

Notice Of Exempt Solicitation: (VOLUNTARY SUBMISSION)
NAME OF REGISTRANT: Occidental Petroleum
NAME OF PERSON RELYING ON EXEMPTION: Majority Action
ADDRESS OF PERSON RELYING ON EXEMPTION: PO Box 4831, Silver Spring, MD 20914

majorityaction

Written materials are submitted pursuant to Rule 14a-6(g)(1) promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Submission is not required of this filer under the terms of the Rule but is made voluntarily.

Occidental Petroleum [NYSE:OXY]:

Due to the Company's Failure to Set Adequate Net Zero by 2050 Target, Realign Investment Plans to Limit Global Warming to 1.5°C, and Ensure Alignment of Policy Influence Activities:

- **Vote AGAINST Independent Chair Stephen Chazen (Item 1b)**

The physical and financial risks posed by climate change to long-term investors are systemic, portfolio-wide, unhedgeable and undiversifiable.

*Therefore, the actions of companies that fail to align to limiting warming to 1.5°C pose risks to the financial system as a whole, and to investors' entire portfolios, in addition to specific risks to those companies. See **Appendix A** for more information regarding Majority Action's Proxy Voting for a 1.5°C World initiative and the transformation required in key industries.*

Occidental Petroleum is one of the largest onshore oil producers in the U.S. and a major off-shore producer in the Gulf of Mexico.¹ According to a November 2021 analysis by the Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis (IEFFA), Occidental is one of the top producers (in terms of production volume) in the Permian Basin.² An analysis conducted by Oil Change International found that carbon emissions from Permian oil and gas production through 2050 could alone exhaust nearly 10% of the global 1.5°C carbon budget (see *Appendix* for more detail on the Permian Basin).³ Occidental Petroleum is among the 167 target companies named by Climate Action 100+ as the largest global emitters, companies that are "key to driving the global net-zero emissions transition."⁴

Petroleum and fossil gas products, including those used in transportation, buildings, industrial processes, and electricity production, account for nearly 80% of carbon emissions from the U.S. energy system.⁵ The U.S. is the largest petroleum and fossil gas producer in the world, having overtaken Saudi Arabia and Russia in recent years.⁶ To stay within the available carbon budget to limit warming to 1.5°C, oil and gas companies must not just decarbonize their own emissions, but global consumption of fossil fuels must fall as well.⁷ In 2021, the International Energy Agency (IEA) set out the implications of a 1.5°C pathway for the oil and gas sector in its "Net Zero Emissions by 2050" scenario (NZE). Under the NZE, fossil fuel use **falls dramatically** and can be satisfied with existing assets, with **no need to invest in new oil and gas fields**.⁸

As shale-focused companies rely primarily on continued new drilling to sustain production, these companies are particularly at risk:⁹ in order to limit warming to 1.5°C and be aligned with the IEA NZE, shale-focused companies must reduce production by more than 80%.¹⁰

Failure to set ambitious decarbonization targets in line with 1.5°C pathways and align companies’ business plans and policy influence to those targets is a failure of strategy and corporate governance, for which long-term investors should hold directors accountable. At companies where the production, processing, sale, and/or consumption of fossil fuels is central to its core business, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions have profound strategic implications, the board chair, and lead independent director where the position exists, should be held accountable.

Failure to set adequate net zero targets

<p>Net zero by 2050 commitment that covers all relevant emissions sources, in particular Scope 3 emissions from the burning of products sold, and on a full equity share basis</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Net zero commitment has limited use of offsets, negative emissions, or unproven or uncommercialized technologies, including carbon capture and storage</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>Company has adopted robust interim targets, including substantial reductions by 2030</p>	<p>X</p>

Occidental has set a net zero by 2050 ambition that covers scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions, and targets net zero emissions from its operations (scopes 1 and 2) by 2040.¹¹

Occidental’s ambition to reduce its scope 3 emissions from its customers’ use of products it sells relies heavily on carbon removals, such as carbon capture, use and storage (CCUS) and direct air capture (DAC) technologies.¹² The company also characterizes its medium-term goals as “CCUS-driven.”¹³ Its Oxy Low Carbon Ventures (OLCV) business unit is focused on the broad development of CCUS technologies. Relying on CCUS—rather than phasing out the production of fossil fuels—is a risky strategy¹⁴; even pro-CCUS sources acknowledge that many proposed CCUS technologies are as yet unproven, and a massive infrastructure investment and buildout would be required to capture enough carbon to limit warming to 1.5°C.¹⁵ DAC and other carbon removal/capture must be in addition to, not instead of, rapid and deep emissions reductions and reductions in the production and use of fossil fuels.

