Investor CDP 2014 Information Request
Statoil ASA

Module: Introduction

Page: Introduction

CC0.1

Introduction

Please give a general description and introduction to your organization.

Statoil is an international energy company headquartered in Norway with more than 23 400 employees. Statoil is the leading operator on the Norwegian Continental Shelf (NCS), but since 2000 our business has grown as a result of substantial investments both on the NCS and internationally. Statoil has business operations in 33 countries and territories, and is present in several of the most important oil and gas provinces in the world.
Statoil has seven business areas: Development & Production Norway (DPN), Development & Production International (DPI), Development & Production North America (DPNA), Marketing, Processing and Renewable Energy (MPR), Technology, Projects and Drilling (TPD), Exploration (EXP) and Global Strategy & Business Development (GSB).
Statoil is an upstream, technology-driven energy company primarily engaged in oil and gas exploration and production activities. Statoil is among the world's largest net sellers of crude oil and condensate, and is the second largest supplier of natural gas to the European market. Statoil also has substantial processing and refining operations. We are contributing to the development of new energy resources, have on going activities in offshore wind, and are in the forefront of the implementation of technology for carbon capture and storage (CCS)

CC0.2

Reporting Year

Please state the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.

The current reporting year is the latest/most recent 12-month period for which data is reported. Enter the dates of this year first.

We request data for more than one reporting period for some emission accounting questions. Please provide data for the three years prior to the current reporting year if you have not provided this information before, or if this is the first time you have answered a CDP information request. (This does not apply if you have been offered and selected the option of answering the shorter questionnaire). If you are going to provide additional years of data, please give the dates of those reporting periods here. Work backwards from the most recent reporting year.

Please enter dates in following format: day(DD)/month(MM)/year(YYYY) (i.e. 31/01/2001).

Enter Periods that will be disclosed
Tue 01 Jan 2013 - Tue 31 Dec 2013

CC0.3

Country list configuration

Please select the countries for which you will be supplying data. This selection will be carried forward to assist you in completing your response.

Select country
Brazil
Canada
Denmark
Germany
Norway
Mozambique
Tanzania
United States of America

CC0.4

Currency selection

Please select the currency in which you would like to submit your response. All financial information contained in the response should be in this currency.

NOK

CC0.6

Modules

As part of the request for information on behalf of investors, electric utilities, companies with electric utility activities or assets, companies in the automobile or auto component manufacture sectors, companies in the oil and gas industry, companies in the information technology and telecommunications sectors and companies in the food, beverage and tobacco sectors should complete supplementary questions in addition to the main questionnaire.

If you are in these sectors (according to the Global Industry Classification Standard (GICS)), the corresponding sector modules will not appear below but will automatically appear in the navigation bar when you save this page. If you want to query your classification, please email respond@cdp.net.

If you have not been presented with a sector module that you consider would be appropriate for your company to answer, please select the module below. If you wish to view the questions first, please see https://www.cdp.net/en-US/Programmes/Pages/More-questionnaires.aspx.

Further Information

The oil and gas module has been completed. Statoil's answer to the CDP questionnaire includes forward-looking statements which are by their nature, subject to significant risks and uncertainties because they relate to events and depend on circumstances that will occur in the future. Although we believe that the expectations reflected in the forward-looking statements are reasonable, we cannot assure you that our future results, level of activity, performance or achievements will meet these expectations. Moreover, neither we nor any other person assumes responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the forward-looking statements. For a description of the factors that may affect our business, financial performance or results of operation, please have a look at the attached Risk review included in our Annual Report 2013. Statoil has operations in 33 countries, but is reporting emissions only from the countries were we have oil and gas activities under Statoil operational control. In the remaining countries we have offices supporting our partner operated operations. Emissions from these offices are insignificant compared to the emissions from our oil and gas activities.

Module: Management

Page: CC1. Governance

CC1.1

Where is the highest level of direct responsibility for climate change within your organization?

Individual/Sub-set of the Board or other committee appointed by the Board

CC1.1a

Please identify the position of the individual or name of the committee with this responsibility

There has been a growing recognition in recent years that sustainability risks can significantly affect the future of the company. The board's safety, sustainability and ethics committee has the role to assist the board in matters relating to safety, security, ethics and sustainability. The committee also monitors and assesses the practicing, development and implementation of policies, systems and principles within the areas of safety, ethics and sustainability, including corporate social responsibilities.
The members of the board's safety, sustainability and ethics committee were Bjørn Tore Godal (chair), James Mulva, Lill-Heidi Bakkerud and Stig Lægreid

CC1.2

Do you provide incentives for the management of climate change issues, including the attainment of targets?

Yes

CC1.2a

Please provide further details on the incentives provided for the management of climate change issues

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?	The type of incentives	Incentivized performance indicator
Corporate executive team	Monetary reward	Following members of the Corporate Executive team have an environmental/climate KPI on their scorecard: EVP Drilling and Production Norway : Absolute reduction of emitted CO2 compared to BAU EVP Drilling and Production International : CO2 intensity EVP Marketing, Processing and Renewable Energy: Environmental performance; a three-staged KPI consisting of energy efficiency, emissions to air (CO2, NOx,SOx) and emissions to water
Environment/Sustainability managers	Monetary reward	Head of Corporate Sustainability Unit is responsible for implementation of the climate strategy. She has piloted a new KPI CO2 Emission Reductions in 2013. This will be implemented on CEO scorecard in 2014
All employees	Recognition (non-monetary)	Statoil has established an HSE award that is attributed annually. The award was established in order to drive identification and maturing good efforts in the field of health, safety and the environment including climate

Further Information

Page: CC2. Strategy

CC2.1

Please select the option that best describes your risk management procedures with regard to climate change risks and opportunities

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company wide risk management processes

CC2.1a

Please provide further details on your risk management procedures with regard to climate change risks and opportunities

Frequency of monitoring	To whom are results reported	Geographical areas considered	How far into the future are risks considered?	Comment
Six-monthly or more frequently	Individual/Sub-set of the Board or committee appointed by the Board	All geographical areas Statoil is operating or have market exposure in	> 6 years	

CC2.1b

Please describe how your risk and opportunity identification processes are applied at both company and asset level

Overall approach to risk management:
Risk management forms an integral part of our management approach. We aim to minimise harmful impacts and optimise the benefits and opportunities generated by our activities throughout their life cycle. We take a holistic and multi-disciplinary approach to risk management, drawing on tools and expertise from our climate, environmental, social responsibility, and ethics and anti-corruption disciplines to respond to the diverse challenges and opportunities we encounter in the course of undertaking our activities.

We have a number of processes and tools in place to identify and manage climate, environmental, social and integrity risks throughout the life cycle of our activities. pact assessments are required for all relevant projects to assess climate (as well as other environmental, social, human rights and health impacts), and to define measures to reduce or avoid negative impacts and enhance benefits.

Identification of climate risk and opportunities is a key part of the risk management and strategy work both at the asset level and the company level. Issue such a changed weather pattern on how this could influence on demand for our products, EU climate and energy policy, and the risk of stranded assets are carefully assessed. Every business area (asset level) identifies climate and other business risks and opportunities and bring this to the corporate risk and

corporate strategy (company level) who use this is as the input to corporate strategy work and the corporate risk chart. The corporate risk and opportunity chart is updated every quarter and distinguish between short term (next 12 months) and long and mid-term, 2-20 years.

When evaluating the viability of an asset a careful assessment of risks and opportunities in terms of potential new climate regulations and physical effect of climate change is carried out.

CC2.1c

How do you prioritize the risks and opportunities identified?

The overall objectives of our risk management process are to ensure safe operations and achieve our corporate goals. This is what drives the prioritisation within our risk management process.

Furthermore, Statoil recognise a number of climate related factors that could significantly affect our operations and markets, and these factors are incorporated in investment decision tools and business strategic analysis. These include uncertainty over carbon policy and regulation (CO2 and CH4), investor concerns over the long-term viability of the industry (i.e. stranded assets), climate inspired shift in demand in our product or new competing energy sources or new energy supply models, driven by consumer choice; and the effects of climate change on the integrity and reliability of our operations and our markets.

Statoil also recognise that, in the long-term, enterprise risks and opportunities, linked to climate change, will derive from a complex interaction between (i) socio-economic consequences of the physical impacts of climate change; (ii) the pace, scale and shape of the response by policy makers to the climate challenge and (iii) the pace, scale and shape of implementation of substitute products and alternative models for energy supply to the markets.

CC2.2

Is climate change integrated into your business strategy?

