishing their own climate policies or strategies and by being involved in governmental climate legislation. As well as there is positive engagement, supporting climate change mitigation, there is also negative engagement that is unsupportive. Companies can show negative engagement by for example being a member of trade associations that are lobbying against possible climate mitigation measures.

Furthermore, a company can demonstrate both positive and negative climate policy engagement simultaneously. For example, when the climate policy engagement of a company is not aligned with its climate lobbying activity it leads to an inconsistent climate engagement. An inconsistent climate engagement of a company can cause several difficulties, one of them conveying insecurity for investment companies who are looking for a long-term investment (UNPRI, 2015, Compact, 2013).

The issue of inconsistent climate engagement when it comes to long term investment has been recognized by the company GES International – Global Engagement Services. GES International offers advisory services in responsible investment and assist investors to integrate more sustainable operations (International, 2018). It is in the company’s interest to protect investment returns and therefore GES International wish to investigate problems connected to inconsistent climate engagement.

1.2 PREVIOUS LITERATURE

The issue concerning inconsistent climate engagement has been recognised by several organisations who are examining the climate performance of companies. In particular the organisations InfluenceMap and CDP, formerly Carbon Disclosure Project, have been disclosing information about climate engagement and climate lobbying in companies (InfluenceMap, 2017b). A report published in September in 2017 by InfluenceMap on corporate carbon policy footprint (InfluenceMap, 2017h) has been the main source of information in this report. The report by InfluenceMap and has focused on 50 of the 250 largest companies in the world according to the Forbes 250 list (InfluenceMap, 2017h). More information about InfluenceMap and its methods can be found in the theoretical background.

The inconsistent climate engagement has also been recognised by investors globally and large groups of investors have united in order to manage the problem. This has been expressed through public statements that have been a part of the foundation of this report. One of them is “Global Investors Statement on Climate Change” that has been developed by United Nations Principles on Responsible Investment (UNPRI) and the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change (IIGCC), among others, and includes more than 400 investors as signatories (UNPRI, 2014). Another one is “Investor Expectations on Corporate Climate Lobbying” that has been signed by 74 investors as signatories (UNPRI, 2015). This shows that it lies in the interest of investors that corporations are consistent in their climate engagement.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

As mentioned, GES International is a company working with advising investors on responsible investment. The company, that was founded 25 years ago, are today assisting investors by doing screenings on corporations and assisting in active ownership. The goal of
GES International is to protect the investment returns of its clients by helping investors integrate environmental, social and governance aspects in their investments with the belief that sustainability pays off (International, 2018). The company has about 60 employees with offices in Sweden, England, Denmark and Poland.

GES International is currently investigating the possibilities of managing inconsistent climate lobbying as a part of their services and is therefore in need of information about companies and their climate engagement. This report is performed on behalf on GES International with the purpose to present information about inconsistent climate policy engagement in 16 companies, selected by GES International. This report also aims to identify specific problem areas in climate policy engagement and to briefly elaborate on possible actions that can improve a more consistent engagement.

The companies to be investigated in this report are shown in table 1. These specific companies have been chosen for this report with interest from GES International.

1.3.1 Table 1. This table shows the names and order of the companies that are to be investigated from a climate policy engagement perspective in this report. The table also shows the industries the companies are a part of. (InfluenceMap, 2017h).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tesla</td>
<td>Automotive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMW Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daimler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Motor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASF</td>
<td>Chemical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow Chemical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LyondellBasell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENI</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConocoPhillips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo American</td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Tinto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glencore Interna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberdrola</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 **AIM AND OBJECTIVES**

There are two aims to be fulfilled in this report and in total three objectives belonging to them.

The first aim: Investigate the climate policy engagement of 16 selected companies.
- To present the climate policy engagement of the selected companies and a summary of the climate engagement within the five industries the companies are a part of.

The second aim: Identify and analyse problem areas in inconsistent climate policy engagement of the selected companies.
- To detect problem areas in inconsistent climate policy engagement from the information about the selected companies’.
- To analyse and discuss the problem areas and briefly elaborate on measures to convey them in order to improve engagement consistency.
2 Theoretical background

2.1 The Paris Agreement

In the year 2015, a United Nations climate conference was held in Paris through the United Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC). The Parties taking a part of the UNFCCC are countries in diverse development stages, both developed and developing. At the climate conference an agreement was made, which is now known as “The Paris Agreement” or COP21. The main outcome of the agreement was that the Parties agreed on several important points concerning common goals of mitigation and adaptation of climate change (UNFCCC, 2018c). The following quote from UNFCCC shortly summarizes the agreement:

“The Paris Agreement’s central aim is to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change by keeping a global temperature rise this century well below two degrees above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Additionally, the agreement aims to strengthen the ability of countries to deal with the impacts of climate change.” (UNFCCC, 2018c)

In order to ensure the best efforts from the Parties on the matter they are required to communicate and maintain “nationally determined contributions” (NDCs) with domestic mitigation measures that can be achieved within the country. The effort and results should be regularly reported and every fifth year there will be a global assessment of how far the progress have come. From the assessment the proceeding effort and progress of the agreement can be improved continuously (UNFCCC, 2018a). Overall the agreement is supposed to be a long-term engagement enacted globally in order to achieve long-term and global results on mitigating and adapting to climate change (UNFCCC, 2018c).

As of today, 176 out of the 197 Parties have ratified to the convention that was entered into force on November 2016. Until 2020 there is scheduled to be a preparation period where the first round of mitigation and adaptation strategies are to be committed. The effort from each party can be through for example governmental climate policies or decisions (UNFCCC, 2018b).

2.2 Responsible Investment and ESG Engagement of Companies

The importance of investing responsibly has grown during the 21st century. This is partly evident through the establishment of the United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment (UNPRI) that today has about 2000 signatories since its launch in 2006 (UNPRI). Responsible Investment (RI) is the term used when investors consider Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) aspects in their investment strategies in order to assure long-term returns and manage risks in a responsible manner. This implies that the investors should invest in sustainable investees and when it comes to the environmental aspect it implies investing in companies who aim to manage their business to, for example, minimise GHG emissions and waste (UNPRI, 2018b). In order to invest responsibly and with a long-term perspective, it is naturally of importance for the investors to know the engagements of their investees.

Potter (2018) recognises some of the obstacles when it comes to investment involving ESG aspects in their strategies through a survey of 582 institutional investors that are planning on or already practicing RI. One obstacle in particular that was found through the survey is that there is lack of high quality data about companies ESG performance that leads to difficulties for investors when wanting to invest responsible. Furthermore, it is also worth noticing that
the survey shows that there is no doubt between investors that investing in ESG do not imply a sacrifice in returns. On the contrary, it is becoming more evident that investment in sustainability pays off.

Serafeim (2016) investigates some myths in ESG integration in Investment Management and shows that companies that are committing to ESG aspects are found to have competitive advantages in both product and labour as well as the capital market. The same applies for investors that includes ESG aspects in their portfolios; they are not only exposing themselves to a lower risk, their returns are also superior to conventional portfolios. Finally, it is also stated that companies that are pursuing sustainable initiatives and communicate this through reports and with investors are succeeding in attracting long-term.

2.3 IMPORTANCE OF POLICIES IN CLIMATE CHANGE AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) the key for a sustainable economic growth is investment in smart infrastructure in the next decade and establishing robust climate policies. Through policies and incentives, governments can reduce climate change risks while generating an economic growth up to 2.8% on average across the G20 (Group of Twenty Ministers and Central Bank Governors) in 2050. Including the reduced damage of climate change it conduces to an even larger growth at 5%. Also, the organisation OECD is stating that finance will be a key factor in the transition to sustainability since capital must be mobilised, both public and private sources, that can support low-emission and climate friendly infrastructure. Finally, OECD points out that the climate and investment policies have to be coherent in order to be effective (OECD, 2017).

2.4 CLIMATE POLICY ENGAGEMENT OF COMPANIES

As previously stated, corporations and companies can have great influence on governmental strategies. Their influence can be distinguished in several different ways, for example through lobbying, advertising, economic incentives or influential contacts (InfluenceMap, 2017h). Therefore, even though the NDCs of the Paris Agreement is performed through governmental action, corporations can be an important part of the implementation of climate change mitigation strategies due to their governmental influence.

Since the problem of climate change is now globally recognised it has become common for corporations to construct their own climate change agenda. This is usually done through climate policies that describe how the company are supposed to act strategically in order for their (or general) climate impact to decrease. The policies are often disclosed publicly in order for stakeholders to pay attention to their efforts (Sullivan, 2011).

Beyond having their own climate policy, a company and corporation can also engage in climate policy by committing to policies or frameworks established by the government or organisations, similar to the Paris Agreement. Beyond the Paris Agreement there are frameworks for energy and climate as well as several directives by for example the European Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency in the U.S. (Commission, 2018, EPA, 2018).

As mentioned earlier, the climate engagement a company or corporation is taking part of are not always aligned with its established climate policy (UNPRI, 2015). This leads to an inconsistent engagement and will not only be counterproductive but is also untruthful through the disclosed policies.
2.5 MANAGING INCONSISTENT CLIMATE POLICY ENGAGEMENT

According to the UNPRI, that strives for investors to be responsible in their investment, public policy plays a critical role in defining the relationship and the rules between investors and companies. Its belief is that companies, investors and governments must work together in order to achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement through the context of climate policy. Companies can have both a direct and indirect influence on the efforts made by governments, for example by participating in political contributions or by funding research institutes (UNPRI, 2018a). In a report disclosed by UNPRI in 2018 the organisation brings up the issue of inconsistencies in the engagement of companies in climate policy. For example, the report brings up the findings of the report from InfluenceMap, looking at the carbon footprint from corporate influence. Furthermore, the UNPRI report mentions that the negative climate policy engagement from companies can have a great impact on governmental strategies. For example, they mention the EU Emission Trading System that, despite being the largest emission trading system in the world, failed to implement a price over 10 US dollars tonnes until 2017 due to intense lobbying by steel and chemical interests (UNPRI, 2018a).

In a report connected to the Paris Agreement establishment in 2015, it is also recognised that companies in particular tend to be board members of trade associations with climate positions that are inconsistent with the companies own stance. In order to make sure companies are engaged responsibly in climate policy the report, disclosed by a group of important shareholders like the UN Global Compact, CDP and World Resource Institute, three actions are recommended for companies. The first one is to identify their influences, risks and opportunities. The second one is to align their strategies and investments through an internal audit to ensure consistent positions. The final one is for companies to disclose on their actions and positions, focusing on the transparency for stakeholders. This report also recognises that inconsistency in climate policy engagement has historically been underreported (Climate, 2015).

As mentioned in the introduction, there has been made statements of 74 investors that are longing for their investees to be consistent in their climate policy engagement. The following quote is a part of the Investors Expectations on Corporate Climate Lobbying that was established through the UNPRI in 2014 (UNPRI, 2015). This shows the overall aim of the investors.