Capital allocation and investment plans not aligned with 1.5°C pathways

Company has a plan to realign capital expenditures to meet a net zero decarbonization commitment, including substantial reductions in production in line with the IEA Net Zero by 2050 Scenario.

X

According to Carbon Tracker's September 2021 analysis, 60-70% of Occidental's sanctioned (those currently producing or under development) and unsanctioned (those not yet under development) capex between 2021 and 2030 is outside of IEA "Beyond 2 Degrees" (B2DS) Scenario (limiting warming to 1.6°C, net zero by 2060).¹⁶ Carbon Tracker found that 100% of Occidental's unsanctioned capex is outside of the B2DS scenario; this places Occidental in the 3rd quartile (1st being least exposed, 4th being most) of the 36 companies Carbon Tracker analyzed, suggesting that its "oil project options are at a relatively greater risk of becoming stranded assets in a 1.65°C world compared to those of its peer group."¹⁷ Carbon Tracker found that 91% is outside of the IEA's 'Sustainable Development Scenario (SDS), which is aligned with limiting warming to 1.65°C this century, with net zero emissions reached in 2070. Lastly, Carbon Tracker has found that under the IEA NZE, by the 2030s, Occidental's production must be only 28% of its 2021 levels.¹⁸

According to the Climate Action 100+ Net-Zero Company Benchmark, Occidental had not, as of December 31, 2021, met any of the indicators for capital allocation alignment; to do so, the company would need to align future capital expenditures with its long-term GHG reduction target(s), commit to align future capital expenditures with the Paris Agreement's objective of limiting global warming to 1.5°C, and disclose the methodology it uses for such alignment.¹⁹

Occidental ranked among the top 30 global oil and gas producers for resources under development in 2021 (with 92.6% of that in unconventional sources), and ranked 23rd amongst global oil and gas producers for exploration capex between 2019 to 2021.²⁰

Misalignment of policy influence activities with net zero commitment and 1.5°C pathways

Alignment of policy influence activities with net zero target and limiting warming to 1.5°C

X

According to InfluenceMap, Occidental received a near-failing D grade for its obstructive policy engagement.²¹ The company released a *Climate Advocacy and Engagement* report in early 2022,²² and while it provides details on the

trade associations in which it has memberships and whether those trade associations are aligned or misaligned with Occidental's climate position, it does not detail any plans to address clear misalignment of particular trade associations.²³ ²⁴ For example, Occidental finds the American Petroleum Institute "generally consistent" with its own climate position,²⁵ despite that organization's record of climate obstructionism²⁶ and though the report does note some differences over carbon pricing, it does not detail how it will resolve that misalignment.

Shareholder Proposal Related to Climate

In addition to voting against Director Chazen, shareholders may also wish to support climate proposals at Occidental Petroleum this year. A shareholder proposal on the Occidental proxy statement, filed by Follow This, requests that the company "set and publish targets that are consistent with the goal of the Paris Climate Agreement: to limit global warming to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C."²⁷

Conclusion: Occidental Petroleum has failed to set adequate net zero targets, align its capital investments with limiting warming to 1.5°C, or ensure its policy influence activities would support doing so. Therefore, we recommend that shareholders vote AGAINST Stephen Chazen (Item 1.b) at the company's annual meeting on May 6, 2022.

Appendix A: Proxy Voting for a 1.5°C World

The world is currently on track to reach disastrous levels of warming, driving massive harm and threatening the lives and livelihoods of millions. Corporate leaders in the industries responsible for this crisis have failed to take up the leadership required to change course.

“Climate risk” is systemic, escalating and irreversible - and corporate boards urgently need to take responsibility for averting and mitigating this risk.