Yes

CC2.2a

Please describe the process of how climate change is integrated into your business strategy and any outcomes of this process

Context and overall strategy:
We believe we have the technology, experience and capital required to develop some of the solutions and being a part of the future sustainable energy mix. Statoil's greatest contribution will be to continue reducing the carbon intensity of our oil and gas production and developing low-carbon and renewable technologies where we can utilise our capabilities. We are convinced that delivering a reliable supply of natural gas is our greatest contribution to solving the energy and climate dilemma. We believe indeed that natural gas has an important role to play in a lower carbon economy both in the short and long term, and this is also confirmed by the IEAs 2C scenario. We utilise existing core capabilities and current business positions to create profitable positions in renewable energy, prioritising offshore wind projects while keeping track of new opportunities.

i.
Both climate policies and physical impact of climate change are key considerations in Statoil's business strategy and investment decisions, short term as well as long term. We are making and applying scenarios and are forecasting possible energy demand and prices and where possible new climate regulations and changed weather patterns are key factors. For every investment decisions we are including possible future carbon costs in project economy calculations, and we are testing projects' viability in case of significantly changed prices for oil, gas and electricity. Furthermore, we have procedures for ensuring that the project is robust to changed weather events

ii.
One of the strategic responses to climate risks is to ensure that Statoil’s portfolio is CO2 and cost robust with respect to possible changes in regulatory regimes and markets.
A systematic approach to performance in order to be an Industry Leader in CO2-efficiency is already part of Statoil’s steering system. For example: (i)The Capital Value Process (CVP) requires new investments to identify technology qualification needs towards first decision gate (DG1) as well to develop concepts for CO2-reduction towards the second decision gate (DG2). (ii) Statoil has an internal carbon price that is used by each of our project during the investment evaluation phase. (iii)Future prices on oil, gas and CO2-emissions are updated when relevant with Statoil best estimates of expected future CO2-policies. (iv) The company has an approved policy of no-production flaring, stating that continuous flaring for gas disposal is not acceptable. This is included in our Technical Requirements which is valid across Statoil where we are operators. (v) Statoil’s emission performance is measured by an internal climate KPI.
Being an industry leader in HSE means also driving technological development. We have a strong commitment to environmental and climate R&D aimed at identifying new solutions for reducing carbon emissions and staying at the forefront of developing environmental management tools. Driving technological innovation also means working with our suppliers and the different sectors involved in the oil and gas value chain to find solutions that can reduce emissions. In particular, we are involved in several technology projects aimed at reducing greenhouse gases from our shipping activity. These projects focus on both new technical solutions and what type of energy carriers can be used in future.
As economic conditions and the world's energy realities become increasingly complex, we also believe that Statoil's management must effectively anticipate and understand market shifts in order to position Statoil for continued growth and development.

iii.
Climate change is incorporated in the core business strategy and every investment decisions, being long term or short term, see . We constantly look for ways to reduce our emissions from current production and we use every opportunity to communicate our view on climate change policy. Cutting costs (partly driven by risk of stringent climate regulations) is both a short and long term strategy. During the last year we have stepped up our efforts and communication around methane

iv.
Statoil revised business strategy for 2020 was presented in June 2011 and one of the three strategic beliefs underlying this strategy is that HSE and carbon efficiency constitutes a competitive advantage today and, even more, in the future. In August 2011 the CEC decided to establish 2020 carbon efficiency targets to add a top-down approach to the carbon competitive efforts. Six production segments have been identified (conventional oil and gas, extra heavy oil

- including oil sands, heavy oil, shale gas, LNG, refining and processing) and for each of them an intensity target has been set.
As the first oil and gas company we have published last year's actual carbon efficiency measurements for these segments

The Head of Global Strategy and Business Development and his team is provided with weekly updates on climate related issues. This includes potential consequences for the company. The Head of Corporate Sustainability Team is part of this management team. Deep dives on most important issues such as EU Climate Policy and risk of stranded assets are provided on a regular basis.

v.
Our experience is that all oil and gas companies are taking climate change related issues seriously. We believe that we have strategic edge as we are expecting much more stringent climate policies in the future and that take that into consideration in investment decisions and strategic planning. Reducing capex and opex to increase margin and prepare for potentially lower oil and gas prices in the future is on the top of the CEOs agenda. Recent development in our share price shows that we have succeeded well so far.

vi.
All business decisions related to e.g. investment, location, procurement, M&A are taken climate related issues into account, alongside other business issues. Pointing to which decisions that have been most influenced by climate is not possible. As part of our technology strategy, we have decided to focus part of our R&D efforts on three areas that are deemed to be critical to addressing climate challenges: (i) better resource management; (ii) the development of carbon capture and storage; (iii) renewable energies.

CC2.3

Do you engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence public policy on climate change through any of the following? (tick all that apply)

Direct engagement with policy makers
Trade associations
Funding research organizations

CC2.3a

On what issues have you been engaging directly with policy makers?

Focus of legislation	Corporate Position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution
Cap and trade	Support	Submission of Statoil position paper, contributing to position papers from IETA, OGP and Business Europe. Office in Brussels are meeting with policy makers on a regular basis	Supporting strengthening of EU ETS through backloading and ambitious 2030 GHG target for the EU
Cap and trade	Support	In steering committee of the International Emission Trading Associations B-PMR, which works to do capacity building on carbon markets initiatives around the world	Statoil actively support an international price on carbon and support development and initiatives on carbon pricing and linking of carbon market schemes

Focus of legislation	Corporate Position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution
Energy efficiency	Support with minor exceptions	US introduction of emission performance standards in the power sector	

CC2.3b

Are you on the Board of any trade associations or provide funding beyond membership?

Yes

CC2.3c

Please enter the details of those trade associations that are likely to take a position on climate change legislation

Trade association	Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?	Please explain the trade association's position	How have you, or are you attempting to, influence the position?
American Petroleum Institute	Mixed	In favour of industry developed standards to reduce emission reductions. Less in favour of federal climate regulations and legislation in the US	Statoil is relatively small company in the US and is usually not in a position to direct API's position on climate. However, we inform API when we disagree in positions they are taking
International Emission Trading Association	Consistent	Promoting market base climate legislations around the world	Actively participating in working groups on different topics. Provide direct input to positions papers
Center for Environment Policy Studies (CEPS)	Consistent	Discussing international climate negotiations and market based climate legislations around the world	Actively participating in working groups on different topics. Provide direct input to positions papers
IPIECA	Unknown	Not advocating on climate change legislation	
OGP	Mixed	To represent and advocate industry views by developing effective proposals based on professionally established technical arguments in a societal context.	Has a different view than OGP on EU climate and energy policy and is providing input to position papers to adjust this position

CC2.3d

Do you publically disclose a list of all the research organizations that you fund?

Yes

CC2.3e

Do you fund any research organizations to produce or disseminate public work on climate change?

Yes

CC2.3f

Please describe the work and how it aligns with your own strategy on climate change

We fund research institutions such as MIT's Joint Implementation Program and CICEP/CICERO. Research focus topics focused upon includes:
- UN climate policy development
- Climate policies development in Norway, EU, US, China, Brazil, India
- Development of regulations in the transport sector
- Development of new policies in the power sector
- Physical impact of climate change,

When choosing a research program to fund we use three criteria 1) Excellence 2) Bring different knowledge or different perspectives than we already have in-house. 3) Independency. The research institutions' work is related to our climate strategy in the sense that they provide insight on important climate issues such as possible new climate policies around the world. An important part of our climate strategy is to understand latest development and insight on such issues.

CC2.3h

What processes do you have in place to ensure that all of your direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with your overall climate change strategy?

All Statoil employees are using the corporate climate positions as a basis when being in dialogue with industry organizations, policy makers, media and other stakeholders. Besides, the corporate sustainability unit has frequent meetings with the Governmental and Public Affairs team and relevant colleagues in the Business Areas consistency and alignment.

Further Information

Page: CC3. Targets and Initiatives

CC3.1

Did you have an emissions reduction target that was active (ongoing or reached completion) in the reporting year?

Absolute and intensity targets

CC3.1a

Please provide details of your absolute target

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Base year	Base year emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)	Target year	Comment
Abs1	Scope 1	58.3%	9.0%	2007	8867712	2020	Statoil is committed to the Norwegian industry Konkraft pledge to reduce CO2 emissions from the Norwegian Continental Shelf (NCS) by 1 mill. tonnes CO2 from 2007 to 2020. Statoil's share of the pledge is 800 000 tonnes CO2 reductions. Statoil's total GHG emissions in 2007: 15 222 876 tonnes Statoil's CO2 emissions from NCS in 2007: 8 867712; ie 58,3% Status 2013: App. 566 000 tonnes delivered, 70,8% of target

CC3.1b

Please provide details of your intensity target

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Metric	Base year	Normalized base year emissions	Target year	Comment
Int1	Scope 1	100%		metric tonnes CO2e per barrel of oil equivalent (BOE)	2011	7.8	2020	2020 CO2 intensity target for Conventional oil and gas agreed in 2011 and disclosed in the Sustainability Report in 2011. Target is 11 kg. CO2/boe The % reduction is -41.0%, but the format does not allow negative numbers. The target is above the intensity in base year as installations are maturing on NCS and the intensity is expected to increase for this segment until 2020
Int2	Scope	100%	0%	metric tonnes	2011	17.0	2020	2020 CO2 intensity target for Heavy oil (22.3-10 API) agreed in

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Metric	Base year	Normalized base year emissions	Target year	Comment
	1			CO2e per barrel of oil equivalent (BOE)				2011 as 17 kg. CO2/boe and disclosed in the Sustainability Report in 2011. Our first asset in this production segment started up in 2011; hence limited experience was available to decide a challenging target. In 2020 more fields within the segment are expected on stream. In 2013 the target was revised to 11 kg.CO2/boe and disclosed in the Sustainability Report in 2013. Will be reported against new target in CDP next year
Int3	Scope 1	100%	31.2%	metric tonnes CO2e per barrel of oil equivalent (BOE)	2011	72.7	2020	2020 CO2 intensity target for Extra heavy oil (<10 API) agreed in 2011 and disclosed in the Sustainability Report 2011. Target is 50 kg. CO2/boe
Int4	Scope 1	100%	13.4%	metric tonnes CO2e per barrel of oil equivalent (BOE)	2011	27.7	2020	2020 CO2 intensity target for LNG agreed in 2011 and disclosed in the Sustainability Report 2011. Target is 24 kg. CO2/ boe
Int5	Scope 1	100%	59.1%	metric tonnes CO2e per barrel of oil equivalent (BOE)	2013	46.0	2020	2020 CO2 intensity target for tight oil agreed in 2013 and disclosed in the Sustainability Report 2013. Target is 18 kg. CO2/boe