“We believe that companies should be consistent in their policy engagement in all geographic regions and that they should ensure any engagement conducted on their behalf or with their support is aligned with our interest in a safe climate, in turn protecting the long term value in our portfolios across all sectors and asset classes.”
(UNPRI, 2015)

2.6 INFLUENCEMAP

InfluenceMap is an independent organisation that has been looking into the climate policy engagement of 50 companies from the 250 first companies on the Forbes Global 2000 list, which includes the world’s biggest public companies (InfluenceMap, 2017h, Forbes, 2018, InfluenceMap, 2017b). From this, the organisation has published a report with the title “Corporate Climate Policy Footprint” in September in 2017, with the intention to map out the corporate influence the companies’ practices through their engagement. The purpose of the work of InfluenceMap, as well as its reporting, is to look into the influence corporations’ climate policy engagement making which in its turn can have a great impact on governmental climate change legislation. More specifically, the purpose of the report is to look into the climate footprint of companies beyond their emissions and including their policy engagement,
with the argument that climate engagement can be equally if not more important for the companies climate footprint (InfluenceMap, 2017h).

2.6.1 Methodology of InfluenceMap

The report of InfluenceMap on corporations’ climate policy footprint has been performed through an assessment of information on their engagement leading up to a score chart where the data is weighted. The information has been collected from company disclosures or respected third party sources with the main time frame of 2015 to 2017. Information about corporate influence before that time has been added if it is considered valuable. The sources of information to the report has been including is; organisation websites and other organisational messaging, CDP responses, legislative consultation, financial disclosures, EU transparency register, external reports on the organisation as well as external reports or CEO messaging (InfluenceMap, 2017q).

Furthermore, the assessment of the data has been performed through a score chart built up around twelve queries that are responding to the companies support of climate science and climate change (InfluenceMap, 2017q). The queries in the chart can be viewed in table 2. It is important to note that the InfluenceMap report does not assess the actual impact of the companies’ engagement or their performance but their potential influence.

2.6.2 Table 2

This table shows the queries that have been assessed in the InfluenceMap report on corporate climate policy footprint. The score chart includes five issue categories that are connected to 12 queries that are represented to 12 questions that are to be weighted. The area of concern belonging to each query is either transparency or performance (InfluenceMap, 2017q).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue categories</th>
<th>Queries</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Area of concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Science: Acceptance of the IPCC position on climate change science</td>
<td>Climate Science Transparency</td>
<td>Does the organisation provide a transparent position supporting the science of climate change?</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate Science Stance</td>
<td>Is the organisation supporting the IPCC demanded response to tackling climate change?</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Treaty: With regards to the UNFCCC COP process</td>
<td>Need for climate regulations</td>
<td>Does the organisation provide a transparent position on global treaty on climate change through the UNFCCC COP process?</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UN Treaty Support</td>
<td>Is the organisation supporting a global treaty on climate change through the UNFCCC COP process?</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Policy and Legislation: Position on strands of climate related legislation and policy</td>
<td>Transparency on Legislation</td>
<td>Is the organisation transparent about their positions on, and engagement with, climate change policy and relevant policymakers?</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbon Tax</td>
<td>Is the organisation supporting policy and legislative measures to address climate change through carbon tax?</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions Trading</td>
<td>Is the organisation supporting policy and legislative measures to address climate change through emissions trading?</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy Efficiency Standards</td>
<td>Is the organisation supporting policy and legislative measures to address climate change through energy efficiency standards and targets?</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy Legislation</td>
<td>Is the organisation supporting policy and legislative measures to address climate change through renewable energy targets, subsidies and legislation?</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy and Mix</td>
<td>Is the organisation supporting policy and legislative measures to address climate change through energy policy and measures to transition to a low-carbon energy mix?</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG Emission Standards</td>
<td>Is the organisation supporting policy and legislative measures to address climate change through GHG emission standards and targets?</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure on Relationships</td>
<td>Disclosure on Relationships</td>
<td>Are corporations being transparent about their business associations and other sources of indirect influence which may impact the climate debate and policy process? Are trade associations being transparent about the positions corporations hold within their organisation?</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6.3 Scoring of companies

From the queries and their connected questions (table 2) the information about the companies’ climate policy footprint has been assessed. This has been performed through weighing of the information found and giving it a score between -2 to +2, depending on how positive or negative the information is. From the score chart the total points of a company has then been calculated with a score between -100 to +100, where a score above zero is considered positive. An example of how the information is weighted into a score is shown in figure 1. In some cases, information found has been highlighted by InfluenceMap as notably positive or negative information, for example when the influence of a corporation is showing exceptional imitative in a certain climate policy process (InfluenceMap, 2017q).

The engagement intensity as well as the organisational relationships of the companies has also been taken into consideration in the InfluenceMap report. The engagement intensity is weighted in percentage and is dependent on how heavily a company is engaged in climate policy making in legislation. Beyond a score of -100 to +100 the companies have also been given a grade between A+ to F that describes their overall climate policy engagement. The grades are a result of the score of the companies together with their organisational score and engagement intensity (InfluenceMap, 2017a).
**2.6.4 Figure 1.**

This figure shows an example of how the information gathered by the InfluenceMap organisation is weighted and scored into the report of corporate climate policy footprint. The score of the twelve queries are set between -2 and +2 depending on how the information gathered corresponds to each query (InfluenceMap, 2017q).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Examples of Scores for Some Queries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Scoring (-2 to 2 points)</strong></td>
<td>Points taken away (-2, -1)</td>
<td>Q2: Evidence of opposition to urgent action (as recommended by the IPCC) to address climate change would score (-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q5: Have disclosed very few details about how they may, or may not, be influencing climate change policy (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q7: Support emissions trading with major exceptions, advocating for conditions that exceed the sum of the support (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q9: Evidence of legal action against feed-in tariffs for renewable energy would score (-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points neither taken or given (0)</td>
<td>Q6: Evidence suggests clear engagement with carbon tax policy, although it is unclear whether their intervention is supportive or obstructive (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q9: Evidence of support for renewable energy legislation with exceptions (i.e. supporting a policy under condition that policy reviews occur annually) would score (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q12: Have disclosed a full list of trade associations memberships, although have not provided any details of the policy positions of the trade associations or how they may be engaging with them (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points given (2,1)</td>
<td>Q2: Evidence of support for GHG emissions reductions with time-scales in line with IPCC recommendations would score (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q9: Statement of support for renewable energy legislation would score (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q11: Have taken action (such as sending a letter to a policymaker) in support of GHG emissions standards (+2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.7 ORGANISATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS OF CORPORATIONS**

One option for corporations to engage in policy making is through organisational relations, for example by being a part of trade associations or federation. In this way companies have the possibility to cooperate with each other and turn their voices into one larger voice that can have a greater influence on governments. Therefore, trade associations play an important role of the companies’ climate policy engagement since it is an opportunity for companies to cooperate in order to achieve collective targets (Rajwani, 2015, Rappaport, 2015).

**2.7.1 The influence of trade associations**

Similarly to the analysis of the climate policy engagement of companies, InfluenceMap has published a report analysing the 50 most influential trade associations in the world and their climate policy footprint. Few of the trade associations analysed are supportive of a climate policy engagement that is aligned with the Paris Agreement. Only six of the 50 analysed trade associations are scored as supportive while the other 44 trade associations are ranged between partly and thoroughly opposing climate change engagement (InfluenceMap, 2017u). The scoring of the trade associations has been performed through a similar methodology to the scoring of companies, and they have been given a score between -100 and +100 (InfluenceMap, 2017q).

In the bottom of the scoreboard are three trade associations that are all U.S. based. With a score between -82 and -86, the American Legislative Exchange Council, the US Chamber of Commerce and National Association of Manufacturers are found to be most opposing to climate change engagement. According to the data they have played a large role in being
obstructive in the development of international, federal and US state level climate policy the last couple of years. For example, they seized the opportunity to lobby for a roll back of the U.S. climate policy when the current U.S. Administration led by president Donald Trump were positioned (InfluenceMap, 2017u).

When it comes to trade associations positioned within the EU the European Chemical Industry Council, the European Automobile Manufacturers Association and BusinessEurope have been pointed out as the most powerful lobbying groups who have been opposing climate change policy for the last decade. With a score between -29 and -41 they are continuing to oppose climate change policy and being obstructive in establishing legislation. For example, data shows that European Chemical Industry Council and BusinessEurope have been resisting the EU Emission Trading System, while the European Automobile Manufacturers Association have been opposing the EU strategy for low emission mobility (InfluenceMap, 2017u).

There are several trade associations that are involved in the climate policy engagement of companies in this report. Table 2 shows the trade association with a connection to the companies being analysed, given that it has been included in the InfluenceMap analysis.

### 2.7.2 Table 2.
This table shows trade associations that have been presented in this report. Most of the companies are a part of more trade associations than presented in this table (InfluenceMap, 2017h), however these are the business organisations that have been mentioned in the results of this report, divided into industrial sectors. Because of this, some of the associations are mentioned more than once. Some of the companies might be a part of these associations through e.g. a subsidiary, without being presented in this table. The trade associations are way arranged in the order of their performance in each sector with a scoring from -100 to +100 by the InfluenceMap (InfluenceMap, 2017u).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial sector</th>
<th>Trade association</th>
<th>Companies involved</th>
<th>Climate Policy Impact Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>Advanced Energy Economy</td>
<td>Tesla</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solar Energy Industries Association</td>
<td>Tesla</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German Automotive Association</td>
<td>BMW Group Daimler Ford Motor</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers</td>
<td>Ford Motor</td>
<td>-18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Automobile Manufacturers Association</td>
<td>BMW Group Daimler Ford Motor</td>
<td>-29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Ford Motor</td>
<td>-86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>American Chemistry Council</td>
<td>BASF LyondellBasell</td>
<td>-28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Chemical Industry Council</td>
<td>BASF Dow Chemical LyondellBasell</td>
<td>-41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Dow Chemical LyondellBasell</td>
<td>-86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Manufacturers</td>
<td>BASF Dow Chemical</td>
<td>-86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>FuelsEurope</td>
<td>ENI</td>
<td>-29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BusinessEurope</td>
<td>ENI</td>
<td>-37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Petroleum Institute</td>
<td>ConocoPhillips Chevron</td>
<td>-64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>ConocoPhillips</td>
<td>Chevron</td>
<td>-86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Associations of Manufacturers</td>
<td>ConocoPhillips</td>
<td>Chevron</td>
<td>-86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Emissions Trading Association</td>
<td>ENI</td>
<td>Chevron</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Business Council of Australia</td>
<td>Rio Tinto</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Council of Australia</td>
<td>Rio Tinto</td>
<td>Glencore International</td>
<td>-14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Coal Association</td>
<td>Anglo American</td>
<td>Glencore International</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Chamber of Mines</td>
<td>Anglo American</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Associations of Canada</td>
<td>Anglo American</td>
<td>Rio Tinto</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>WindEurope</td>
<td>Iberdrola</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Roundtable of Industrialists</td>
<td>Iberdrola</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Roundtable</td>
<td>Duke Energy</td>
<td>Southern Company</td>
<td>-13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Electric Institute</td>
<td>Duke Energy</td>
<td>Southern Company</td>
<td>-13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Southern Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>-86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Manufacturers</td>
<td>Southern Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>-86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Emissions Trading Association</td>
<td>Iberdrola</td>
<td>Duke Energy</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Methods

3.1 Methodology

The report is a master thesis report that has been performed through a literature review of previously existing information. The main source of information is a report on climate engagement of companies by the independent organisation InfluenceMap on recommendation of GES International. The InfluenceMap report and company information can be for the sake of the report, 16 companies were selected by GES International what were to be investigated. The selection was made by Emma Henningson together with her colleagues from the available companies included in the InfluenceMap report. The 16 companies were chosen both by their relevance to GES International and because of the industries they are a part of. In total they represent five different industries that gave the possibility to compare and analyse whether there are any differences between them.