The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 2018 made clear that in order to have at least a 50% chance of limiting warming to 1.5°C and avoiding the most catastrophic effects of the climate crisis, we must bring global, economy-wide carbon emissions down to net zero by 2050 at the latest.²⁸ According to the International Energy Agency (IEA), in order to achieve net zero emissions globally by 2050, the electricity sector must reach net zero emissions in OECD countries no later than 2035 and there can be no investment in new fossil fuel production from today.²⁹ The IPCC also recognizes that reducing rates of deforestation and forest degradation also represents one of the most effective and robust options for climate change mitigation.³⁰

That means that corporate directors must ensure that companies set ambitious decarbonization targets in line with 1.5°C pathways, and align companies' business plans, capital expenditures, and policy influence to those targets. Despite the escalating climate crisis, systemically important U.S. companies continue to invest in the expansion and continued use of fossil fuels, further accelerating global warming.³¹

The physical and financial risks posed by climate change to long-term investors are systemic, portfolio-wide, unhedgeable and undiversifiable. Therefore, the actions of companies that directly or indirectly impact climate outcomes pose risks to the financial system as a whole and to investors' entire portfolios. In order to manage this systemic portfolio risk, investors must move beyond disclosure and company-specific climate risk management frameworks and focus on holding accountable the relatively small number of large companies whose actions are a significant driver of climate change.

When directors fail to transform corporate business practices in line with 1.5°C pathways, responsible investors must use their most powerful tool – their proxy voting power – to vote against directors.

Bold and unprecedented action by investors is a prerequisite to averting further global economic and financial catastrophe. While past shareholder efforts at standard setting, disclosure and engagement have laid important groundwork, company commitments won thus far have been far too

incremental, far too hard fought, and collectively insufficient to the scale of the crisis.

Business-as-usual proxy voting will not suffice to address the seriousness of the crisis at hand. We urge investors to vote against directors at companies failing to implement plans consistent with limiting global warming to 1.5°C.

Key Sectors Are Critical to Curbing the Climate Crisis

The electric power, finance, transportation, and oil and gas sectors are key drivers of the production and consumption of fossil fuels and must all make dramatic transformations to curb the worst of catastrophic climate change and protect long-term investors. Similarly, companies driving deforestation – including companies that source key deforestation-linked agricultural commodities, driving market demand for one of the greatest threats to the world's forests – must adopt comprehensive climate policies and end deforestation.

Substantial votes against board members at these companies could help realign business and investment plans to the goals of the Paris Agreement, hold companies accountable for lobbying and policy influence practices that obstruct climate action, and align executive compensation to key decarbonization goals.

While each industry and company will need to chart its own path in pursuing decarbonization consistent with limiting warming to 1.5°C, setting a target to reach net zero emissions by no later than 2050 is a critical first step. In the absence of such a target, investors can have no confidence that the company will be able to transform its business consistent with limiting warming to 1.5°C.

Voting Guide: Oil & Gas

Petroleum and fossil gas products, including those used in transportation, buildings, industrial processes, and electricity production, account for nearly 80% of carbon emissions from the U.S. energy system.³² The U.S. is the largest petroleum and fossil gas producer in the world, having overtaken Saudi Arabia and Russia in recent years.³³ In general, U.S. oil companies lag behind their European peers in adopting net zero by 2050 ambitions³⁴, or investing in renewable energy production.³⁵

To stay within the available carbon budget to limit warming to 1.5°C, not only must oil and gas companies decarbonize their own emissions, but global consumption of fossil fuels must fall as well.³⁶ In May 2021, the IEA set out the implications of a 1.5°C pathway for the oil and gas sector in its “Net Zero Emissions by 2050” scenario (NZE).³⁷ Prior IEA scenarios such as the Beyond 2°C Scenario (aligned to limiting warming to 1.75°C by 2060³⁸) and the Sustainable Development Scenario (aligned to the Paris Agreement’s upper target of well below 2°C³⁹), still fell short of limiting warming to 1.5°C.

Under the NZE, fossil fuel use falls dramatically and can be satisfied with existing assets, with no need to invest in new oil and gas fields, and no new coal mines or mine extensions.⁴⁰ However, according to analyses by Carbon Tracker, the world's largest oil companies have projects both sanctioned (those currently producing or under development) and unsanctioned (those not yet under development) over the course of the next two decades that would exceed the carbon budget for 2.0°C of global warming, let alone 1.5°C.⁴¹ This signals that many companies are not yet fully committed to meaningful reductions. While oil demand fell in 2020 due to COVID-19 disruptions,⁴² oil demand and pricing are currently rebounding,⁴³ and any expansion plans are fundamentally at odds with the immediate global production reductions required within most Paris Agreement-aligned scenarios.⁴⁴