CC3.1c

Please also indicate what change in absolute emissions this intensity target reflects

ID	Direction of change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions at target completion?	% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions	Direction of change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions at target completion?	% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions	Comment
Int1					.
Int2					
Int3					
Int4					
Int5					

CC3.1d

For all of your targets, please provide details on the progress made in the reporting year

ID	% complete (time)	% complete (emissions)	Comment
Abs1	53.8%	70.8%	App. 566 000 tonnes delivered end 2013
Int1	22.2%	100%	2020 CO2 intensity target 2020 for Conventional Oil and gas: 11 kg. CO2/boe Intensity 2013: 8.9 kg. CO2/boe, however intensity is expected to increase towards 2020 Our 2013 share of production in this segment: 91.3%
Int2	100%	0%	2020 CO2 intensity target for Heavy oil : 17 kg. CO2/boe Intensity in 2013: 13.6 kg. CO2/boe Our 2013 share of production in this segment: 2.7% Pls. note that target is revised to 11 kg CO2/boe late 2013. Will report against revised target next year
Int3	22.2%	13.7%	Intensity in 2011 for Extra heavy oil: 72.7 kg. CO2/boe Intensity 2013: 69.6kg. CO2/ boe Our 2013 share of production in this segment: 0.6%
Int4	22.2%	0%	Intensity in 2011 for LNG: Intensity in 2013: 26.9 kg. CO2/boe Our 2013 share of production in this segment: 3.2%

CC3.2

Does the use of your goods and/or services directly enable GHG emissions to be avoided by a third party?

Yes

CC3.2a

Please provide details of how the use of your goods and/or services directly enable GHG emissions to be avoided by a third party

1) Fuel switch: Exporting Gas to Europe
i) Scope 1 emissions
ii) Natural gas export from Norway hold the potential of substituting coal (and lignite) in electricity generation and thereby provide CO2 emissions reductions. A gas fired power plant emits about 50% less CO2 per kWh electricity than a coal fired power plant.
iii &iv)) Statoil marketed and sold 36.3 bcm (entitlement) and 35.2 bcm (Norwegian State entitlement) from the Norwegian Continental Shelf to Europe in 2013. Of the total Norwegian gas export delivered to terminals in Europe of 102.5 bcm in 2013, Statoil sold about 70%.
Theoretically natural gas could reduce CO2 emissions in Germany alone by as much as 280 million tonnes if all lignite and coal power plants were substituted with gas power plants (that would amount to more than 25% reduction in total German CO2 emissions)
v) No generation of CERs or ERUs within CDM / JI

2) Low Carbon Electricity (Offshore wind) in UK
i) Scope 1 emissions

ii) Production of electricity from the 317MW Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm, located off the coast of North Norfolk in the UK, comprises 88 wind turbines and generates around 1.1TWh per annum. Providing clean energy to households substituting elecricity from coal plants or gas power plants. Lower Emission Factor (gr CO2eq/KWh) than average UK Grid
iii and iv) iii) This is enough clean energy to power almost 220,000 British homes and reduce CO2 emissions by 475 200 tonnes every year based on the current UK generation mix.
v) No generation of CERs or ERUs within CDM / JI

3) Active use of CDM / JI Credits and carbon trading.
i) Scope 1 emissions
ii) Flaring reductions on Tres Hermanos (collaborative project between Statoil and Pemex to reduce gas flaring). The Tres Hermanos oilfield in Mexico was registered under the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change's Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) in 2010. This was the first gas flaring reduction project to be registered as a CDM by the UN and opens up interesting funding opportunities for similar projects globally.
iii). From that date, Pemex will stop flaring the associated gas in their “Tres Hermanos” oil field, and therefore reducing their emissions by an average of 83 000 tonnes CO2/year.

CC3.3

Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year (this can include those in the planning and implementation phases)

Yes

CC3.3a

Please identify the total number of projects at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings

Stage of development	Number of projects	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	45	
To be implemented*	24	207000
Implementation commenced*		
Implemented*	21	180000
Not to be implemented		

CC3.3b

For those initiatives implemented in the reporting year, please provide details in the table below

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative, years	Comment
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Refinery and gas processing Tjeldbergodden: Increase efficiency of generator by changing feed water pump set up This affects scope 1 and is a voluntary initiative	6000	2760000	48000000	1-3 years	Lifetime of facility	Complete annual monetary savings not calculated for each initiative. A simplified approach for CO2 reduction initiatives in Norway would be to take Norwegian CO2 taxes and quota prices (460 NOK per tonnes CO2) into the calculation (reported in column 4). The result is generally too low as saved energy, NOx taxes etc are not part of this calculation.
Other	Segment Refinery and gas processing Mongstad: Reduced flaring due to better control of H2S in A-4000, step 1	7000	3220000	200000	<1 year	Lifetime of facility	See comment given to item 1
Other	Segment Refinery and gas processing Mongstad: Reduced flaring due to improved process control on refinery fuel gas, step 2	26000	11960000	300000	<1 year	Lifetime of facility	See comment given to item 1
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Refinery and gas processing Kalundborg: Installation of automatic slide valve to maximize steam production	2000		1000000	1-3 years	Lifetime of facility	NPV calculated to 1 000 000
Other	Segment Refinery and gas processing Kollsnes: Change of flash gas technique	1000	460000				See comment given to item 1
Other	Segment Refinery and gas processing Sture terminal: New de waxing method to increase efficiency of heat exchangers	4000	1840000		1-3 years		See comment given to item 1

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative, years	Comment
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Extra heavy oil Leismer demo project: Two initiatives; Solvent co-injection pilot project and Repair fugitive emissions	7000	3222000				
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Heavy oil Peregrino: Reduce temperature in separator with 5C to reduce steam required Reduce diesel consumption	12000					
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Heavy oil Peregrino: Optimized heat recovery. Produced water circulation	7000					
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Heavy oil Peregrino: Increase crude run down	8000					
Fugitive emissions reductions	Segment Heavy oil Peregrino: Water cut reduction from 75 to 60% Reduce diesel consumption	56000					
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Heavy oil Peregrino: Increase temperature of produced water circulation	14000					
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Conventional oil and gas Grane: Operation of one booster pump for oil export	1000	460000			10	See comment given to item 1
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Conventional oil and gas Åsgard A: Change of turbines	8000	3680000				See comment given to item 1

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative, years	Comment
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Conventional oil and gas Oseberg: Power for drilling operations from main power generator instead of dedicated drilling power generator	3000	1380000				See comment given to item 1
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Conventional oil and gas Grane: Increased frequency on turbine blade washing	8000	3680000	1000000	<1 year		See comment given to item 1
Energy efficiency: Processes	Segment Conventional oil and gas Troll C: LWI on flare	10000	4600000	70000000	1-3 years		See comment given to item 1

CC3.3c

What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Method	Comment
Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards	Minimum requirements for energy efficiency, non- production flaring or evaluation requirements for CO2 reduction projects are included with our corporate technical requirements/ corporate policies. Not respecting those requirement implies to ask for a formal dispensation and mitigation plan need to be in place. TR10009: Technical environment for onshore plants TR10011: Technical Environment standard for design, modification and operation of offshore plants Corporate Recording requirements on * CO2 and CH4 reporting. Monthly for Statoil Operated and Quarterly for Partner Operated Installations * CO2 and CH4 Forecasting Compliance with legislation such as EU-ETS, Norwegian CO2 tax, etc. where applicable to our operations
Dedicated budget for energy efficiency	The governing documentation require annual Energy Management Plans for each facility/installation. This plan should contain an energy efficiency target and the list of potential initiatives to achieve the target. When approved by the facility/installation manager, budget will be allocated. Plan and expenditure are closely monitored during the year.
Dedicated budget for low carbon	Statoil total R&D investment has been app. 2.7 billion NOK ($460 million) per year for the last three years. Investments in R&D for

Method	Comment
product R&D	carbon reduction technologies such as energy efficiency programme, CCS, offshore wind technologies, second generation biofuels and geothermal has received their fair share of the investments.
Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities	Budget for CO2 / Energy consumption reduction in buildings and living quarters, from increase of building energy efficiency to usage of renewable paper coffee cups
Employee engagement	Encouraging cycling to work, arranging for Company buses for transportation between airport and offices and providing bus transportation for commuters between hotel and offices (for larger offices) to reduce use of individual taxi
Internal price of carbon	We consider the potential cost of a project's CO2 emissions in all investments decisions. Our internal price of carbon assume major increase of CO2 price both in Europe and in the rest of the world towards 2040
Internal incentives/recognition programs	Annual HSE Awards, of which large CO2 Emission Reductions could be proposed by anyone in the organization.
Lower return on investment (ROI) specification	Yes, Konkraft commitment. Target ID: Abs.1
Marginal abatement cost curve	We have developed Marginal Abatement Curve for evaluating our emissions reduction projects and for communicating with Statoil's management. These provide a method of evaluating potential emissions reductions activities by comparing the largest equity CO2 Reduction Measures..
Partnering with governments on technology development	In cooperation with Gassnova (which represents the Norwegian government in CCS matters), Norske Shell and Sasol, Statoil started up the Carbon dioxide Technology Centre Mongstad (TCM) in 2012. The 6 billion NOK test centre is unique in the global context, two different technologies can be tested on two different exhaust gas sources (Combined heat and power plant and refinery). This makes the findings from TCM relevant to both gas- and coal-fired power plants.