A part of the report involves an analysis of the information presented in the results. This analysis has been performed in parallel with the search of information about the 16 companies when detecting inconsistencies within the companies’ climate policy engagement. After finalising the results, the information gathered about different industries and companies were compared in order detect certain trends, for example in companies heavily relying on fossil fuels. From that the inconsistencies have been grouped into different topics that seems to be relevant, divided into so called “problem areas”. These problem areas have further been developed, giving examples on similar situations between the companies. The analysis includes my own reflections of the inconsistencies of the climate policy engagement.

The figure below shows the work process of the report divided into steps, describing how it has been executed.

3.1.1 Figure 2

The figure shows the five steps of the work process of this report, which includes scope, background, results, analysis and discussion.
3.2 INVOlvement of supervisor
Emma Henningson has, in the role of supervisor, been an important guide for me in the topic of investment and climate engagement. Through her current position at GES International and her previous role as employed at CDP she holds a great amount of knowledge about both the perspective of investors as well as the importance of companies’ climate engagement. Emma Henningson has given me a large amount of input and guidance by giving me advice and sharing interesting reports, also giving me ideas on different approaches to my master thesis. Furthermore, Emma Henningson has been discussing the context of this report, in particular the problem areas presented in the analysis part, contributing to ensure that my reasoning was on point.

3.3 LIMITATIONS
The time limit for this report has been the spring semester of 2018 that extends from January to June. The time frame of the information provided focuses mostly on information from 2010 and till 2017, since the main source of this report, which is the climate engagement from InfluenceMap, was released in September 2017. Therefore, the information provided in the results are not including the most recent information about the selected companies.

The results are limited to information of about the 16 companies selected by GES International. The companies selected are either based in the U.S. or Europe and therefore the results in general are concerning these areas. The literature used in this report about the companies is partly limited to information provided by the InfluenceMap.

InfluenceMap has provided a score when it comes to grade of performance, organisation score, relationship score and engagement intensity. This report has only taken consideration of grade of the performance and engagement intensity as parameters, since they have been of most importance to the context of this project. However, the organisation and relationship score are concerning the climate policy engagement and the involvement in trade associations, which are both included to some extent in the information presented by each company.

More specifically, when it comes to relationship score of the companies, this report does not take into consideration each organisational relationship the companies have. In the InfluenceMap report it can be found specifically all associations, federations or advocacy groups that the companies are connected to, for example through subsidiaries. Instead, this report focuses on the organisational relationships that are evaluated to have a strong relationship to the companies. That evaluation includes information from the InfluenceMap report and particular remarks, for example if a spokesperson of a company is a part of the board of a trade association.

The InfluenceMap has during the time frame of this report updated some of its data, for example the engagement intensity of companies. With a desire to be up to date, this report has been adapting to the changes of the InfluenceMap, in particular the aspect of engagement intensity. It is noteworthy that the information in this report responds to the version of the InfluenceMap report available on the 28th of May in 2018.

3.4 LITERATURE ANALYSIS
The main source of literature used in this report consists of information provided by InfluenceMap. As discussed in the theoretical background, InfluenceMap is judged as trustworthy through its wide collection of sources and since it has been recommended by GES International. It is important to point out that the main part of the results is based on information from one single literature, nevertheless InfluenceMap should not be disregarded because of this. Its collection of sources is provided from several different articles and
reports and is able to give a broad insight into the climate engagement of the selected companies. Since the time given for this report was limited to six months and performed by one person it could have been difficult to perform an in-depth analysis similar to the one given by InfluenceMap. Therefore, it can be considered legitimate to base a report like this on a pre-existing foundation of information.

Despite the usage of InfluenceMap as main literature in this report, in order to give the results of a larger significance it would be favourable to look into several other literature as well. This could for example be of interest if GES International decides to move forward with management of companies’ climate engagement and be in need of a wider scope.

Information about the selected companies and their support of climate change mitigation has also been gathered from the companies’ own websites; either through a sustainability segment on the website or, if available, through a sustainability report. In this way it has been possible look into what the companies own view of climate change risk is and what their policies or strategies on climate change mitigation are. Collecting information from their websites has been of an advantage since it is of interest to this report to compare what the companies’ stance on climate change risk is in contrast to their actual climate engagement activities. However, it should be pointed out that the information on the websites are presented by the companies themselves and can therefore be displayed to portray the companies in the best way.

The companies’ websites can be seen as a part of the companies’ advertisement and naturally it is in their interest to attract potential business partners. Nevertheless, since the companies investigated in this report are some of the largest companies in the world they are constantly in the public eye. Therefore, it would be unfavourable for them to untruthful on their websites. To summarize it can be assumed that the information presented on the companies’ websites are truthful however the information can be presented in a way to be in favour of the companies’.

It is also important to notice that the discussion of inconsistencies in climate engagement of companies is a rather new topic on the global climate agenda. It is difficult to find any literature on climate policy engagement before for 2010 and the aspect of inconsistencies has mainly been covered by UNPRI. This is confirmed by my supervisor Emma Henningson that has been part of advising for example reports by UNPRI that is covering the issue. It is also mentioned in some of the reports used in the theoretical background (Potter, 2018). As mentioned in the theoretical background, InfluenceMap is also being included in reports by the UNPRI, which I think enhances their credibility.
4 Results

The following information is the results of information gathered by the InfluenceMap and the disclosed information published on the official websites of the companies.

The table below shows some of the information provided in section 4.2 to 4.6 and from the InfluenceMap report. In the column to the right there is information about if the companies are estimated to support mitigation on climate change aligned with the Paris Agreement. The estimated support is based on the information provided on the companies’ websites and is therefore an arbitrary estimation that is not necessarily portraying the entire picture of the companies’ commitment to the Paris Agreement. Nevertheless, this is the results that will be analysed in this report.

To explain further, a “yes” in the column implies that the company is clearly supporting the content of the Paris Agreement while “to some extent” means that the company is acknowledging climate change mitigation but not referring to the Paris Agreement in particular.

4.1 Table 3

This table shows the names and order of the companies that are to be investigated from a climate policy engagement perspective in this report. The table also shows that industries the companies are a part of, if they have a positive or negative climate policy engagement as well as their grade and engagement intensity according to the InfluenceMap report. InfluenceMap (2017h). The right column shows if the companies have stated support for mitigation on climate change aligned with the Paris Agreement, based on information in sector 8.2 – 8.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Engagement intensity (%)</th>
<th>Acknowledged support aligned with the Paris Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tesla</td>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMW Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daimler</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Motor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>E+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASF</td>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow Chemical</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>E+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LyondellBasell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENI</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConocoPhillips</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>E-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>E-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo American</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>E+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Tinto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>E+</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glencore International</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberdrola</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>E+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 AUTOMOTIVE SECTOR

The following four companies investigated are a part of the automotive sector: Tesla Inc., BMW Group, Daimler and Ford Motor. Only one of them, Tesla Inc., is having a positive impact when it comes to climate policy engagement aligned with the Paris Agreement, according to the InfluenceMap report. The other three companies are opposing the issue; however, they are in the upper section of the list where the companies are ranked with an opposing climate policy engagement (InfluenceMap, 2017h).

4.2.1 Tesla

**Sector:** Automotive  
**Performance:** A-  
**Engagement intensity:** 26%

4.2.1.1 Company background

Tesla is an American company that was founded in 2003 with the intention to produce well-performing electric vehicles that should be as fun and fast as vehicles running on petrol. Since then its vehicles have continuously developed and is today one of the leading companies within the automotive sector (Tesla, 2018).

4.2.1.2 Climate policy engagement

On Tesla’s website the company is showing support of the transition to a low-carbon economy where the focus is on phasing-out vehicles using petrol in favour of electric vehicles. Throughout its existence Tesla has been focusing on its climate performance and is one of the global leading companies when it comes to progressing climate policy engagement (Tesla, 2018).

Tesla is supporting several environmental agencies and standards that are striving towards a mitigation of climate change like U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies and its Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards, the Zero Emissions Vehicle program and the Californian Air Resources Board. Furthermore, the CEO of the company is actively advocating for climate change improvement by for example supporting carbon tax and promoting more immediate climate action (InfluenceMap, 2017t).

4.2.1.3 Particular queries

One particular query about Tesla has been highlighted as notably positive information in the InfluenceMap report. This query is about supporting the UN global treaty of COP21 that Tesla is indicated to support strongly. The evidence for this is the protest shown by the CEO of Tesla who decided to leave the White House business advisory council as a protest at the U.S. leaving the Paris Agreement in Junie, 2017. After this event the CEO tweeted “Am departing presidential councils. Climate change is real. Leaving Paris is not good for America or the world.” (AFP, 2017)

4.2.1.4 Notable organisational relationships

According to the InfluenceMap report, Tesla is a member of Advanced Energy Economy and an executive on Tesla are also on the board of the Solar Energy Industries Association, both organisations are supportive of climate change measures. However, Tesla is not a part of a trade association associated with the automotive sector (InfluenceMap, 2017t).
4.2.2 BMW Group

*Sector: Automotive*
*Performance: D*
*Engagement intensity: 18%*

### 4.2.2.1 Company background

BMW Group is a German company that was founded in 1916 and has since then been producing vehicles. Today, BMW Group is one of the world’s leading companies in the automotive sector (Group, 2018a).

### 4.2.2.2 Climate policy engagement

On the BMW Group website, the company shows support of the two degree goal aligned with the Paris Agreement. BMW Group claims that the company is doing this by e.g. investing in electric and hybrid automobiles and support policy measures that help expand the electric vehicle industry (Group, 2018b). When the U.S. withdrew from the Paris Agreement in 2017, BMW Group also came out with a statement that the company still supports the content of the Paris Agreement and wish to continue cooperate with U.S. companies to reach its goals (Group, 2017). Nevertheless, BMW Group appears to be discouraging several regulations on climate change when it comes to the automotive sector (InfluenceMap, 2017e).

On a consistent basis, BMW Group appears to be opposing the EU 2021 CO2 emission standards as well as global GHG emission targets for vehicles. In 2016, the company stated that GHG regulations creates difficulties within the automotive sector. Furthermore, in 2014 BMW Group advocated for less stringent Zero Emission Vehicle standards. In 2015 the CEO of BMW Group was sceptical about the automotive sector to become a part of the EU Emissions Trading System (InfluenceMap, 2017e).

BMW Group appears to be against some agencies and standards that are striving towards an improvement of climate change like the U.S. Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards, the U.S. GHG Emission Standards as well as the EU 2021 CO2 Emission Standards (InfluenceMap, 2017e).