As shale-focused companies rely primarily on continued new drilling to sustain production, these companies are particularly at risk: in order to limit to 1.5°C and be aligned with the IEA NZE, shale-focused companies in particular must reduce production by more than 80%.⁴⁵ However, many U.S. companies continue to expand into shale-rich regions such as the Permian Basin⁴⁶ (see Capital Allocation section). The Permian is predicted to account for much of the growth in US oil production, and much of this will likely be exported and burned overseas; an Occidental Petroleum company executive recently noted the trend by saying “every single molecule from here on out has to be exported.”⁴⁷

Target setting

To avoid the risk of global temperature overshoot, emissions need to fall by 45% from 2010 levels by 2030, reaching net zero by 2050.⁴⁸ Net-zero commitments should also incorporate interim targets and milestones that allow accelerated emissions reduction between now and 2030 rather than delaying the hard task of emissions reduction until after that date. Net zero commitments must cover projects on a full equity share basis, such that all joint ventures and subsidiaries are covered by the company-wide target. Companies should achieve net zero by 2050 with limited use of offsets, negative emissions, or unproven or uncommercialized technologies, including carbon capture and storage (CCUS). Relying on CCUS—rather than phasing out the production of fossil fuels—is a risky strategy⁴⁹; even pro-CCUS sources acknowledge that many proposed CCUS technologies are as yet unproven, and a massive infrastructure investment and buildout would be required to capture enough carbon to limit warming to 1.5°C.⁵⁰ Oil and gas companies should clearly disclose specific plans to use offsets or negative emissions to achieve net zero emissions by 2050, so that investors may assess the quality and credibility of their plans.

KEY DATA SOURCES:

- CDP (formerly Carbon Disclosure Project), company survey responses⁵¹
- Science-Based Targets Initiative, Companies list⁵² and Sector Guidance⁵³
- Climate Action 100+, Disclosure Indicators 1-4⁵⁴
- Oil Change International, Big Oil Reality Check⁵⁵

Capital allocation

Given that oil supplies currently in production already exceed the carbon budget for limiting warming to 1.5°C, oil and gas companies must immediately cease approving investment in new projects that fall outside the carbon budget. At minimum, Arctic and oil sands projects should be halted because they are inconsistent with limiting warming to 1.5°C⁵⁶, economically marginal due to elevated production costs, and carry additional environmental and human rights risks.⁵⁷

Oil production in the Permian Basin in Texas and New Mexico – almost entirely fracking⁵⁸—has nearly quadrupled from 2010 to today,⁵⁹ while natural gas production has more than tripled.⁶⁰ According to an analysis conducted by Oil Change International, carbon emissions from Permian oil and gas production through 2050 could alone exhaust nearly 10% of the global 1.5°C carbon budget.⁶¹ The climate impact of Permian oil and gas is even greater than coal based on the amount of methane that escapes into the atmosphere during hydraulic fracking.⁶² It is estimated that the Permian Basin has a 60% higher methane leakage rate than other U.S oil and gas regions.⁶³ Given that the vast majority of these emissions would come from wells not yet in production at the end of 2020, much of these emissions could be avoided if companies simply halted all drilling of new wells.⁶⁴

Investors should use the NZE scenario as a floor to assess companies' climate policies, transition scenarios and capital allocation alignment. Importantly, no new oil or gas fields should be approved for development under a 1.5°C pathway; no investment in new oil and gas production should be undertaken,⁶⁵ and production levels must fall by the 2030s.⁶⁶ Under such a scenario, asset stranding of additional production assets as well as existing assets is a major risk to investors.⁶⁷

KEY DATA SOURCES

- Rainforest Action Network, [Banking on Climate Chaos](#)⁶⁸
- Carbon Tracker, [Fault Lines \(2020\)](#)⁶⁹ and [Adapt to Survive \(2021\)](#)⁷⁰
- Carbon Tracker, [Company Profiles: Oil & Gas Companies](#)⁷¹
- Climate Action 100+, [Climate Action 100+ Net-Zero Company Benchmark: Company assessments, see Disclosure Indicator 6](#)⁷²

Policy influence

Oil and gas companies must fully align their policy influence activities, including political spending and lobbying, with the policy settings required to accelerate sector-wide emissions reductions on a timeline necessary to limit warming to 1.5°C. Oil and gas companies must provide full disclosure of all political and lobbying spending in all jurisdictions to allow investors to assess this alignment. Finally, companies must ensure the alignment of the policy influence activities of any trade associations or similar entities of which they are members or to which they contribute with 1.5°C outcomes, or cease membership of such organizations.