Further Information

Page: CC4. Communication

CC4.1

Have you published information about your organization’s response to climate change and GHG emissions performance for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s)

Publication	Page/Section reference	Attach the document
In mainstream financial reports (complete)	Climate change, pg. 8-15	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2014/32/23132/Investor CDP 2014/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/SustainabilityReport.pdf
In mainstream financial reports (complete)	Our corporate strategy, pg.9;Risk factors pg. 93(HSE)/ pg.95 (renewable energy), Legal and regulatory risks, pg. 100	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2014/32/23132/Investor CDP 2014/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/AnnualReport20-F.pdf
In voluntary communications (complete)	Environmental ambitions, pg.14, Environmental performance pg. 20 and 48	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2014/32/23132/Investor CDP 2014/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/2013 Oil Sands Report.pdf
In voluntary communications (complete)	Statoil's position on carbon asset risk	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2014/32/23132/Investor CDP 2014/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/Statoil response to Ceres letter 9 October 2013.pdf
In voluntary communications (complete)	Overall energy market outlook, pg.13-19	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2014/32/23132/Investor CDP 2014/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/Energy Perspectives 2013.pdf

Further Information

Module: Risks and Opportunities

Page: CC5. Climate Change Risks

CC5.1

Have you identified any climate change risks that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure? Tick all that apply

Risks driven by changes in regulation
Risks driven by changes in physical climate parameters
Risks driven by changes in other climate-related developments

CC5.1a

Please describe your risks driven by changes in regulation

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
International agreements	International climate negotiations, including at UN level, leading to carbon budget and new policies: Policies and initiatives at international level to address climate change that could affect business conditions and demand for our products in the medium to long term.	Increased operational cost	3 to 6 years	Direct	More likely than not	Medium			
Cap and trade schemes	Higher prices in EU ETS Stringent 2030 cap and hence the price path of the system	Increased operational cost	1 to 3 years	Direct	Very likely	Medium	In 2013 we paid approximately USD 6 million for allowances to be used for our offshore settlement in the EU ETS for 2013. If the EU price gets 5 times higher than the average of last year and equal the record level from 2007, the financial implications will be around USD 30 million/year	We are calling for higher prices in the EU ETS (see opportunities) and are using resources	0
Carbon taxes	Increased Norwegian	Increased	1 to 3	Direct	About as	High	For 2013 the	Dialogue with	0 beyond

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	CO2 tax Some direct carbon taxes exist in various regions where Statoil operates, especially in Norway. The Norwegian offshore CO2 tax was doubled to around 75USD/tonne on 1 January 2013. Increased CO2 tax in Norway might result in marginal projects (new or development of existing) not being realized. Beside, this national tax constitutes a competitive disadvantage in comparison to our competitors who operate in other part of the world. Statoil believes that cap and trade is a better solution to promote cost-efficient solutions rather than domestic carbon tax.	operational cost	years		likely as not		amount paid in CO2 tax in Norway was approximately USD 500 million. The Norwegian government has in the past doubled the CO2 tax. If this is repeated; the financial implications will be another 500 mill. USD/year	the Norwegian government on the importance of not undermining the EU ETS by introduction more/more stringent regulation	already spent in the dialogue with Norwegian government
General environmental regulations, including planning	Rising climate change concerns could lead to additional regulatory measures that may result in project delays and higher	Increased operational cost	1 to 3 years	Direct	Likely	Low-medium			

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	costs								
Product efficiency regulations and standards	Emission performance standards in power sector US to reduce demand for gas	Reduced demand for goods/services	3 to 6 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Low-medium			
Uncertainty surrounding new regulation	Investment risks associated with uncertainties surrounding scope and timescales for new climate regulation in countries in which we operate (Brazil, US, Canada, etc.)	Increased operational cost	1 to 3 years	Direct	More likely than not	Medium			
Lack of regulation	Lack of regulation in countries outside of Norway/the EU could represent a competitive disadvantage for Statoil who is today very much exposed to carbon costs.	Reduced stock price (market valuation)	3 to 6 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Low-medium			
Product efficiency regulations and standards	Low Carbon Fuel Standard in California and other states in the US and the Fuel Quality Directive in the EU for example could have some important market for the fuel markets and reduce the demand for some of our products	Reduced demand for goods/services	1 to 3 years		About as likely as not	Medium			

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
				Direct					
				Direct	More likely than not	High			
Cap and trade schemes	Alberta Carbon pricing scheme. Statoil's Leismer project (approx 200.000 ton CO2/year) will be part of the system in 2014. The project is set to emit less than the allocated baseline and could in this case sell credits to other operators. However, there is a risk that the baseline and the price of complying will change	Increased operational cost	Up to 1 year	Direct	About as likely as not	Medium-high			

CC5.1b

Please describe your risks that are driven by change in physical climate parameters

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Change in precipitation extremes and droughts	Development of extreme weather patterns that affect operations and have specific impacts on water availability which	Reduction/disruption in production capacity	>6 years	Direct	More likely than not	Medium-high			

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	could represent an increased challenge for our onshore activities in the US for example								
Sea level rise	Many of our assets have coastal or offshore locations. Sea level rise (including high storm surge) presents a risk to the integrity of these assets and to the safety of workers beond what we already are designing for	Reduction/disruption in production capacity	>6 years	Direct	Unlikely	Low-medium			
Uncertainty of physical risks	Given the high uncertainty of how and where climate change will affect our business there is a risk that installations turns out to be wrongly designed	Increased operational cost	>6 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Low-medium			
Uncertainty of physical risks	Climate change could reduce the GDP growth and hence demand for oil and gas	Reduced demand for goods/services	>6 years	Direct	More likely than not	Medium			

CC5.1c

Please describe your risks that are driven by changes in other climate-related developments

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated Financial Implications	Management method	Cost of management
Reputation	Poor reputation may impact our	Wider social	3 to 6	Direct	Unlikely	High			

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated Financial Implications	Management method	Cost of management
	market value, access to acreage and our attractiveness for talent	disadvantages	years						
Other drivers	Today Statoil is recognized as one of the most efficient oil and gas upstream companies (60% more efficient than the industry average). However our strategy for 2020 implies that we will move towards more-intensive crudes. This can have adverse effect on our business if lifecycle CO2 intensity based regulations impose constraints on access to certain markets/exploration of certain resources	Increased operational cost	3 to 6 years	Direct	More likely than not	Medium-high			
Uncertainty in market signals	Some analysts argue that companies with carbon intensive production will be less attractive or investors (ref reports on "The Carbon bubble" from HSBC, Rystad Energy, Standard & Poor, Carbon Tracker) . Other analysts disagree and claim that oil and gas will be dominating till 2030 and that the prices of these commodities will increase	Reduced demand for goods/services	>6 years	Direct	About as likely as not	High			

Further Information

Page: CC6. Climate Change Opportunities

CC6.1

Have you identified any climate change opportunities that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure? Tick all that apply

Opportunities driven by changes in regulation
Opportunities driven by changes in physical climate parameters
Opportunities driven by changes in other climate-related developments

CC6.1a

Please describe your opportunities that are driven by changes in regulation

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
International agreements	A stringent international agreement on climate applicable for all countries may present an opportunity for Statoil. It could create a level playing field and will benefit our gas operations through a high carbon price that will lead to fuel switching from coal to gas	Other: Create a level playing field	3 to 6 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Medium			
Cap and trade schemes	A strengthened EU ETS is vital for bringing more gas (and less coal) to the European power sector. Establishment of new carbon pricing	Increased demand for existing products/services	1 to 3 years	Direct	Very likely	Medium-high	Total revenues from Statoil's Norwegian gas (mainly going to Europe) was around USD 15 billion in 2013. A much higher EU price could	Calling for a more stringent cap in the EU ETS and a properly designed scheme	Difficult to estimate as our regulatory work in Brussels goes beyond focusing on EU ETS but a fair estimate could be USD

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	mechanism and linking of carbon markets is likely to have the same effect. Pricing on CO2 could also stimulate our offshore wind projects and our efforts to bring CCS to the market						possibly increase the gas sale by some 2 % and in that case represent additional revenues of some USD 300 million		150.000/year
Emission reporting obligations	Statoil CO2 intensity is currently very low in comparison to our peers. Improved benchmarking methodology could constitute an opportunity to communicate about Statoil's carbon performance.	Wider social benefits	1 to 3 years	Direct	Likely	Low-medium			
Other regulatory drivers	Legislation to support offshore wind and Carbon Capture and Storage	Investment opportunities	1 to 3 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Low-medium			

CC6.1b

Please describe the opportunities that are driven by changes in physical climate parameters

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Snow and ice	Melting of the ice in the Arctic is opening new opportunities for sustainable exploration of hydrocarbons high North	Increased production capacity		Direct	Likely	Medium-high			
Other physical climate opportunities	More need for abundant and reliable energy in a world that is affected by climate change(for example the increased use of air conditioning) could increase demand for oil and gas	Increased demand for existing products/services	>6 years	Direct	Unlikely	Medium			