### 4.2.2.3 Particular queries

Two queries about BMW Group has been highlighted as notably negative information in the InfluenceMap report. The queries are about GHG emission standards that BMW Group is indicated to discourage strongly. The first one is about the CEO of BMW Group in 2015 opposing the CO2 targets in EU, wanting to delay its implementation (Neslen, 2014). The second one is about BMW Group in 2014 directly reaching out to policymakers about opposing the CO2 targets in EU, for example by making political donations Christian Democrat Union in Germany (Reithofer, 2014, March).

### 4.2.2.4 Notable organisational relationships

The CEO of BMW Group is on the board of the automotive trade association the *European Automobile Manufacturers Association* as well as *German Automotive Association* that are known to oppose several strands of EU climate regulations and policy. The CEO of BMW Group is also a member of European Roundtable of Industrialists, that are also opposing climate change measures (InfluenceMap, 2017e).
4.2.3 Daimler

*Sector: Automotive*

*Performance: D-
  Engagement intensity: 14%*

4.2.3.1 Company background
Daimler is a German company that was founded in 1998 through a merge of two companies; Chrysler Corporation and Daimler-Benz, both with foundations in the early 20th century. It is now one of the world’s leading companies in the automotive sector, producing vehicles since its establishment (InfluenceMap, 2017i).

4.2.3.2 Climate policy engagement
On the company’s website, Daimler is stating support for climate measures concerning the two degree goal along with the Paris Agreement. One part of their climate strategy is to invest in electric and hybrid automobiles (Daimler, 2018). Despite this, Daimler appears to be discouraging several measures on climate change when it comes to the automotive sector (InfluenceMap, 2017i).

In 2014 the CEO of Daimler supported the inclusion of the automotive sector in the EU Emission Trading System (ETS) instead of including the automotive sector in the EU 2021 GHG emission standards. This would have led to a looser regulatory framework when it comes to cutting carbon emissions from vehicles, however the suggestion was not achieved (InfluenceMap, 2017i).

Daimler appears to be against some agencies and standards that are striving towards an improvement of climate change. These include the U.S. Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards and their fuel economy standards for heavy-duty engines as well as the EU 2021 CO2 Emission Standards (InfluenceMap, 2017i).

4.2.3.3 Particular queries
There are no particular queries about Daimler that have been highlighted as notable information in the InfluenceMap report (InfluenceMap, 2017i).

4.2.3.4 Notable organisational relationships
The CEO of Daimler are actively engaged in two trade associations that are opposing several strands of the EU climate regulations and policy. First of all, the CEO has been president of the *European Automobile Manufacturers Association* until 2018 (now a member) and secondly the CEO is vice president of the *German Automotive Association* (InfluenceMap, 2017i).
4.2.4 Ford Motor
Sector: Automotive
Performance: E+
Engagement intensity: 16%

4.2.4.1 Company background
Ford Motor is an American company that was founded in 1903 and has since then been producing vehicles. Ford Motor has been influencing global methods when it comes to mass producing goods and is today one of the world’s leading automotive companies (Motor, 2018).

4.2.4.2 Climate policy engagement
On its website, Ford Motor states support of the two degree goal, aligned with the Paris Agreement, as well as acknowledging the impact the automotive sector has on the climate (Company, 2017a). Ford Motor was not supportive of the U.S. leaving the Paris Agreement in 2017, stating the company will continue engaging in climate change mitigation as usual (Luscombe, 2017). Ford Motor claims to work actively in lowering CO2 emissions, for example by partly investing in electric and hybrid automobiles (Company, 2017a). Despite this, Ford Motor appears to be discouraging several regulations on climate change when it comes to the automotive sector (InfluenceMap, 2017m).

Ford Motor appears to be against some agencies and standards that are striving towards an improvement of climate change. These include the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies and its Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFÉ) standards and GHG vehicle efficiency standards as well as the California’s Zero Emission Vehicle program (InfluenceMap, 2017m).

4.2.4.3 Particular queries
Two particular queries about Ford Motor has been highlighted as notably negative information in the InfluenceMap report. The queries are about energy efficiency standards that Ford Motor is indicated to discourage strongly. First of all, the company has lobbied with the effort to ease the U.S. government fuel economy requirements (Krisher, 2017). Secondly Ford Motor is encouraging policymakers to weaken U.S. CAFE standards. The overall argument supporting this is that the industry needs “flexibility”, otherwise one million jobs could be at risk. This argument has been met with criticism since the facts behind the statements are said to be calculated on extreme risk scenarios (Martinez, 2017).

4.2.4.4 Notable organisational relationships
Some senior executives of Ford Motor are active in trade associations that appear to be opposing climate change legislation, for example a senior executive of the company is on the board of the National Association of Manufacturing and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Furthermore, Ford Motor is also a member of the European Automobile Manufacturers Associations and the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, that are both lobbying against climate change measures (InfluenceMap, 2017m).
4.2.5 Summary of companies in the automotive sector

All four companies in the automotive sector are in general stating support for the mitigation of climate change risk, however Tesla is the only one who is showing an overall positive climate policy engagement. The grading of the companies’ performance reaches from A- to E+ and their engagement intensity varies from 14% to 26%. Despite acknowledgment of the climate change risk BMW Group, Daimler and Ford Motor are still lobbying against climate policy engagement to some extent.

It is noteworthy that Tesla is the company that has the most positive climate engagement. Tesla is showing a strong disapproval for the U.S. leaving the Paris Agreement while the other three company are lobbying for a less stringent Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agencies. BMW Group, Daimler and Ford Motor are also members of trade associations that are to some extent opposing climate policy engagement.
4.3 CHEMICAL SECTOR

The following three companies investigated are a part of the chemicals industry: BASF, Dow Chemicals and Lyondell Industries. None of them are having a positive impact when it comes to climate policy engagement aligned with the Paris Agreement, according to the InfluenceMap report. All three companies are opposing the engagement and they are in the bottom section of the list where the companies with an opposing climate policy engagement are ranked (InfluenceMap, 2017h).

4.3.1 BASF

Sector: Chemicals
Performance: E
Engagement intensity: 30%

4.3.1.1 Company background

BASF is a German company that was founded in 1865 and has since then been producing different kinds of chemicals. Today, BASF still has its headquarters in Germany and is one of the world’s leading companies within the chemical industry (BASF, 2015).

4.3.1.2 Climate policy engagement

On the BASF website the company acknowledges climate change and the Paris Agreement, saying that the company is supporting the global climate treatment and are actively working towards energy efficiency and climate protection. BASF claims that even before the Paris Agreement the company had called for an ambitious global agreement considering limiting global warming below two degrees (BASF, 2017). Despite this, evidence shows that BASF has consistently been lobbying against climate change policy.

BASF has been lobbying against several climate measures in the EU, for example in 2016 the company opposed a raise of the carbon price as well as supported the abolition of the UK Carbon Price Floor. During the same year BASF has also been advocating for exemptions when it comes to the EU Emission Trading System (ETS) and the EU Energy Efficiency Directive for industries with intense manufacturing. The leadership of BASF has in 2017 been opposing renewable energy policies on European energy prices, in particular the German energy transition policy, and has instead stated support for fracking and increased unconventional oil and gas production, specifically in Germany as well (InfluenceMap, 2017d).

4.3.1.3 Particular queries

There is one query about BASF that have been highlighted as notably negative information in the InfluenceMap report (InfluenceMap, 2017d). In 2014, BASF cooperated with 13 other companies who were advocating against a reform to intensify the effectiveness of the EU ETS and the Market Stability Reserve of them. The companies’ argument was that it was not necessary to intensify the systems in order to achieve the EU 2020 and 2030 goal (Benoit Potier, 2014).

4.3.1.4 Notable organisational relationships

Executives at BASF are having senior leadership roles in trade associations connected to the chemical sector that are opposing climate change policy engagement. Two worth noticing is the U.S. National Association of Manufacturers and the European Chemical Industry Council where a senior executor of BASF is a board member. BASF is also a member of the American Chemistry Council (InfluenceMap, 2017d).
4.3.2 Dow Chemical

Sector: Chemicals  
Performance: E+  
Engagement intensity: 27%

4.3.2.1 Company background  
Dow Chemical is a company founded in 1897 with headquarters in Michigan, the U.S., and has since then been producing different kinds of chemicals. Today Dow Chemical is one of the world’s leading companies in the chemical industry (Chemical, 2017).

4.3.2.2 Climate policy engagement  
On its website Dow Chemical recognises the difficulties that may be a result of climate change if it is not dealt with in time. According to the company the world is in need of a dramatic reduction of GHG emissions and to increase the use of renewable energy in order to meet the energy demand of the future (Chemicals, 2018). On its website Dow Chemical is also stating disappointment over the fact that the president of the U.S., Donald Trump, has decided to withdraw from the Paris Agreement and that the company will continue to work towards alternative solutions to cope with the climate change challenge (Chemicals, 2017). Nevertheless, Dow Chemical seems to be opposing several climate measures and policy engagements (InfluenceMap, 2017j).

Dow Chemical shows mixed support with several climate measure, for example the Ohio’s Renewable Portfolio Standards and Ohio’s Energy Efficiency Standards in 2017. Publicly the company is showing support for both standards however Dow Chemical is critical towards the costs of the portfolio and also critical towards other energy efficiency targets. Particularly Dow Chemical was critical towards a reform to increase the EU Energy Efficiency Targets in 2016 arguing they were unrealistic (InfluenceMap, 2017j).

Dow Chemical are publicly supporting the need to transition towards a low-carbon economy whilst the company is also advocating for an increased unconventional gas production. In 2014 the company seemed to be unsupportive of the U.S. Clean Power Plan however in 2017 it has showed more support towards it. In general Dow Chemical also seems unsupportive of a more ambitious EU Emission Trading System (InfluenceMap, 2017j).

4.3.2.3 Particular queries  
There is one query about Dow Chemical that have been highlighted as notably negative information in the InfluenceMap report (InfluenceMap, 2017j). After a recalculation the European Court of Justice decided to decrease the amount of free allocations of the EU ETS, which would lead to an increase of carbon prices. Dow Chemical decided to take legal action against this reform claiming it was entitled to more free allowances (Garside, 2016).

4.3.2.4 Notable organisational relationships  
There are several trade associations that are heavily lobbying against climate change policy that Dow Chemical is having leadership positions in, for example the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the U.S. National Association of Manufacturers and the European Chemical Industry Council (InfluenceMap, 2017j).
4.3.3 LyondellBasell Industries

**Sector:** Chemicals  
**Performance:** F  
**Engagement intensity:** 11%

### 4.3.3.1 Company background
The company LyondellBasell was founded in 2007 through a merge of the two companies Basell and Lyondell who both have roots back to the 1950’s. LyondellBasell has its headquarters in Texas in the U.S. and are today one of the world’s leading companies in the chemical industry (LyondellBasell, 2017a).

### 4.3.3.2 Climate policy engagement
On the LyondellBasell website it is not acknowledged any particular information about climate change sciences or the Paris Agreement. However, the company acknowledges their responsibility as a large company in the industry to minimize their environmental impact (LyondellBasell, 2017b). In January of 2018 it was also announced that a high-ranking employee at LyondellBasell named Richard Roudeix became a chairman of the Climate Change and Energy Council of the trade association European Chemical Industry Council. Roudeix stated that the industry is working on moving towards a low-carbon world with two particular challenges: preserving the environment as well as the competitiveness in the business (LyondellBasell, 2018).