KEY DATA SOURCES:

- Climate Action 100+ Net-Zero Company Benchmark: Company assessments, see Disclosure Indicator 7⁷³
- InfluenceMap, List of companies and influencers⁷⁴

Summary table

TARGET SETTING	1.1	Net zero by 2050 commitment that covers all relevant emissions sources, in particular scope 3 emissions from the burning of products sold, and on a full equity share basis
	1.2	Net zero commitment has limited use of offsets, negative emissions, or unproven or uncommercialized technologies, including carbon capture and storage
	1.3	Company has adopted robust interim targets, including substantial reductions by 2030
CAPITAL ALLOCATION	2.1	Company has a plan to realign capital expenditures to meet a net zero decarbonization commitment, including substantial reductions in production in line with the IEA Net Zero by 2050 Scenario
POLICY INFLUENCE	3.1	Alignment of policy influence activities with net zero target and limiting warming to 1.5°C

¹ Occidental Petroleum, "Performance Production" (website), <https://www.oxy.com/operations/performance-production/>, Accessed April 15, 2022

² Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis, *Independent Producers Dominate Majors in the Permian*, November 2021, http://ieefa.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Independent-Producers-Dominate-Majors-in-the-Permian_November-2021.pdf, p. 1

³ Oil Change International. *Drilling Towards Disaster: Why US Oil and Gas Expansion Is Incompatible With Climate Limits*, January 2019, <https://priceofoil.org/content/uploads/2019/01/Drilling-Towards-Disaster-Web-v2.pdf>, pp. 7 and 26

⁴ Climate Action 100+, "Companies," <https://www.climateaction100.org/whos-involved/companies/>, accessed March 16, 2022

⁵ U.S. Energy Information Administration, 'Total Energy.' Data browser. <https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/browser/index.php?tbl=T11.01#/?f=A&start=1973&end=2019&charted=0-1-13>, accessed March 1, 2022

⁶ U.S. Energy Information Administration, "United States Remains Largest Producer of Petroleum and Natural Gas Hydrocarbons," <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=26352>, accessed March 1, 2022

⁷ International Energy Agency (IEA), *Net Zero by 2050: A Roadmap for the Global Energy Sector*, May 2021. <https://www.iea.org/reports/net-zero-by-2050>

⁸ IEA, 'Net Zero by 2050,' Figure 3.4, p. 103

⁹ Somasekhar, A., "As Oil-well Backlog Shrinks, U.S. Shale May Upset Investors and Drill More." *Reuters*, September 14, 2021, <https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/oil-well-backlog-shrinks-us-shale-may-upset-investors-drill-more-2021-09-14/>

¹⁰ Carbon Tracker, *Adapt to Survive: Why Oil Companies Must Plan for Net Zero and Avoid Stranded Assets*, September 2021. <https://carbontracker.org/reports/adapt-to-survive/>

¹¹ Occidental Petroleum, *Occidental 2021 Pathway to Net-Zero*, [date] <https://www.oxy.com/globalassets/documents/publications/oxy-climate-report-2021.pdf>, p. 16

¹² Occidental Petroleum, 'Occidental 2021 Pathway to Net-Zero,' p. 8

¹³ Occidental Petroleum, Schedule 14-A, filed April 7, 2022, https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/797468/000114036122013468/brhc10036187_defa14a.htm p. 11