CC6.1c

Please describe the opportunities that are driven by changes in other climate-related developments

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Changing consumer behaviour	Climate change and the growing demand for clean energy are opening up new business opportunities. Statoil is in a position to seize these opportunities by utilising long-standing core capabilities from the oil and gas industry.	New products/business services	>6 years	Direct	Likely	Medium			
Increasing humanitarian	Statoil aims to be a part of the future sustainable	Increased demand for existing	>6 years	Direct	Very likely	Medium-high			

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
demands	energy mix where more energy is needed to bring people out of poverty.	products/services							

Further Information

Module: GHG Emissions Accounting, Energy and Fuel Use, and Trading

Page: CC7. Emissions Methodology

CC7.1

Please provide your base year and base year emissions (Scopes 1 and 2)

Base year	Scope 1 Base year emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope 2 Base year emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
Mon 01 Jan 2007 - Mon 31 Dec 2007	15222876	106674

CC7.2

Please give the name of the standard, protocol or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions

Please select the published methodologies that you use
IPIECA's Petroleum Industry Guidelines for reporting GHG emissions, 2nd edition, 2011
US EPA Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
ISO 14064-1
Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, Calculating Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 2003
American Petroleum Institute Compendium of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Methodologies for the Oil and Natural Gas Industry, 2009

Please select the published methodologies that you use
Energy Information Administration 1605B
Other

CC7.2a

If you have selected "Other" in CC7.2 please provide details of the standard, protocol or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions

Norwegian Oil and Gas Association - Guideline for annual emissions and discharge report
EU Emission Trading Scheme
Brazil National/Local reporting requirements (IBAMA)
Norwegian Directorate of Tax and Excise - Emissions of NOx (2008)
ISO standard ISO 6976:1995 ”Natural gas — Calculation of heating values, density, relative density and Wobbe index from composition”
US EPA Technology Transfer Network Clearinghouse for Inventories & Emission Factors, Emission Factors & AP42, Fifth Edition
European Commission (EC) Eurostat: EC Statistics
2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories

CC7.3

Please give the source for the global warming potentials you have used

Gas	Reference
CO2	IPCC Second Assessment Report (SAR - 100 year)
CH4	IPCC Second Assessment Report (SAR - 100 year)

CC7.4

Please give the emissions factors you have applied and their origin; alternatively, please attach an Excel spreadsheet with this data at the bottom of this page

Fuel/Material/Energy	Emission Factor	Unit	Reference
Crude oil	3.17	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	Klif (Norwegian Climate and Pollution Agency)
Other: Condensate	3.17	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	Klif (Norwegian Climate and Pollution Agency)

Fuel/Material/Energy	Emission Factor	Unit	Reference
Natural gas	2.8	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	Klif (Norwegian Climate and Pollution Agency)
Liquefied petroleum gas (LPG)	2.75	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	EIA - Voluntary reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program. Appendix H. Form EIA-1605 Emission Factors (kg CO2 / MMBtu), converted into kgCO2/kg product using MIT Energy club conversion factors
Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)	2.75	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	EIA - Voluntary reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program. Appendix H. Form EIA-1605 Emission Factors (kg CO2 / MMBtu), converted into kgCO2/kg product using MIT Energy club conversion factors
Other: Methanol	1.21	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	EIA - Voluntary reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program. Appendix H. Form EIA-1605 Emission Factors (kg CO2 / MMBtu), converted into kgCO2/kg product using MIT Energy club conversion factors
Naphtha	5.33	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	EIA - Voluntary reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program. Appendix H. Form EIA-1605 Emission Factors (kg CO2 / MMBtu), converted into kgCO2/kg product using MIT Energy club conversion factors
Diesel/Gas oil	2.97	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	EIA - Voluntary reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program. Appendix H. Form EIA-1605 Emission Factors (kg CO2 / MMBtu), converted into kgCO2/kg product using MIT Energy club conversion factors
Motor gasoline	2.97	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	EIA - Voluntary reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program. Appendix H. Form EIA-1605 Emission Factors (kg CO2 / MMBtu), converted into kgCO2/kg product using MIT Energy club conversion factors
Other: Heavy Fuel Oil	3.06	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	EIA - Voluntary reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program. Appendix H. Form EIA-1605 Emission Factors (kg CO2 / MMBtu), converted into kgCO2/kg product using MIT Energy club conversion factors
Jet kerosene	2.05	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	EIA - Voluntary reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program. Appendix H. Form EIA-1605 Emission Factors (kg CO2 / MMBtu), converted into kgCO2/kg product using MIT Energy club conversion factors
Petroleum coke	2.86	metric tonnes CO2 per metric tonne	EIA - Voluntary reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program. Appendix H. Form EIA-1605 Emission Factors (kg CO2 / MMBtu), converted into kgCO2/kg product using MIT Energy club conversion factors

Further Information

The emission factors above are used for our Scope 3 calculations. Our Scope 1 emissions are calculated on a site by site basis, and the emissions factors used are often governed by local regulations. While some sites may use standard factors from published guidelines, other use fuel composition and flow rates in a daily/monthly basis to calculate their emissions. Some of our refinery operations use continuous flue gas flow rates and stack measurements for their calculations. The diversity in methodologies, units, accuracies and calculation frequencies makes it impractical (and uneconomic) to present our emission factors on a corporate level. Our Scope 2 emission factor for CO2 depends on the region in question. Examples: Norway 14 kg/MWh, Denmark 189

kg/MWh, USA (North Dakota) 827 kg/MWh, Canada (Alberta): 1000 kg/MWh. Statoil accounts for the CO2 from the imported energy delivered to our facilities, but also the CO2 from the energy lost in the distribution grid and lost during the energy generation process at our suppliers' power plants.

Page: CC8. Emissions Data - (1 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2013)

CC8.1

Please select the boundary you are using for your Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas inventory

Operational control

CC8.2

Please provide your gross global Scope 1 emissions figures in metric tonnes CO2e

16007228

CC8.3

Please provide your gross global Scope 2 emissions figures in metric tonnes CO2e

436598

CC8.4

Are there are any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Yes

CC8.4a

Please provide details of the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure

Source	Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source	Relevance of Scope 2 emissions excluded from this source	Explain why the source is excluded
Scope 1-3 CO2 and CH4 from US Shale operations Marcellus and Eagle Ford	Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition	Emissions excluded due to a recent acquisition	Statoil assumed operatorship for Eagle Ford and Marcellus throughout the three last quarters of 2013. Because our control of these assets was phased in during this period, performance data has not been included in this report.
Scope 2 CH4 from all operations	Emissions are not evaluated	Emissions are not evaluated	CH4 emission factors from imported energy are not easily available.

CC8.5

Please estimate the level of uncertainty of the total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions figures that you have supplied and specify the sources of uncertainty in your data gathering, handling and calculations

Scope 1 emissions: Uncertainty range	Scope 1 emissions: Main sources of uncertainty	Scope 1 emissions: Please expand on the uncertainty in your data	Scope 2 emissions: Uncertainty range	Scope 2 emissions: Main sources of uncertainty	Scope 2 emissions: Please expand on the uncertainty in your data
More than 2% but less than or equal to 5%	Assumptions	There is monthly internal reporting of data and follow-up on trend and variances on a corporate level. Most of the CO2 reported for Norway and Canada is based on data from continuous sampling and metering (CEMS) which is imported into our environmental accounting system. These calculations are considered to have a high level of accuracy. Other data are based on a lower-tier approach using standard factors from published or local regulatory guidelines. Data accuracy will very across the company, but an overall uncertainty higher than 5% is not expected. Our Scope 1 CO2 emissions are externally verified.	More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%	Assumptions	Scope 2 emissions are not verified. The published factors used in the Scope 2 emissions calculations are by nature uncertain in that they cover large regions where there could be variations on grid losses, thermal efficiencies and also the mixture of renewables and non-renewables in the supplied power.

CC8.6

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 1 emissions

Third party verification or assurance complete

CC8.6a

Please provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements

Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 1 emissions verified (%)
Reasonable assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2014/32/23132/Investor CDP 2014/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC8.6a/Statoil Sustainability Report 2013.pdf	Refer to section 13 -Independent assurance report. The reasonable assurance level requires a minimum of 80% of Scope 1 emissions to be verified. Section 4 (page 12) relates to our scope 1 emissions which are covered by the verification process. However, KPMG had access to all our data and went beyond the 80% requirement. The range of verified data is 90-100%, but as we have to state one figure we have chosen to report the most conservative approach (90%).	ISAE3000	90

CC8.7

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 2 emissions

No third party verification or assurance

CC8.8

Please identify if any data points other than emissions figures have been verified as part of the third party verification work undertaken

Additional data points verified	Comment
Year on year emissions intensity figure	Intensity figures were published for the first time in our annual sustainability report. These figures were also part of our external verification process.

CC8.9

Are carbon dioxide emissions from biologically sequestered carbon relevant to your organization?

No

Further Information

Page: CC9. Scope 1 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2013)

CC9.1

Do you have Scope 1 emissions sources in more than one country?