Despite stating that LyondellBasell has a responsibility as a large company to preserve the environment the company has also supported a continued high GHG energy mix. First of all, the company appeared to be supportive of the Keystone XL pipeline in the U.S. and secondly LyondellBasell supported unconventional oil production in Canada in 2013. The support of the Canadian oil production was stated by its CEO who said that the oil production would generate more jobs and would also benefit their own production (InfluenceMap, 2017p).

### 4.3.3.3 Particular queries
There are no particular queries about LyondellBasell that have been highlighted as notable information in the InfluenceMap report (InfluenceMap, 2017p).

### 4.3.3.4 Notable organisational relationships
LyondellBasell are members of several trade associations that are opposing numerous climate measures, for example the European Chemical Industry Council, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Furthermore, a senior executor of LyondellBasell is also on the board of directors in the American Chemistry Council (InfluenceMap, 2017p).
4.3.4 Summary of companies in the chemical sector

All three companies investigated in the chemical industry are in general stating support for the improvement of climate change risk on their websites however only BASF is stating support for the Paris Agreement. The grading of the companies’ performance reaches from E to F and their engagement intensity varies from 11% to 30%. Despite their acknowledgment of the climate change risk all of them are still lobbying against climate policy engagement to some extent.

Dow Chemical and BASF are both in some way against increased energy efficiency targets in EU and BASF is also unsupportive of intense manufacturing industry to be a part of the efficiency targets as well as the ETS. LyondellBasell is supporting a high GHG energy mix and has showed support for the Keystone XL pipeline as well as unconventional oil production in Canada.
4.4 ENERGY SECTOR

The following three companies investigated are a part of the energy sector: ENI, ConocoPhillips and Chevron. None of them are having an overall positive impact when it comes to climate policy engagement aligned with the Paris Agreement, according to the InfluenceMap report. All three companies are opposing the engagement; however, they are in varied sections of the list where the companies are ranked with an opposing climate policy engagement (InfluenceMap, 2017h).

4.4.1 ENI

Sector: Energy
Performance: D+
Engagement intensity: 27%

4.4.1.1 Company background
ENI is an Italian company that was founded in 1953 but have roots going back to 1926 through its subsidiary company Agip. Since its establishment ENI has been active within the energy sector through both exploration and production of oil and natural gas. Today ENI is one of the world’s leading petroleum companies within the energy sector (ENI, 2017b).

4.4.1.2 Climate policy engagement
On its website ENI is acknowledging the climate change risk according to the Paris Agreement and the need to act along the two-degree limit of global warming (ENI, 2017a). During 2016 ENI took a more positive stance on the EU Energy Efficiency Directive compared to a few years earlier when it was opposing the EU renewable energy and energy efficiency targets, however it is still not supporting an increased ambition of the targets (InfluenceMap, 2017l).

Overall ENI has a mixed engagement in the climate policy efforts in the EU. When it comes to the EU Emissions Trading System ENI are opposing the lack of free allowances for industry and state that it prefers other methods for reducing emissions. On the other hand, ENI are supporting carbon pricing like carbon tax. Moreover, ENI has also showed support for energy efficiency policies in Italy (InfluenceMap, 2017l).

Previously, ENI was also unsupportive of renewable energy subsidies, but the company has now showed support for limiting the pollution from the electricity sector by proposing an establishment of an emission performance standard in the EU in 2017. For example, ENI are supportive of decarbonisation of energy, diminishing fossil fuels and coal subsidies. However at the same time, the company continues to advocate hydrocarbons in the future energy mix, especially gas (InfluenceMap, 2017l).

4.4.1.3 Particular queries
There are no particular queries about ENI that have been highlighted as notable information in the InfluenceMap report (InfluenceMap, 2017l).

4.4.1.4 Notable organisational relationships
ENI is a member of several trade associations that are actively opposing climate policy making in the EU like FuelsEurope, BusinessEurope and the International Emissions Trading Association. These associations have been against the European zero-emission vehicle policy respectively the EU Emission Trading System (InfluenceMap, 2017l).
4.4.2 ConocoPhillips

*Sector:* Energy  
*Performance:* E-  
*Engagement intensity:* 21%

4.4.2.1 Company background
ConocoPhillips is a U.S. based company founded in 2002 through a merge of the two companies Conoco Inc. and Phillips Petroleum Co. with roots leading back to 1975 respectively 1917. ConocoPhillips are one of the world’s leading petroleum companies within the energy sector that both explore and produce oil and natural gas (ConocoPhillips, 2016).

4.4.2.2 Climate policy engagement
On its website ConocoPhillips acknowledges the climate-related issues connected to human activity and claims that it is a high priority (ConocoPhillips, 2018a). However, the company prefers market-based solutions, both nationally and globally, instead of regulatory approaches. Despite being against regulatory approaches, ConocoPhillips advocated for the U.S. to stay in the Paris Agreement partly because it gives the U.S. an opportunity to take a part and influence future environmental and economic discussions (ConocoPhillips, 2018b). Beyond the company’s efforts, ConocoPhillips are still lobbying against several climate measures.

Overall ConocoPhillips seems to be opposing the transitioning to a low carbon economy and in 2015 the company requested for policy makers to support policies that can maintain a high GHG energy mix. In 2013 the company also stated that energy production would preferably be left entirely to the market, advocating that renewable energy sources could drive up consumer costs and lead to volatility. ConocoPhillips appears to be against the Carbon tax in Australia and Canada and the UK Carbon Price Floor that are both striving towards an improvement of climate (InfluenceMap, 2017g).

4.4.2.3 Particular queries
There are no particular queries about ConocoPhillips that have been highlighted as notable information in the InfluenceMap report (InfluenceMap, 2017g).

4.4.2.4 Notable organisational relationships
ConocoPhillips is a member of some trade associations that are actively discouraging climate change legislation. These associations are the U.S. National Associations of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the American Petroleum Institute. In all of these associations, a senior executive of ConocoPhillips is a member of the board (InfluenceMap, 2017g).
4.4.3 Chevron

Sector: Energy
Performance: E-
Engagement intensity: 33%

4.4.3.1 Company background
Chevron is a U.S. based company founded in 2001 through a merge of the two companies Texaco and the predecessor of Chevron, with roots leading back to 1901 respectively 1876. Today Chevron is one of the world’s leading companies within the energy sector (Chevron, 2017).

4.4.3.2 Climate policy engagement
On its website Chevron acknowledges the science behind climate change and the fact that humankind is standing before a grand challenge. The company is providing a climate change strategy (Chevron, 2018) however, Chevron has also proclaimed the fact that energy demand will increase in the future and it does not support a dramatic reduction of GHG emissions. In 2016 its CEO stated that emission trading and carbon taxes leads to unnecessary costs for both consumers and business. Overall Chevron has the belief that fossil fuels will be continuing to be important in the future and are therefore opposing a transition away from fossil fuels (InfluenceMap, 2017f).

Before the meeting for the Paris Agreement in 2015 Chevron did not take a part of the commitment of joint companies in the oil sector, who vowed to collaborate. In 2014 the company sponsored a conference in the U.S. where climate denial was proclaimed. Furthermore, in 2014 the CEO of Chevron also spoke publicly about that renewable energy could become so expensive that it could lead to deindustrialization of Germany. Chevron appears to be against cap and trade legislation in California, the Energy efficiency legislation in Australia and GHG emission standards in Oregon and in California that are all striving towards an improvement of climate change (Chevron, 2018).

4.4.3.3 Particular queries
There is one query that has been highlighted as notably negative information in the InfluenceMap report, which is about energy policy and mix. Chevron was in 2015 specifically opposing a reduction standard of petrol in California that is a measure in order to transition the energy mix towards renewables, particularly reducing the state’s dependence on oil. The desire of the opposition was that the state would no longer have to cut their petroleum use in half during the upcoming 15 years (Gutierrez, 2015).

4.4.3.4 Notable organisational relationships
Chevron is engaged in several trade associations that are opposing climate change related legislation, for example the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the U.S. National Association of Manufacturers and the International Emissions Trading Association. Furthermore, a senior executive of Chevron is on the board of the American Petroleum Institute (InfluenceMap, 2017f).
4.4.4 Summary of companies in the energy sector

All three companies in the energy sector are in general stating support for the improvement of climate change risk however only ENI seem to be supporting the Paris Agreement. The grading of the companies’ performance reaches from D+ to E- and their engagement intensity varies from 21% to 33%. Despite acknowledgment of the climate change risk all three of the companies are still lobbying against climate policy engagement to some extent.

Being a part of the energy sector all three of the companies are lobbying for a continuous use for fossil fuels in the future energy mix. Chevron was specifically lobbying against a reduction standard of petrol in California, ConocoPhillips are against carbon tax in Australia and ENI are advocating for fossil fuels in the future energy mix. All of the companies are also members of trade associations that are to some extent opposing climate policy engagement.
4.5 MATERIAL SECTOR

The following three companies investigated are a part of the material sector: Anglo American, Rio Tinto and Glencore International. None of them are having a positive impact when it comes to climate policy engagement aligned with the Paris Agreement, according to the InfluenceMap report. All three companies are opposing the engagement; however, they are in varied sections of the list where the companies are ranked with an opposing climate policy engagement (InfluenceMap, 2017h).

4.5.1 Anglo American

**Sector:** Materials  
**Performance:** E+  
**Engagement intensity:** 14%

4.5.1.1 Company background
Anglo American is a company based in both South Africa and the United Kingdom, which was founded in 1917 and has since then been involved in distribution of natural resources. Today it is one of the world’s leading companies in the material sector, focusing on metals and mining (AngloAmerican, 2018).

4.5.1.2 Climate policy engagement
On the Anglo American website, it is stated that the company recognises the climate change sciences and also acknowledge its responsibility in taking a part of the climate movement that includes the Paris Agreement, especially since its business is related to non-renewable resources (AngloAmerican, 2017). However, Anglo American is still engaged in several activities that are negative towards climate policy engagement.

On several occasions Anglo American has been opposing carbon tax measures, both in 2013 in Australia and also in 2015 in South Africa. Instead the company seems to be supporting the EU Emissions Trading System before other climate actions, for example Anglo American is lobbying for the removal of renewable energy subsidies (InfluenceMap, 2017c).

In 2017 Anglo American stated that the company believes that it is unfair that fossil fuels are an energy source to be excluded in future energy forecasts. For example, the company claims that there is no substitute for coal in steel production and that it is foreseen in the planned 2040 energy mix scenario for a two-degree global warming limit. It also states that diminishing coal production would be a threat to emerging economies, like in southern Africa. Instead of limiting the use of fossil fuels Anglo American gravitate towards low-carbon technologies, like carbon capture and carbon storage, for the sake of lowering carbon dioxide emissions (InfluenceMap, 2017c).

4.5.1.3 Particular queries
There are no particular queries about Anglo American that have been highlighted as notable information in the InfluenceMap report (InfluenceMap, 2017c).