- 14 Oil Change International, *Big Oil Reality Check*, September 2020. <http://priceofoil.org/content/uploads/2020/09/OCI-Big-Oil-Reality-Check-vF.pdf>, pp. 8, 9, and 18.
- 15 Global CCS Institute, *Global Status of CCS 2021*, <https://www.globalccsinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Global-Status-of-CCS-2021-Global-CCS-Institute-1121.pdf> p. 35
- 16 Carbon Tracker, *Adapt to Survive*, September 2021, <https://carbontracker.org/reports/adapt-to-survive/>, p 35 (note that the company is referred to in this report only as “Oxy” not Occidental)
- 17 Carbon Tracker, “Occidental Petroleum Corporation” (company profile), at sub-header “CAPEX: Cumulative Potential Oil Supply (2021-2040), Unsanctioned Oil Fields, New Assets Only, Analysis” updated January 31, 2022, <https://og.companyprofiles.carbontracker.org/Occidental%20Petroleum%20Corporation>
- 18 Carbon Tracker, ‘Adapt to Survive,’ webpage graphic <https://carbontracker.org/reports/adapt-to-survive/>
- 19 Climate Action 100+, ‘Occidental Petroleum Company Assessment,’ <https://www.climateaction100.org/company/occidental-petroleum-corporation/>, accessed March 30, 2022
- 20 Analysis using Urgewald’s Global Oil and Gas Exit List (GOGEL), available at <https://gogel.org/> Expenditure is a 3-year average from 2019-2021.
- 21 InfluenceMap, ‘Occidental Petroleum’ (profile), <https://lobbymap.org/company/Occidental-Petroleum/projectlink/Occidental-Petroleum-In-Climate-Change> accessed March 6, 2022
- 22 Occidental Petroleum, *Climate Advocacy and Engagement*, <https://www.oxy.com/globalassets/documents/sustainability/oxy-climate-advocacy-and-engagement.pdf>, accessed March 30, 2022
- 23 LobbyMap, additional detail on Occidental disclosure, <https://lobbymap.org/evidence/179052537b61041e7a5310f55635f8e3>, accessed March 30, 2022
- 24 Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark, ‘Occidental Petroleum Company Assessment,’ March 30, 2022, <https://www.climateaction100.org/company/occidental-petroleum-corporation/>, see Indicator 7
- 25 <https://www.oxy.com/globalassets/documents/sustainability/oxy-climate-advocacy-and-engagement.pdf/download>, p. 3
- 26 InfluenceMap, ‘American Petroleum Institute’ profile <https://lobbymap.org/influencer/American-Petroleum-Institute-API>, accessed March 16, 2022
- 27 Occidental Petroleum, Schedule 14-A, filed March 24, 2022 <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/0000797468/000120677422000870/oxy3995601-def14a.htm#a050> p. 76
- 28 IPCC, *Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C.*, 2018, https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/2/2019/06/SR15_Full_Report_Low_Res.pdf , pp. v, 5, 7-10, 95-97 and 116
- 29 International Energy Agency (IEA), *Net Zero by 2050: A Roadmap for the Global Energy Sector*, May 2021. <https://www.iea.org/reports/net-zero-by-2050>, Slide 8.
- 30 IPCC. *Special Report on Climate Change and Land, Summary for Policy Makers*, January, 2020, https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/4/2020/02/SPM_Updated-Jan20.pdf, pp 23-24 and 26.
- 31 Climate Action 100+: Net-Zero Company Benchmark Company Assessments <https://www.climateaction100.org/progress/net-zero-company-benchmark/>
- 32 US Energy Information Administration, ‘Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Energy Consumption by Source’, <https://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/browser/index.php?tbl=T11.01#?f=A&start=1973&end=2019&charted=0-1-13>, accessed March 19, 2022
- 33 US Energy Information Administration, “The U.S. leads global petroleum and natural gas production with record growth in 2018,” <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=40973>, accessed March 16, 2022
- 34 Luhavalja, Amanda, et al. “Path to Net Zero: European Oil Majors Outpace US Companies on Climate Goals,” *S&P Global Market Intelligence*, July 28, 2020, <https://www.spglobal.com/marketintelligence/en/news-insights/latest-news-headlines/path-to-net-zero-european-oil-majors-outpace-us-companies-on-climate-goals-59543423>, accessed March 16, 2022
- 35 Quinson, Tim, “US Oil Companies Lag Far Behind Greener European Rivals,” Bloomberg, March 24, 2021, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-03-24/u-s-oil-companies-lag-far-behind-greener-europe-rivals-green-insight>
- 36 IEA, ‘Net Zero by 2050 Scenario’
- 37 IEA, ‘Net Zero by 2050 Scenario’
- 38 IEA, ‘Energy Technology Perspectives 2017.’ <https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-technology-perspectives-2017>
- 39 IEA, ‘Sustainable Development Scenario.’ <https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-model/sustainable-development-scenario-sds>
- 40 IEA, ‘Net Zero by 2050 Scenario.’ pp. 21 -22.
- 41 Carbon Tracker, ‘Adapt to Survive.’ p. 4 and pp.14-16
- 42 International Energy Agency, *World Energy Outlook 2021*, <https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/4ed140c1-c3f3-4fd9-acae-789a4e14a23c/WorldEnergyOutlook2021.pdf> p. 19.
- 43 Deloitte, 2022 Oil and Gas Industry Outlook, <https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/us/Documents/energy-resources/us-2022-outlook-oil-and-gas.pdf> p. 4.