Yes

CC9.1a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region

Country/Region	Scope 1 metric tonnes CO2e
Norway	13441133
Canada	410312
Brazil	385819
United States of America	1121613
Denmark	589257
Tanzania	30964
Mozambique	23061
Germany	5068

CC9.2

Please indicate which other Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide (tick all that apply)

By business division
By GHG type

CC9.2a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
DPN (Development and Production Norway)	9339879
DPNA (Development and Production North America)	1510683
DPI (Development and Production International)	385819
EXP (Exploration)	140249
MPR (Marketing, Refining and Processing)	4630512
GBS (Global Business Services)	86

CC9.2c

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type

GHG type	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
CO2	15083175
CH4	924053

Further Information

Statoil have operations in 33 countries, but is reporting CO2 emissions only from countries were we have oil and gas activities under operational control (8 countries). In the remaining countries, CO2 emissions from the offices are considered insignificant.

Page: CC10. Scope 2 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2013)

CC10.1

Do you have Scope 2 emissions sources in more than one country?

Yes

CC10.1a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions and energy consumption by country/region

Country/Region	Scope 2 metric tonnes CO2e	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted for CC8.3 (MWh)
Norway	242844	3819009	
Canada	71715	192909	
United States of America	43754	56889	
Denmark	72973	426225	
Germany	5313	7699	

CC10.2

Please indicate which other Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide (tick all that apply)

By business division

CC10.2a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division

Business division	Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
DPN	4201
DPNA	115469
MPR	315321
TPD	55
GBS	1552

Further Information

Statoil has operations in 33 countries, but is reporting emissions only from the countries were we have O&G activities under operational control. In the remaining countries we have offices supporting equity production or commercial offices. Emissions from these offices are insignificant. Statoil has scope 2 emissions from 5 countries only

Page: CC11. Energy

CC11.1

What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

CC11.2

Please state how much fuel, electricity, heat, steam, and cooling in MWh your organization has purchased and consumed during the reporting year

Energy type	MWh
Fuel	60750534
Electricity	4293172
Heat	208608
Steam	0
Cooling	951

CC11.3

Please complete the table by breaking down the total "Fuel" figure entered above by fuel type

Fuels	MWh
Natural gas	45143873
Diesel/Gas oil	4389321
Butane	177752
Coke oven coke	3076165
Motor gasoline	64

Fuels	MWh
Propane	6685
Refinery gas	7493980
Other: Condensate	3177
Other: Fuel Oil	319
Other: LOFS	3287
Other: Purge Gas	301039
Other: Sour Gas	105
Other: Spill gas	80726
Other: Not assigned	74042

CC11.4

Please provide details of the electricity, heat, steam or cooling amounts that were accounted at a low carbon emission factor in the Scope 2 figure reported in CC8.3

Basis for applying a low carbon emission factor	MWh associated with low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling	Comment
No purchases or generation of low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted with a low carbon emissions factor		We calculate the emissions associated with any type of electricity, heat, steam or cooling purchased. Emission factors are also applied towards electricity from the Norwegian grid, which is mostly based on hydropower.

Further Information

Page: CC12. Emissions Performance

CC12.1

How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to the previous year?

Increased

CC12.1a

Please identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year

Reason	Emissions value (percentage)	Direction of change	Comment
Emissions reduction activities	0.1	Decrease	Heavy oil asset Peregrino has managed to reduce their CO2 emissions by implementing several CO2 reduction initiatives.
Divestment	0.8	Decrease	Statoil sold its shares and gave up operatorship of the Brage field during 2013. Additionally, Statoil Fuel and Retail (SFR) was sold in Q3 2012, and SFR emissions data were reported for 2012.There are no emissions data for SFR reported for 2013. Both these divestments have caused a decrease in emissions of CO2 equivalents.
Acquisitions			
Mergers			
Change in output	1.9	Increase	An increase in production in our tight oil asset Bakken has caused an 1.6% increase in flaring, in terms of CO2 equivalents. The increase is partially offset by the introduction of higher efficiency flares at the site. Additionally, increased exploration activities has added another 0,3% to our emissions in 2013.
Change in methodology	4.1	Increase	We have changed the GWP for CH4 from 21 to 25, causing an 0,9% increase in emissions of CO2 equivalents. Both Peregrino and Bakken have updated their calculation methodology since 2012. This has an impact on both CO2 and CH4, increasing their CO2 equivalents emissions by 3,2%.
Change in boundary			
Change in physical operating conditions	1.2	Decrease	There was a shutdown at our Hammerfest LNG plant, resulting in a decrease of CO2 emissions compared to 2012.
Unidentified	0.1	Decrease	There is a slight decrease in emissions within DPN and MPR. All our segments are working on CO2 reduction activities in order to reach our 2020 targets.
Other	0.2	Increase	In Canada, as the oil sands wells at Leismer matures, they require more steam to maintain production levels. This has caused a 0,2% increase in our overall emissions of CO2 equivalents.

CC12.2

Please describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tonnes CO2e per unit currency total revenue

Intensity figure	Metric numerator	Metric denominator	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change

Intensity figure	Metric numerator	Metric denominator	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
0.000025	metric tonnes CO2e	unit total revenue	18	Increase	There has been an increase in emissions, but there was also a 12% decrease in revenue from 2012 to 2013. The decrease in revenues was mainly attributable to reduced volumes of liquids and gas sold. Lower liquids and gas prices measured in NOK, lower unrealised gains on derivatives and the drop in revenues due to the divestment of the Fuel and Retail segment in the second quarter of 2012, added to the decrease. Increased volumes of third party gas sold, partly offset the decrease in revenues.

CC12.3

Please describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tonnes CO2e per full time equivalent (FTE) employee

Intensity figure	Metric numerator	Metric denominator	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
652	metric tonnes CO2e	FTE employee	7	Increase	Please note that previous year's reported FTE figures were not collected according to the guidance. Only the company's own employees were accounted for, whereas the new intensity figure contains also contractors performing work within our organisational boundaries. We have re-calculated last year's intensity of 685 tonne to 609 tonnes CO2e/FTE to in order to work out the % change. The increase in this intensity is partially due to the total increase in Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions from last year. This constitutes 4% of the increase. The rest is due to a decrease in FTE from 25895 to 25239 between the years 2012 and 2013. Most of the FTE reductions can be attributed to contractors. Whereas the number of Statoil employees has remained more or less the same, the number of contractors was reduced by almost 30%.

CC12.4

Please provide an additional intensity (normalized) metric that is appropriate to your business operations

Intensity figure	Metric numerator	Metric denominator	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
11.7	metric tonnes CO2e	Other: mboe	16	Increase	Please be advised that the denominator for this intensity has been wrong in the past, it has been stated as boe, whereas the denominator for the reported figures should have been mboe. Please also note that we have changed the consolidation basis for this intensity form equity to operatorship to align with the rest of this section. As such, the change and direction of change is also calculated based on operatorship. For 2012, the intensity was 10 tonnes CO2eq/mboe on operatorship basis, as opposed to the reported 9,4 tonnes CO2eq/mboe. Due to the nature of our business, only our upstream business is relevant to this intensity. Refineries and exploration activities are excluded. The changes in intensities are monitored on a segment-to-segment basis within our organisation. Refer to the "Further information" section for explanations of variations in intensities.

Further Information

For the conventional oil & gas segment, which represents over 90% of our total share of production from operated assets, carbon intensity increased by 10% from 2012 to 2013. The increase was driven by more energy intensive production at mature assets. In addition, planned maintenance and unplanned production stops in 2013 impacted production while CO2 emissions were not proportionally reduced. For the heavy oil segment, the carbon intensity decreased by 18% from 2012 to 2013. The reduction was a result of successful implementation of CO2 emission reduction initiatives combined with an increase in production. For the LNG segment, unplanned shutdowns during the first two quarters of 2013 resulted in reduced production with a subsequent energy intensive start-up of cold facilities. This resulted in an increase in CO2 emissions intensity by 4% from 2012 to 2013. In 2013, there was a 25% increase in CO2 intensity levels for the extra heavy oil segment compared to 2012. We anticipated this increase in intensity due to two primary operational factors: First, more steam was utilised in 2013 to support our current production levels. This was mainly due to the age of the wells. As a Steam Assisted Gravity Drainage (SAGD) well matures, the chambers enlarge, requiring more steam to maintain production levels. We added an additional steam generator in 2013 to service existing wells and support future production. When introducing more steam, CO2 intensity increases, because the resulting emissions are not balanced by a proportional increase in production. Second, planned maintenance resulted in a temporary suspension of production from the facility. Production was suspended to ensure regulatory compliance and to add components for piloting new technologies. As a result, production levels were lower and this impacted our overall CO2 intensity rate. Over time, as production increases, the CO2 intensity level for the extra heavy oil segment is expected to improve as operations normalise and technology improvements yield results. However, in the near term, the CO2 intensity for Leismer may be higher than the projected segment target. Our technology plan remains on course and is expected to continue to yield environmental benefits as projects in this segment matures. For the tight oil segment, the CO2 emissions intensity increased by 5% between 2012 and 2013 due to increased production and higher flaring volumes. The new, higher efficiency flares are more CO2 intensive, but emit considerably less nmVOC and CH4 emissions per flared unit.

Page: CC13. Emissions Trading

CC13.1

Do you participate in any emissions trading schemes?

Yes

CC13.1a

Please complete the following table for each of the emission trading schemes in which you participate

Scheme name	Period for which data is supplied	Allowances allocated	Allowances purchased	Verified emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Details of ownership
European Union ETS	Tue 01 Jan 2013 - Tue 31 Dec 2013	6514290	4422698	10936988	Facilities we own and operate

CC13.1b

What is your strategy for complying with the schemes in which you participate or anticipate participating?