4.5.1.4 Notable organisational relationships
Anglo American is a member of three trade associations that all are supporting a continued use of coal in the global energy mix. These trade associations are the World Coal Association, the South African Chamber of Mines and the Mining Associations of Canada (InfluenceMap, 2017c).
4.5.2 Rio Tinto

Sector: Materials  
Performance: E+  
Engagement intensity: 32%

4.5.2.1 Company background
Rio Tinto is a company based in both Australia and the United Kingdom that was founded in 1873 and is distributing natural resources. Today it is one of the world’s leading companies in the material sector, focusing on metals and mining (Tinto, 2017).

4.5.2.2 Climate policy engagement
On its website Rio Tinto recognises that the science behind climate change is to be taken seriously and that they support the two-degree goal that was set at the Paris Agreement. Furthermore, the company was also against the President of the U.S., Donald Trump, leaving the agreement in 2017 (Tinto, 2018). Nevertheless, Rio Tinto is opposing several climate policy engagements and legislations globally.

Rio Tinto has been opposing carbon tax in Australia and has also been against the EU Emission Trading System, however the company showed support for a similar system in China in 2017. In Canada, Rio Tinto has also supported a weakening of the carbon tax measures and a protection of trade-intense industries in 2016. Similarly, Rio Tinto supported trade-intense industries and aluminium production by advocating for them being an exemption of renewable energy legislative costs in Australia during 2015-2016 (InfluenceMap, 2017r).

4.5.2.3 Particular queries
There are two queries of Rio Tinto that have been highlighted as notably negative information in the InfluenceMap report. The first one is that Rio Tinto in 2014 was opposing the Renewable Energy Targets of Australia since, according to Rio Tinto, it would lead to unnecessary cost pressure on businesses, especially the ones on international markets (Edmans, 2014). This opposition has continued and in 2017 Rio Tinto was also unsupportive of subsidies of renewable energy in Australia (Tinto, 2018). The second query is that the company has been continuously supportive of coal as a part of the future energy mix since 2015 because coal is effectively used in the mining industry. In 2017 Rio Tinto suggested that new coal plants should be built in order to the reduce the costs of Australia’s electricity supply (Fitzergald, 2015).

4.5.2.4 Notable organisational relationships
Rio Tinto is a part of the board of three trade associations that all have been opposing climate legislation. The trade associations are the Mining Association of Canada, Minerals Council of Australia and the Business Council of Australia (InfluenceMap, 2017r).
4.5.3 Glencore International

Sector: Materials
Performance: E
Engagement intensity: 17%

4.5.3.1 Company background
Glencore is a company that was founded in 1974 with its headquarters in Switzerland and was in 2013 joined by their business partner Xstrata. Today it is one of the world’s leading companies in the materials sector, focusing on metals and mining (Glencore, 2017a).

4.5.3.2 Climate policy engagement
On the company’s website, Glencore states that it recognises climate change science and that the company actively engages with policy-makers on regulatory changes, e.g. the commitments of the Paris Agreement. Glencore also recognises that it is in the interest of the company to improve energy efficiency, both for an economic and environmental cause (Glencore, 2017b). Nevertheless, Glencore are still taking a part of several actions that has a negative impact on climate policy engagement.

Glencore has stated support for measures to price carbon emissions however Glencore seems to be against carbon tax in South Africa with the argument that it would e.g. increase production costs that could lead to job losses. Furthermore, Glencore is advocating for a continued high energy mix where the company stated in 2017 that the demand for coal will grow. Also, Glencore seems to support the electrification of transportation while at the same time the company is supporting the use of coal to power the electricity grid (InfluenceMap, 2017n).

4.5.3.3 Particular queries
There are four queries of Glencore that have been highlighted as notably negative information in the InfluenceMap report. Two of them are about Glencore opposing GHG emission targets and supporting a weakening of the UN Treaty along with the Paris Agreement in 2017. For example, Glencore thinks that the agreement is not safe for heavy industries who might not survive the reductions and commitments and the same time maintain economic prosperity, especially when it comes to dependency on coal (King, 2016).

The following two highlighted queries are about Glencore supporting an abolishment of the renewable energy targets in Australia and opposing an expansion of renewable energy there as well, in 2017. One of the company’s arguments is that an expansion of renewable energy would lead to a destruction of the affordable energy capacity that exists today and when current plants are shut down they will not be brought back (Chambers, 2017).

4.5.3.4 Notable organisational relationships
Glencore has leadership positions in some trade associations that to some extent are opposing climate policy engagement. The trade associations are the Minerals Council of Australia, the Mining Association of Canada and the World Coal Association (InfluenceMap, 2017n).
4.5.4 Summary of companies in the material sector

All three companies in the material sector are in general stating support for the improvement of climate change risk on their websites as well as acknowledging the Paris Agreement. The grading of the companies’ performance reaches from E+ to E and their engagement intensity varies from 14% to 32%. Despite their acknowledgment of the climate change risk all three of the companies are still lobbying against climate policy engagement to some extent.

Since the three companies are all heavily dependent on coal they are lobbying for a continuous use for fossil fuels in the future energy mix. Glencore has supported a weakening of the Paris Agreement, Rio Tinto has supported lower renewable energy targets in Australia and Anglo American is lobbying for a removal of renewable energy subsidies in the EU. All of the companies are also members of trade associations that are to some extent opposing climate policy engagement.
4.6 Utility Sector

The following three companies investigated are a part of the utilities sector: Iberdrola, Duke Energy and Southern Company. Only one of them, Iberdrola, is having a positive impact when it comes to climate policy engagement aligned with the Paris Agreement, according to the InfluenceMap report. The other two companies are opposing the issue and both of them are in the bottom section of the list where companies with an opposing climate policy engagement are ranked (InfluenceMap, 2017h).

4.6.1 Iberdrola

Sector: Utilities
Performance: B-
Engagement risk: 44%

4.6.1.1 Company background
Iberdrola is a Spanish company, founded in 1992 through a merge of the two companies Hidroeléctrica Española and Iberduero with roots going back to 1907 and 1944 respectively. Iberdrola is today one of world’s leading companies in the utility industry and is focusing on renewable energy production (Iberdrola, 2017b).

4.6.1.2 Climate policy engagement
According to Iberdrola’s website the company thinks the electricity sector has a large role in living up to the environmental targets set by the Paris Agreement (Iberdrola, 2018). Iberdrola are acknowledging the climate change sciences and claims to be incorporating sustainability in its work aligned with these targets (Iberdrola, 2017a). This is shown through e.g. the climate policy engagement Iberdrola is taking a part of.

Iberdrola is supporting market methods that are to help finance the transition to renewable energy usage in the EU. This includes both the EU Emission Trading System (ETS) and carbon tax. Earlier Iberdrola has been opposing some of the targets when it comes to energy efficiency and renewable energy however in 2016 the company stated an urge of more ambitious legislative targets in the EU 2030 (InfluenceMap, 2017o).

4.6.1.3 Particular queries
There are two queries about Iberdrola that have been highlighted as notably positive information in the InfluenceMap report (InfluenceMap, 2017o). The first one is about when Iberdrola through an open letter advocated for the policy makers in Ohio to oppose legislation that could inhibit the renewable energy standards in 2014 (Alliance, 2014). The second query is about Iberdrola supporting the EU 2030 targets to be even more ambitious when it comes to renewable energy in 2017, saying it is the most competitive option for the next power generation in Europe (Times, 2017).

4.6.1.4 Notable organisational relationships
Iberdrola is a member of trade associations where most of them are supporting the climate change policies of the EU, for example International Emissions Trading Association and WindEurope. On the other hand, the CEO of Iberdrola is a member of the trade association European Roundtable of Industrialists that are opposing increased carbon prices in the EU ETS (InfluenceMap, 2017o).
4.6.2 Duke Energy

**Sector:** Utilities
**Performance:** E+
**Engagement risk:** 23%

4.6.2.1 Company background
Duke Energy was founded in 1904 with its headquarters in North Carolina, the U.S., and has since then been producing and distributing electric energy and natural gas. Today Duke Energy is one of the world’s leading companies within the utilities industry (Energy, 2018).

4.6.2.2 Climate policy engagement
On the website of Duke Energy, the company states it is committed to reduce its GHG emissions through different actions, like increasing the usage of renewable energy, increase the energy efficiency and implementing smart grid technologies. The company acknowledges the fact that the U.S. is no longer a part of the Paris Agreement and Duke Energy states that the has done a “two-degree policy” risk analyses on its own, claiming that being a part of the two-degree goal would be possible for them (Corporation, 2018, March).

Duke Energy has in general been opposing climate change policy however it is showing some mixed signals. While e.g. being supporting of renewable energy and energy efficiency standards they lobbied in 2015-2016 against several legislative measures within this area. Duke Energy shows continued opposition towards the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Clean Power Plan during 2016 however, they showed positive engagement though, at the same, evidence suggested Duke Energy had been funding legal actions to derail the plan (InfluenceMap, 2017k).

4.6.2.3 Particular queries
There are three queries that have been highlighted as notably negative information about Duke Energy by the InfluenceMap report (InfluenceMap, 2017k). The first one is that in 2014 Duke Energy also advocated for policy makers to oppose GHG emission standards for the law to be withdrawn (Agency, 2014). Secondly in 2016 the company, together with other energy companies, funded a support for an amendment that could limit the usage of solar panels in the U.S (Kasper, 2016). Finally, in 2016 Duke Energy continued to oppose the EPA Clean Power Plan by funding lawyers arguing against the plan (Institute, 2016).

4.6.2.4 Notable organisational relationships
Duke Energy are a part of several trade associations, that are opposing climate change policy engagement, where senior executives at the company are a part of the board. Some of these trade associations are Business Roundtable, the International Emissions Trading Association, the American Legislative Exchange Council and the Edison Electric Institute. It is noteworthy however that Duke Energy left the National Association of Manufacturers due to them opposing climate change policy (InfluenceMap, 2017k).
4.6.3 Southern Company

Sector: Utilities
Performance: F
Engagement risk: 32%

4.6.3.1 Company background
The Southern Company was founded in 1945 with its headquarters in the state of Georgia in the U.S. and has since then been producing and distributing energy. Today Duke Energy is one of the world’s leading companies within the utilities industry (Company, 2017b).

4.6.3.2 Climate policy engagement
On the Southern Company’s website, the company acknowledges that climate change is a challenging issue and that the company is putting efforts into reducing its GHG emissions. There is no specific information about its stance on the Paris Agreement or the two-degree climate warming limit in particular. However, Southern Company states that it is committed to develop renewable energy in their energy mix, improving energy efficiency as well as prioritising research and development (Company, 2018, April).

Southern Company is strategically opposing the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Clean Power Plan and in 2016 the company, engaging in legal administration, arguing that the plan is moving too fast. In general, the company seems to be unsupportive of climate change legislation and its CEO have openly been opposing renewable energy subsidies (InfluenceMap, 2017s).

4.6.3.3 Particular queries
There are three queries that have been highlighted as notably negative information about Southern Company in the InfluenceMap report. The first one is about the company lobbying against the Clear Air Act rules and Clean Power Plan of the EPA of the U.S. in 2014. Furthermore, in 2015 Southern Company funded parties that were distributing information or showing support for climate change denial. Finally, in 2016, its subsidiary company Gulf Power, together with other energy companies, funded a support for an amendment that could limit the usage of solar panels in the U.S.