- 44 Oil Change International et al, *The Sky's the Limit: Why the Paris Climate Goals Require A Managed Decline of Fossil Fuel Production*, https://priceofoil.org/content/uploads/2016/09/OCI_the_skys_limit_2016_FINAL_2.pdf, pp. 19-21 and 24.
- 45 Carbon Tracker, 'Adapt to Survive.' p. 6 and p. 15.
- 46 Oil Change International. *Drilling Towards Disaster: Why US Oil and Gas Expansion Is Incompatible With Climate Limits*, January, 2019, <https://priceofoil.org/content/uploads/2019/01/Drilling-Towards-Disaster-Web-v2.pdf>, p. 7.
- 47 Collier, Kiah. "As Oil and Gas Exports Surge, West Texas Becomes the World's 'extraction colony'" *Texas Tribune*, August 10, 2018, <https://www.texastribune.org/2018/10/11/west-texas-becomes-worlds-extraction-colony-oil-gas-exports-surge/>
- 48 IPCC. 'Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5.' 2018
- 49 Oil Change International, *Big Oil Reality Check*, September 2020. <http://priceofoil.org/content/uploads/2020/09/OCI-Big-Oil-Reality-Check-vF.pdf>, pp. 8, 9, and 18.
- 50 Global CCS Institute, *Global Status of CCS 2021*, <https://www.globalccsinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Global-Status-of-CCS-2021-Global-CCS-Institute-1121.pdf> p. 35
- 51 <https://www.cdp.net/en/responses?queries%5Bname%5D=&utf8=%E2%9C%93>
- 52 <https://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action>
- 53 <https://sciencebasedtargets.org/sectors>
- 54 <https://www.climateaction100.org/progress/net-zero-company-benchmark/>
- 55 Oil Change International, 'Big Oil Reality Check'
- 56 Carbon Tracker, *Breaking the Habit: Why None of the Large Oil Companies are "Paris-aligned", and What They Need to Do to Get There*, September 2019, https://carbontransfer.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Capex-report-2019_Infographic.pdf,
- 57 BankTrack, Oil Change International, Rainforest Action Network, Sierra Club. *Banking on Climate Change: Fossil Fuel Finance Reportcard 2017* https://priceofoil.org/content/uploads/2017/06/Banking_On_Climate_Change_2017.pdf, pp.4, 13 and 20
- 58 Oil Change International. 'Drilling Towards Disaster.' p. 26
- 59 Please see chart: Total Oil Production in the Permian Basin <https://www.dallasfed.org/research/energy11/permian.aspx#Oil>
- 60 Natural Gas Production in Permian Basin chart <https://www.dallasfed.org/research/energy11/permian.aspx#Gas>
- 61 Oil Change International. 'Drilling Towards Disaster.' pp. 7 and 26
- 62 <https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/155101-report-gas-from-fracking-worse-than-coal-on-climate>
- 63 Zhang, Y. et al. "Quantifying methane emissions from the largest oil-producing basin in the United States from space." *Science Advances*: 22 Apr 2020. <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aaz5120>
- 64 Oil Change International, Earthworks, and the Center for International Environmental Law, *The Permian Climate Bomb*. <https://www.permianclimatebomb.org/chapter-2>
- 65 Carbon Tracker. 'Adapt to Survive.' pp. 4-5, 8-10
- 66 Carbon Tracker. 'Adapt to Survive.' p. 6.
- 67 Carbon Tracker. 'Adapt to Survive.', pp. 4-5, 8-10
- 68 Rainforest Action Network, *Banking on Climate Chaos*. March 2021. <https://www.ran.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Banking-on-Climate-Chaos-2021.pdf>
- 69 Carbon Tracker, *Fault Lines: How Diverging Oil and Gas Company Strategies link to Stranded Asset Risk*, October 2020, <https://carbontracker.org/reports/fault-lines-stranded-asset/>
- 70 Carbon Tracker. 'Adapt to Survive.'
- 71 <https://carbontracker.org/company-profiles/>
- 72 <https://www.climateaction100.org/progress/net-zero-company-benchmark/>
- 73 <https://www.climateaction100.org/progress/net-zero-company-benchmark/>
- 74 <https://influencemap.org/filter/List-of-Companies-and-Influencers#>