Our first objective is to ensure that we are in compliance with the schemes in which we participate, and in addition transaction cost is minimised. Statoil operates facilities which are subject to Norwegian and European climate legislation. The company must each year submit quotas corresponding to the entire (oil and gas production on the Norwegian continental shelf) or parts (other activities) of its carbon emissions. Emission allowances are purchased in the market to meet these compliance obligations. The emission trading group is responsible for compliance related CO2 trading for all Statoil operated licenses. Statoil has been active in the carbon market since 2005, and was the first company to execute a contract on the first carbon exchange in the world. In addition to European carbon allowances (EUAs) Statoil is using Certified Emissions Reductions (CERs), generated by CDM projects, for compliance purposes. Statoil supports the developments of new emission trading scheme in different part of the world as the most cost-efficient way to cut emissions.

CC13.2

Has your organization originated any project-based carbon credits or purchased any within the reporting period?

Yes

CC13.2a

Please provide details on the project-based carbon credits originated or purchased by your organization in the reporting period

Credit origination or credit purchase	Project type	Project identification	Verified to which standard	Number of credits (metric tonnes of CO2e)	Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e): Risk adjusted volume	Credits cancelled	Purpose, e.g. compliance
Credit Origination	Other: Prototype Carbon Fund	From various projects in Prototype Carbon Fund	CDM (Clean Development Mechanism)	254367	254367	No	Compliance
Credit Origination	Other: Community Development Carbon Fund	From various projects in Community Development Carbon Fund	CDM (Clean Development Mechanism)	11580	11580	No	Compliance
Credit Origination	Other: Carbon portfolio MGM	From various projects in Carbon portfolio MGM	CDM (Clean Development Mechanism)	102095	102095	No	Compliance

Further Information

Page: CC14. Scope 3 Emissions

CC14.1

Please account for your organization's Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using primary data	Explanation
Purchased goods and services	Not relevant, explanation provided				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions.
Capital goods	Not relevant, explanation provided				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions. In 2012 this was calculated as 0.00% of percentage of emissions calculated using primary data. Not material.
Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in	Not relevant, explanation				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions. In 2012 this was calculated as 0.00%

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using primary data	Explanation
Scope 1 or 2)	provided				of percentage of emissions calculated using primary data. Not material.
Upstream transportation and distribution	Not relevant, explanation provided				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions. In 2012 this was calculated as 0.01% of percentage of emissions calculated using primary data. Not material.
Waste generated in operations	Relevant, not yet calculated				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions.
Business travel	Not relevant, explanation provided				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions. In 2012 this was calculated as 0.02% (total employee commuting and business travel) of percentage of emissions calculated using primary data.
Employee commuting	Not relevant, explanation provided				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions. In 2012 this was calculated as 0.02% (total employee commuting and business travel) of percentage of emissions calculated using primary data.
Upstream leased assets	Not relevant, explanation provided				No upstream leased assets.
Downstream transportation and distribution	Not relevant, explanation provided				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions. In 2012 this was calculated as 0.01% of percentage of emissions calculated using primary data.
Processing of sold products	Not relevant, explanation provided				Our own processing of sold products is included scope 1 and 2. The rest of oil and gas products are sold worldwide, making it impossible to analyse the procesing of our products.
Use of sold products	Relevant, calculated	278018695		100.00%	Based on gas and liquids sold and applying emission factors based on Klif guidelines.
End of life treatment of sold products	Not relevant, explanation provided				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions. It is assumed that all sold products are burnt or oxidized, therefore, no end-of -life treatment of sold products is needed.
Downstream leased assets	Not relevant, explanation provided	5788		0.00%	Is insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions.
Franchises	Not relevant,				Not applicable to our operations

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using primary data	Explanation
	explanation provided				
Investments	Not relevant, explanation provided				Not applicable to our operations
Other (upstream)	Not relevant, explanation provided				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions.
Other (downstream)	Not relevant, explanation provided				Assumed to be insignificant compared to the Total of Scope 3 emissions.

CC14.2

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 3 emissions

No third party verification or assurance

CC14.3

Are you able to compare your Scope 3 emissions for the reporting year with those for the previous year for any sources?

Yes

CC14.3a

Please identify the reasons for any change in your Scope 3 emissions and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Reason for change	Emissions value (percentage)	Direction of change	Comment
Use of sold products	Change in output	2	Decrease	This is related to a general decrease in equity production since 2012. Please note that last year's Scope 3 figure was slightly underestimated, as it did not take into account the CH4 contribution to

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Reason for change	Emissions value (percentage)	Direction of change	Comment
				CO2 equivalents. In order to make this comparison, last year's reported figure was therefore adjusted to reflect this change in methodology.

CC14.4

Do you engage with any of the elements of your value chain on GHG emissions and climate change strategies? (Tick all that apply)

Yes, our customers
Yes, other partners in the value chain

CC14.4a

Please give details of methods of engagement, your strategy for prioritizing engagements and measures of success

The majority of our shipping needs are covered under long-term contracts, allowing us to seek energy efficient solutions together over time. In 2013 we continued our "Green logistics" improvement programme to achieve more efficient vessel transport and helicopter services on the Norwegian Continental Shelf. Our goal is to reduce CO2 emissions from these activities by 10% within 2015, compared to 2011. In 2011, the emissions from the activities in scope were approximately 460,000 tonnes CO2. Adjusted for activity level, emission reductions of about 8% have been achieved so far.
The world's first LNG driven product tanker, Bit Viking, first sailed in 2011. The vessel supplies products to the Norwegian coast. In 2013, we agreed with Bergen Tankers AS to convert the vessel Bergen Viking to run on LNG, aiming for completion in the spring 2015. Two new shuttle tankers with low fuel consumption, exhaust emission cleaning and ballast water treatment systems are planned to serve the North and Barents Sea by 2015. Energy efficiency and low emissions are important criteria for the ongoing renewal of our fleet.
Through our 'carbon pact' with Maersk Tankers, we develop measures to improve the energy efficiency of our contracted fleet. The pact's focus is on reducing the carbon footprint. Our partner Maersk monitors and evaluates energy efficiency and CO2 emission reduction developments in every single voyage performed for Statoil, providing a customer scorecard every six months.

Further Information

Attachments

https://www.cdp.net/sites/2014/32/23132/Investor%20CDP%202014/Shared%20Documents/Attachments/InvestorCDP2014/CC14.Scope3Emissions/Statoil%20Scope%203%20calculations%202013%20data.xlsx

Module: Sign Off

Page: CC15. Sign Off

CC15.1

Please provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response

Name	Job title	Corresponding job category
Elna Berner	Senior Advisor Sustainability	Other:

Further Information

Senior advisor in Corporate Sustainability

Module: Oil & Gas

Page: OG0. Reference information

OG0.1

Please give the gas types included in "All nonconventional gas"

Hydrocarbon group	Gas types in this group
All nonconventional gas	We are not using this category

OG0.2

Please give the oil types included in "All conventional oil"

Hydrocarbon group	Oil types in this group
All conventional oil	Light & medium oils Heavy oil Extraheavy oil

Hydrocarbon group	Oil types in this group
	Natural gas liquids inc condensate

OG0.3

Please give the oil types included in "All nonconventional oil"

Hydrocarbon group	Oil types in this group
All nonconventional oil	Bitumen (oil sands) Shale oil

Further Information

Terminology tight oil is used instead of shale oil in the response to the climate questionnaire

Page: OG1. Production & reserves by hydrocarbon type - (1 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2013)

OG1.1

Is your organization involved with oil & gas production or reserves?

Yes

OG1.2

Please provide values for annual production by hydrocarbon type (in units of BOE) for the reporting year in the following table. The values required are aggregate values for the reporting organization. The values required for 2014 are forward-looking estimates

Product	Production (BOE) - Reporting year	Production (BOE) - 2014 estimate
Other: Total production from all segments, equity	708100000	722000000

OG1.3

Please provide values for reserves by hydrocarbon type (in units of BOE) for the reporting year. Please indicate if the figures are for reserves that are proved, probable or both proved and probable. The values required are aggregate values for the reporting organization

Product	Country/region	Reserves (BOE)	Date of assessment	Proved/Probable/Proved+Probable
Other: Oil and NGL	Norway	1286000000	Tue 31 Dec 2013	Proved
Other: Natural Gas	Norway	2631000000	Tue 31 Dec 2013	Proved
Other: Oil and NGL	Eurasia	227000000	Tue 31 Dec 2013	Proved
Other: Natural Gas	Eurasia	342000000	Tue 31 Dec 2013	Proved
Other: Oil and NGL	Africa	288000000	Tue 31 Dec 2013	Proved
Other: Natural Gas	Africa	60000000	Tue 31 Dec 2013	Proved
Other: Oil and NGL	Americas	518000000	Tue 31 Dec 2013	Proved
Other: Natural Gas	Americas	250000000	Tue 31 Dec 2013	Proved

OG1.4

Please explain which listing requirements or other methodologies you have used to provide reserves data in OG1.3. If your organization cannot provide data due to legal restrictions on reporting reserves figures in certain countries, please explain this

Statoil's oil and gas reserves have been estimated by its qualified professionals in accordance with industry standards under the requirements of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), Rule 4-10 of Regulation S-X.