4.6.3.4 Notable organisational relationships
Southern Company has a strong relationship with several trade associations that are opposing climate change policy engagement. The vice-president of the company and president for external affairs are a part of the executive committee of the National Association of Manufacturers and is also a regional vice-chairman of the US Chamber of Commerce. The CEO of Southern Company is also a member of Business Roundtable and a chairman of the Edison Electric Institute (InfluenceMap, 2017s).
4.6.4 Summary of companies in the utility sector

All three companies in the utilities industry are in general stating support for the improvement of climate change risk on their websites however Southern Company is not explicitly stating support for the Paris Agreement. The grading of the companies’ performance reaches from B- to F and their engagement intensity varies from 23% to 44%. Despite their acknowledgment of the climate change risk both Duke Energy and Southern Company are still lobbying against climate policy engagement to some extent, while Iberdrola is mostly showing signs of positive engagement.

Both Duke Energy and South Company are based in the U.S. and are lobbying against the U.S. EPA. Clean Power Plan. Together they also funded support for legal actions wanting to limit the usage of solar panels in the U.S. Iberdrola on the other hand is encouraging even more ambitious climate targets in the EU 2030 plan.
5 Analysis of the results

This part of the report is the analysis of the results that include problem areas that have been found in the information provided in the results. The problem areas will be followed by an analytical discussion that will partly include possible measures on how to improve consistency.

5.1 Problem areas

The following is my perception of what the main problem areas are in the inconsistent climate engagement of the selected companies that have been recognised in the results, section 4.1 to 4.6. The detection of these problem areas is made through an interpretation based on the information provided by the InfluenceMap report and the companies’ own stance on their climate policy engagement. It is noteworthy that there can be more problems in inconsistent engagement than the areas presented below, however these are the ones most relevant problems detected from these specific 16 companies.

5.1.1 Organisational relationships

The first problem area of inconsistent climate engagement that is evident in the results is that companies are being members of trade associations or federations with agendas that are not aligned with the companies own stance on climate change engagement. All companies with a negative climate policy engagement are, in fact, a part of trade associations that to some extent are being unsupportive of implementing climate measures. Even Iberdrola (4.6.1), who is having a positive climate policy engagement, are a part of the trade association European Roundtable of Industrialists that is opposing increased carbon pricing in the EU (InfluenceMap, 2017o). This is portraying a distinct conflict of interest where the agenda of the trade associations and the companies are contradicting each other, resulting in inconsistent climate policy engagement.

Being a part of an organisational relationship like a trade association can be a good way for companies to join forces in order reach a common goal. It is evident through the results that all of the companies presented are involved in some way in an organisational relationship, which in its own is not necessarily something negative. The complications arise when the trade associations are not sharing the same values as the companies. This, in its turn, leads to an immediate contradiction and inconsistency in of the companies’ climate policy engagement.

The issue of trade associations has been mentioned in the theoretical background, through one report in particular that also recognised this problematic trait, especially when senior executives or a CEO are a part of the board of a trade association. This is unfortunately the case in several of the companies in the results of this report.

5.1.1.1 Member of the board in trade associations

Beyond being a member of trade associations that are lobbying against climate measures, several of the companies also have hold of chairmanship positions in these associations. To mention a few, Rio Tinto (4.5.2) are a board member of e.g. Minerals Council of Australia (InfluenceMap, 2017r), Chevron (4.4.3) is on the board of American Petroleum Institute (InfluenceMap, 2017f) and LyondellBasell (4.3.3) are on the board of American Chemistry Council (InfluenceMap, 2017p). It could be argued that companies might not be aware of the agenda the trade associations have, however if a CEO or senior executive of a company is on a board of a trade association there should no doubt that the company is aware of its agenda.
5.1.2 Being against climate legislation

Despite if the companies try to set an ambitious climate policy, their way of being unsupportive of climate legislation is putting sticks in the wheels of the global climate agenda. As mentioned in the background (3.1), the Paris Agreement and the NDC’s are putting pressure on governments to establish climate legislation and restrictions as a part of reaching the global climate goals. In that way, it is the government’s responsibility to make sure that the national actors are playing a part in climate change mitigation. Therefore, when companies contradict the implementation on climate change measures the climate agenda is set back.

There are several of the 16 companies mentioned in this report that are opposing climate change legislation despite wishing to be aligned with the Paris Agreement. To give a few examples ConocoPhillips (4.4.2) has been against carbon tax in Australia and Canada (InfluenceMap, 2017g), Chevron (4.4.3) has been against cap and trade legislation in California (InfluenceMap, 2017f) and Glencore International (4.5.3) has supported an abolishment of renewable energy targets in America (InfluenceMap, 2017n).

Furthermore, companies that are a part of trade associations that are lobbying against certain climate legislation and measures are, though indirectly, being against that legislation as well.

The problem of companies being against climate legislation also covers companies approving on a legislation or climate measure however, they are lobbying for it to become less stringent. An example of this can be the BMW Group who has advocated for less stringent Zero Emission Vehicle standards (4.2.2). Beyond this, there can also be shown in the results that companies are supporting climate change measures however they wish for their own industrial sector to be excluded out of the equation. An example of this is BAFS who wanted the chemical industry to be relieved of the EU Emission Trading System (4.3.1).

Furthermore, some companies are not showing indirectly that they are being against climate legislation. Instead companies are lobbying against the legislation through funding legal actors to push for their opinion. Some examples of this that was brought up in the results are the BMW Group (4.2.2), Southern Company (4.6.3) and Duke Energy (4.3.2).

5.1.2.1 Supporting monetary measures instead of restricting legislation

In comparison to being opposing climate legislation, several companies are instead being supportive of implementing monetary measures. The EU Emission Trading System (ETS) is an option that several companies are supporting instead of supporting restrictions on how large emissions a company can have. For example, Daimler (4.2.3) has supported the ETS instead of GHG emission standards in 2014 (InfluenceMap, 2017i). Anglo American (4.5.1) also supported the ETS before renewable energy subsidies (InfluenceMap, 2017c).

Furthermore, ENI (4.4.1) are also supporting the carbon tax, another monetary measure (InfluenceMap, 2017i).

A reason for why monetary measures can be preferred could be that these companies – that are some of the largest companies in the world – are possessing a great amount of capital. Supporting monetary measures could be their way of paying themselves out of the issues instead of actually minimising their emission and environmental impact. Nevertheless, it should be noted that monetary measures not necessarily are a bad solution in itself. For example, Iberdrola (4.6.1) a company with an overall positive climate engagement, are stating support for monetary measures since it can finance the transition to a low carbon economy.
5.1.3 Supporting mitigation – but not in their own industrial sector

Another repapering trend in the results is that many of the included companies seem to support climate change mitigation, however not within their own industrial sector. Many of the companies can be supporting of a climate change measure in general but think there should be exceptions for their own industry. For example, in 2015 BMW (4.2.2) was sceptical towards the inclusion of the automotive sector in the EU ETS (InfluenceMap, 2017e) and in 2014 Daimler (4.2.3) did not want the automotive sector to be a part of the EU 2021 GHG emission standards (InfluenceMap, 2017i). Furthermore BASF (4.3.1) in 2016 wanted intense manufacturers to be an exemption in the EU ETS and the EU Energy Efficiency Directive (InfluenceMap, 2017d) while also Rio Tinto (4.5.2) supported in 2016 that trade-intensive as well as aluminium production industries should be exemptions of renewable energy legislative costs in Australia (InfluenceMap, 2017r).

5.1.3.1 Dependency on fossil fuels

There are several companies in the results that are heavily dependent on fossil fuels, for example in the energy and material sector. Many of these companies argue that there is not yet a renewable energy substitute available that is sufficient enough for their production and therefore they continuous to support a high GHG energy mix. This includes for example the companies LyondellBasell (4.3.3), ConocoPhillips (4.4.2) and ENI (4.4.1).

Several arguments for a continuous use for fossil fuels are also connected to social factors, like work environment and development. For example, Ford Motor (4.2.4) has been encouraging policymakers to weaken the U.S. Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards with the argument automotive industry needs “flexibility”, otherwise there could be a great loss of jobs (Martinez, 2017). Glencore International also seems to be against carbon tax in South Africa with the argument that it would for example increase production costs that could lead to job losses (InfluenceMap, 2017n). Furthermore, LyondellBasell has been supporting an unconventional oil production in Canada with the argument from its CEO that the production would not only benefit the production of LyondellBasell but also generate more jobs (InfluenceMap, 2017p).

Another argument for maintaining fossil fuels is that the energy usage should be decided by the market, not policies. Chevron (4.4.3) who’s CEO in 2014 claimed that renewable energy could become so expensive that it could lead to a deindustrialization of Germany (InfluenceMap, 2017f). A market crash would be the results of renewable energy being too expensive since it is not available to the same extent as fossil fuels.

5.1.3.2 Energy efficiency and low-carbon technologies instead of excluding high GHG fuels

Instead of being willing to downscale their fossil fuels usage and being against a high GHG energy mix several companies seem to promote energy efficiency as a climate change mitigation strategy. Some of the companies promoting energy efficiency is the Southern Company (4.6.3), BASF (4.3.1), ENI (4.4.1) and Glencore international (4.5.3).

5.1.4 Mixed signals on the same policy topic

Another problem area that has been detected from the results is that several of the selected companies show mixed signals when it comes to e.g. a climate change measures. This can be shown when a company is supporting a climate legislation while at the same time a spokesperson for the company are making a statement that the legislation in question is questionable. Another possibility is that a company might be supportive of a climate measure in one region but are unsupportive of the same, or a similar, climate measure in another region.
To give a few examples, Dow Chemical (4.3.2) has in 2017 shown support for Ohio’s Renewable Portfolio Standards and Ohio’s Energy Efficiency standards, however the company is being critical towards the costs of the portfolio and the efficiency targets (InfluenceMap, 2017). Rio Tinto has been opposing the EU Emission Trading System and carbon tax in Australia while the company has shown support for a similar system in China in 2017 (InfluenceMap, 2017).

Moreover, it can be argued that the inconsistent statements and actions on climate change mitigation can count as showing mixed signals as well.

5.1.4.1 Monetary measures
As mentioned in the results, some of the companies seem to be supportive of monetary measures, like carbon tax and the EU Emission Trading System, and seem to prefer these solutions instead on GHG emission standards or subsidies of renewable energy. One reason for this could be that the companies – that are some of the largest companies in the world – are possessing a great amount of capital. Supporting monetary measures could be their way of paying themselves out of the issues instead of actually minimising their emission and environmental impact. Nevertheless, it should be noted that monetary measures not necessarily are a bad solution in itself. For example, Iberdrola (4.6.1) a company with an overall positive climate engagement, are stating support for monetary measures since it can finance the transition to a low carbon economy.

5.2 Analytical discussion
The following section will include discussion points about the results as well as the problem areas.

5.2.1 Inconsistency in climate policy engagement - why does it exist?
The global climate agenda has rather rapidly expanded the in the last two decades. Since the first climate meeting in the UN in 1995 in Berlin leading up to the Paris Agreement in 2015 issues of climate change risk has risen to the agenda (UNFCCC, 2016). Nowadays, large companies can feel obligated to “jump on the bandwagon” and be a part of the sustainability movement; partly in order to be up to date and partly to attract stakeholders with similar interests. Thanks to the awareness spread through the Paris Agreement It is no longer option for companies to state their view on climate change but an obligation.

Because companies nowadays feel obliged to make climate change a part of their agenda it may be that they make a stance on climate change engagement without being fully aware of what it takes to follow through with their plans. Being engaged in minimising a climate change risk does not imply that a company must be supportive of proposed climate legislations.

5.2.1 Positive engagement
Of the 16 selected companies there are only two of them that are having a positive climate policy engagement according to the InfluenceMap report: Iberdrola in the utility sector and Tesla in the automotive sector. Since they are also two world leading companies, how come that they have achieved a more consistent and positive engagement compared to the remaining 14 companies?

It is noteworthy that the top performing company in the results is Tesla, with a grade of A- and an engagement intensity of 26%. Tesla is also the youngest company, established in 2003, and has a business plan that is based on the need for climate friendly vehicles. It can be difficult to compare a company like that to for example Ford Motor that was founded in the
beginning of the 20th century and has evolved since the first vehicle in the world was developed. Iberdrola on the other hand have company roots going back to the beginning of the 20th century however one of its focus area is renewable energy. The company’s grade has been set to a B- while its engagement intensity is the largest one of all companies in this report at 44%.

5.2.2 The future of improving consistency in climate engagement
The following is a discussion on what kind of measures can be applied to improve the consistency in climate engagement.

5.2.2.1 Time
The first realisation that comes to my mind when thinking about trying to improve the consistency of climate policy engagement in companies is time. As mentioned in the theoretical background, the term of responsible investment is a rather new approach for investors and the same could be stated about climate engagement in general (UNPRI, 2018a). The Paris Agreement was settled three years ago (2015) and has since then been a part of global agenda. I think this shown through the information disclosed on all the companies’ websites, shown in the results. Despite that 14 out of 16 companies researched are having a negative climate engagement they are still showing a positive stance on climate change on their websites. To me this shows that they are willing and ready to take a leap forward, however their actual business as well as their actual engagement is not keeping up. It could also be argued that companies tend to show a more positive façade on their websites in order to attract stakeholders.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that – as previously mentioned – the companies considered in this report are some of the largest companies in the world. This also implies that in order to make grand changes in these companies it will likely take a significant amount of time. It could be compared to a large vessel trying to steer when the winds change direction, the vessel being a large corporation and the winds being the investors trying to influence the companies. However, as mentioned in the report by OECD, the window of opportunity to invest in climate change mitigation is now (OECD, 2017). It would, naturally, be favourable to seize this opportunity in order to minimise climate change risk.

5.2.2.2 Statements by investors
I believe the kind statements made by investors, that was mentioned in the introduction of this report, can be a contributing force to companies both realising and managing the inconsistencies found in their climate policy engagement. I believe that as the awareness of contradicting messages of companies grow as well as the need for responsible investment, these kinds of statements can become more common. Since companies have a monetary interest in investors I think investors view on a corporation can have a large impact. Going back to the vessel-comparison; the stronger the winds are the easier it will be for the vessel to turn around.

5.2.2.3 Previous examples
As mentioned in the theoretical background, a report on how to engage responsibly brings up three different steps to improve the consistency of a company’s climate policy engagement. Two of them are to be aligned internally and being transparency through reporting. There are two examples of these approaches I would like to mention.

The first one, about being internally aligned, can be compared to the company BHP Billiton who in 2017 decided to make a review on what kind of trade associations they were participating in. More precisely, BHP Billiton made a list of all of the material differences the company holds on climate change and energy policy compared to the trade associations it
was a part of. From this BHP Billiton made a re-evaluation of which trade associations the company should continue to be a part of. Most importantly, this made BHP Billiton internally aware on their stances of climate change compared to the company’s engagements. The results of this was for example that BHP Billiton decided to exit the World Coal Association and its review could be constructive critic to the trade associations (Billiton, 2018). I think this is a tremendous example on how companies could manage their engagement in climate change, however they need to be aware of the issue in order to go through with it.

The second example is connecting to being transparent through reporting. As mentioned earlier in this report, CDP, formerly Carbon Disclosure Project, has a reporting system for companies in order to disclose information about its climate performances. This includes what stances the companies have on for example climate legislation and what trade associations they are a part of. This can be of importance since transparency is needed for stakeholders, like investors, to be aware of the engagements of companies (Climate, 2015). Nevertheless, transparency in itself is not a solution to a problem. Several of the companies researched in this report reporting to CDP however they still have an inconsistent and negative climate policy engagement (InfluenceMap, 2017h). The transparency is of value first when a company becomes aware of their incoherent agenda and decides to make a change, for example in the case of BHP Billiton. On the other hand, when issues in climate engagement are transparent they can also be detected by stakeholders that can influence the companies in another direction.
6 Discussion

6.1 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN RESULTS
The following is brief summary of what was shown in the results.

6.1.1 Information about companies
The first part of the results was information about the climate policy engagement of 16 companies that was chosen by the investment advisory company GES International. The information has been collected from the 16 companies’ own websites and a report on corporate climate policy engagement released by the independent organization InfluenceMap.

The information shows that all companies are acknowledging the global climate change risk to some extent and that their company is a part of an industry that has to manage its operations responsibly. At the same time, every company except for Tesla show evidence of being unsupportive of different climate legislations and policies while also lobbying against climate change measures through for example trade associations. There are only two of the companies investigated that are showing a positive climate engagement, according to the InfluenceMap report, which are the automotive company Tesla and the materials company Iberdrola. Iberdrola is also the companies with the highest engagement intensity at 40%. The company with the lowest engagement intensity is LyondellBasell in in the chemistry industry with an engagement intensity at 11%.

In the beginning of the results table 2 (4.1) some of the basic facts about the companies are explained. In the column to the right it is described whether the companies are acknowledging climate change mitigation aligned with the Paris Agreement, marking them with either "yes" or “to some extent”. It should be clarified that “to some extent” does not necessarily imply that the companies are not being involved with climate change mitigation strategies or that the company is not involving climate change risk in their work. It is only an arbitrary evaluation whether the company states that it is acknowledging the Paris Agreement or not. Both companies clearly acknowledging and not acknowledging the Paris Agreement are showing negative climate engagement, for example Glencore International (4.5.3) and Chevron (4.4.3).

6.1.2 Summary of industries
After the presentation of three or four companies in the same industry there is a short summary of the main results. Overall it can be stated that all of the industries are rather similar to each other despite the fact that their engagement is involved in different industrial sectors and therefore are engaged in different topics. Most of the companies show a more or less inconsistent climate policy engagement.

6.1.3 Detected problem areas
In total four problem areas were detected from an analysis of the first section of the results (4). The problem areas targeted are concerning the issues in the inconsistent climate policy engagement that was evident in the results. It should be noted that there are most likely several more problem areas to be detected from the industries in general. However, the problem areas mentioned in this report gives a general overview of the complications connected inconsistent climate engagement. Inconsistency and conflict of interest in engagement and lobbying could be analysed further.
6.2 Discussion of Significance

This report has been a part of an investigation on inconsistent lobbying on behalf of the investment consulting company GES International. As mentioned in section 1.3, the purpose of this report has been to scope the topic of inconsistent lobbying in order to determine whether it could become a part of the services offered by GES International to investors.

Since purpose of this report is to briefly look into the selected to detect problem areas in inconsistent climate engagement, no in-depth analysis of each company has been performed. If there is a need for a more in-depth analysis on a specific company as a follow up to this report it will have to be done separately. A more in-depth company analysis could include a wider foundation of sources beyond the InfluenceMap.

In particular, I believe that the next step of the investigation of inconsistent climate policy engagement is to look more closely into the problem areas detected in this report.

6.3 Discussion of the Limitations

As mentioned in section 2.6, the purpose of this report has been to scope the topic of inconsistent climate policy engagement. The detailed limitations of the report are available in section 3.2. but in general, this report is limited to 16 selected companies that are including five industrial sectors where a majority of the companies are involved in a negative climate policy engagement.

The time frame has naturally limited the extent of the report. If the time frame would have been longer the extent of the report could have been greater, and the report could perhaps have included more companies and more problem areas. Reflecting on this report in hindsight, it might have been favourable to look at information about fewer companies, for example eight instead of 16, and let the analysis of them be an even larger part of the report. On the other hand, a fewer amount of companies might not have given the same amount of information to reflect upon. This in its turn might not have given the possibility to compare and detect similarities between the five industries in this report, which resulted in the problem areas detected.

Another limit for this report has been my previous knowledge on the topic of lobbying in large companies. Before this, I have been engaged in another project of GES International and therefore I was familiar with the services of the company. However, I have not previously been involved with or studied the topic of lobbying specifically. This has naturally affected this report I had to get a grasp on the inconsistent lobbying issue, mainly through the information collected from the InfluenceMap (section 4). Beyond using the information as a foundation for detecting the problem areas the information has also been great part of my own understanding of the issue. Because of this, my own interpretation of the issue may be biased towards the comprehension I have gained from the InfluenceMap.

If I prior to this project had had a more general knowledge about investment as well as lobbying, based on a larger range of sources, my angle on the detected problem areas and the discussion might have been different. Furthermore, I might have had the possibility to dig deeper into the topic and accomplish a more in-depth analysis.

On the other hand, my lack of knowledge in investment and lobbying prior to the beginning of this project might also have been to my advantage. Without having a specific opinion formed already I have been able to see the gathered information from novel point of view. Also, my education in sustainability and environmental management might have contributed to a different angle to the analyses in this report compared to GES International, which has its own agenda.
My knowledge has also affected the time frame of the report since a portion of time was needed for me to understand the content of the project. This was not taken in account for in the time frame set before starting on the project and because of this the first section of the results (section 4) took an extended amount of time to accomplish. The outcome of this was that the analysis (5) as well as the discussion (6) was postponed in comparison to the original time frame. In order to manage the adjusted time frame, the report was extended from June to July.

It should also be stated that in this report the outlook on climate change engagement is that a positive engagement is the correct one. Even though the need for climate change mitigation has been proven it can still be argued that there are different ways to approach this problem. Therefore, it is important to know that my stance on climate change is naturally affecting my reasoning in both the analysis and the discussion.
7 Conclusions

It is evident in this report that there are distinct inconsistencies in climate policy engagement in some of the world's largest companies. In 14 out of 16 investigated companies in this report it is unclear what their actual stance on climate change mitigation is. It can also be difficult to define whether the stance available on the corporations’ websites or the corporations’ stance in engagement are the correct one.

The problem areas detected connected to inconsistencies in engagement in this report is the companies’ organisational relationships, when companies are unsupportive of climate legislation, when companies’ do not want to include their own industrial sector in climate mitigation and when companies’ show mixed signals on the same topics. All of these problems are shown in several of the investigated companies.

In order to improve consistency, the corporations could review their own engagement and disclose what their actual stance on climate change policy is. Also, the companies could be more transparent about their climate policy engagement. Nevertheless, there is no guarantee that these measures can improve the inconsistency. Overall, the transitioning for companies to a consistent and positive climate policy engagement will most likely take time.
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