OG1.5

Please provide the average breakeven cost of current production used in estimation of proven reserves

Hydrocarbon/project	Breakeven cost/BOE	Comment
		Confidential information, cannot be disclosed

OG1.6

Do you conduct any scenario analysis based on a low-carbon scenario consistent with reducing GHG emissions by 80% by 2050 to achieve the 2°C goal in your assessment of the economic viability of proved undeveloped and undeveloped reserves?

Yes

OG1.6a

Please describe your analysis and the implications for your capital expenditure plans

1) All investment decisions are tested towards lower oil and gas prices and higher carbon costs then assumed in the base case
2) Statoil carries out regular break even (project costs) analysis for reserves, and this year also how a 2C scenario could impact on break even vs oil/gas price

Further Information

Response to CERES letter:
http://www.statoil.com/en/NewsAndMedia/News/Downloads/Statoil%20response%20to%20Ceres%20letter%209%20October%202013.pdf

Attachments

https://www.cdp.net/sites/2014/32/23132/Investor%20CDP%202014/Shared%20Documents/Attachments/InvestorCDP2014/OG1.Productionreservesbyhydrocarbontype(1Jan2013-31Dec2013)/Statoil%20response%20to%20Ceres%20letter%209%20October%202013.pdf

Page: OG2. Emissions by segment in the O&G value chain - (1 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2013)

OG2.1

Please indicate the consolidation basis (financial control, operational control, equity share) used to report the Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by segment in the O&G value chain. Further information can be provided in the text box in OG2.2

Segment	Consolidation basis for reporting Scope 1 emissions	Consolidation basis for reporting Scope 2 emissions
Exploration, production & gas processing	Operational Control	Operational Control
Storage, transportation & distribution	Operational Control	Operational Control
Refining	Operational Control	Operational Control

OG2.2

Please provide clarification for cases in which different consolidation bases have been used and the level/focus of disclosure. For example, a reporting organization whose business is solely in storage, transportation and distribution (STD) may use the text box to explain why only the STD row has been completed

Scope 1 Emissions related to Storage, transportation & distribution, are included in our Scope 3 emissions.

OG2.3

Please provide masses of gross Scope 1 GHG emissions in units of metric tonnes CO2e for the organization's owned/controlled operations by value chain segment. The values required for 2014 are forward-looking estimates

Segment	Gross Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e) - Reporting year	Gross Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e) - 2014 estimate
Exploration, production & gas processing	11376716	
Refining	4630512	

OG2.4

Please provide masses of gross Scope 2 GHG emissions in units of metric tonnes CO2e for the organization's owned/controlled operations by value chain segment. The values required for 2014 are forward-looking estimates

Segment	Gross Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e) – Reporting year	Gross Scope 2 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e) – 2014 estimate
Exploration, production & gas processing	121277	
Refining	308729	
Storage, transportation & distribution	6592	

Further Information

Exploration, production & gas processing excludes gas processing terminal/facilities, and includes only gas processing on site / platform. Gas processing in terminal /facilities like Sture or Kårstø in Norway are included in Refining figures (MPR). Scope 2 emissions relating to offices, buildings and laboratories are part of Scope 3 reporting.

Page: OG3. Scope 1 emissions by emissions category - (1 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2013)

OG3.1

Please confirm the consolidation basis (financial control, operational control, equity share) used to report Scope 1 emissions by emissions category

Segment	Consolidation basis for reporting Scope 1 emissions by emissions category
Exploration, production & gas processing	Operational Control
Refining	Operational Control

OG3.2

Please provide clarification for cases in which different consolidation bases have been used to report by emissions categories (combustion, flaring, process emissions, vented emissions, fugitive emissions) in the various segments

Consolidation basis is the same for all categories

OG3.3

Please provide masses of gross Scope 1 GHG emissions released into the atmosphere in units of metric tonnes CO2e for the whole organization broken down by emissions categories: combustion, flaring, process emissions, vented emissions, fugitive emissions. The values required for 2014 are forward-looking estimates

Category	Gross Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e) – Reporting year	Gross Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e) – 2014 estimate
Combustion	12258633	
Flaring	1937758	
Process emissions	1072299	
Vented emissions		
Fugitive emissions	738538	

Further Information

Vented emissions are included in the fugitives category

Page: OG4. Transfers & sequestration of CO2 emissions - (1 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2013)

OG4.1

Is your organization involved in the transfer or sequestration of CO2?

Yes

OG4.2

Please indicate the consolidation basis (financial control, operational control, equity share) used to report transfers and sequestration of CO2 emissions

Activity	Consolidation basis
Transfers	
Sequestration of CO2 emissions	Operational Control

OG4.3

Please provide clarification for cases in which different consolidation bases have been used (e.g. for a given activity, capture, injection or storage pathway)

Capture of CO2 from Sleipner gas and storage into saline Utsira formation under the seabed offshore Sleipner.
Capture of CO2 from Snøhvit gas and storage into Stø formation under the seabed offshore Snøhvit

OG4.4

Using the units of metric tonnes of CO2, please provide gross masses of CO2 transferred in and out of the reporting organization (as defined by the consolidation basis). Please note that questions of ownership of the CO2 are addressed in OG4.6

Transfer direction	CO2 transferred – Reporting year
CO2 transferred in	0
CO2 transferred out	0

OG4.5

Please provide clarification on whether any oil reservoirs and/or sequestration system (geological or oceanic) have been included within the boundary of the reporting organization. Provide details, including degrees to which reservoirs are shared with other entities

Capture of CO2 from Sleipner gas and storage of 702177 tonnes in 2013 into saline Utsira formation under the seabed of Sleipner. Utsira formation is used by other entities for disposal/storage.

Capture of CO2 from Snøhvit gas and storage of 468809 tonnes in 2013 into Stø formation under the seabed offshore Snøhvit. Stø formation is not used by other entities for disposal/storage.

OG4.6

Please explain who (e.g. the reporting organization) owns the transferred emissions and what potential liabilities are attached. In the case of sequestered emissions, please clarify whether the reporting organization or one or more third parties owns the sequestered emissions and who has potential liability for them

No transferred emissions. All emissions captured are our own emissions and Statoil is responsible for the storage.

OG4.7

Please provide masses in metric tonnes of gross CO2 captured for purposes of carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) during the reporting year according to capture pathway. For each pathway, please provide a breakdown of the percentage of the gross captured CO2 that was transferred into the reporting organization and the percentage that was transferred out of the organization (to be stored)

Capture pathway in CCS	Captured CO2 (metric tonnes CO2)	Percentage transferred in	Percentage transferred out
Gas stream separation from natural gas purification	702177		
Gas stream separation from natural gas purification	468809		

OG4.8

Please provide masses in metric tonnes of gross CO2 injected and stored for purposes of CCS during the reporting year according to injection and storage pathway

Injection and storage pathway	Injected CO2 (metric tonnes CO2)	Percentage of injected CO2 intended for long-term (>100 year) storage	Year in which injection began	Cumulative CO2 injected and stored (metric tonnes CO2)
CO2 injected into a geological formation or saline formation for long-term storage	702177	100%	1996	14545267
CO2 injected into a geological formation or saline formation for long-term storage	468809	100%	2008	2327285

OG4.9

Please provide details of risk management performed by the reporting organization and/or third party in relation to its CCS activities. This should cover pre-operational evaluation of the storage (e.g. site characterisation), operational monitoring, closure monitoring, remediation for CO2 leakage, and results of third party verification

At Sleipner, the Utsira reservoir is continuously monitored using seismology, and comprehensive models have been developed for calculating how the carbon dioxide moves in the reservoir. The CO2 is contained under an eight hundred metre thick layer of gas-tight cap rock and cannot seep into the atmosphere.

At Snøhvit, a separate pipeline transports the CO2 from the Hammerfest LNG plant back to the Snøhvit field. Until March 2011 the gas was injected and stored in the Tubåen formation while it later has been injected into the Stø formation. This structure lays two thousand five hundred metres beneath the seabed and under the layers in Snøhvit containing gas. The pressure development in the injection well is monitored on a daily basis by using data from the pressure and temperature (PT) gauge installed in the well. In addition, 2D seismic survey was acquired in 2006 in order to establish a 2D-4D reference for further monitoring. A 3D/4D seismic monitoring survey was shot in August 2011 and in 2013 to monitor CO2 movement in the Stø and Tubåen formations. During 2013 monitoring of the injection continued on monthly basis by Fall-Off test. Injection of CO2 has been stable and none well integrity issues are presented for operation of the well. CO2 storage and monitoring is reported yearly to Norwegian authorities (Norwegian Environment Agency) as well as National Inventory Report (NIR) for Snøhvit field Statoil has been participating in most international research initiatives within CO2 storage since we started the Saline Aquifer CO2 storage project (SACS) in 1997. The research activities within CO2 storage include: CO2 storage and risk, CO2 storage operations, CO2 storage monitoring, CO2 transport. The activities are closely related to the ongoing Statoil operations and there is extensive international cooperation where we support and participate in international projects and provide them with real- world data.
For a CCS project to be regarded as a climate change mitigation activity, it is a prerequisite that the geological formations at the selected site have the appropriate long-term containment capability. Many countries have built CCS into their strategies for mitigation measures but the basis for regulating permission and control activities is only to a limited extent in place. We have been actively involved in advising the EU, national governments and international organisations on this matter based on our experience on the Norwegian Continental Shelf.

Further Information

Page: OG5. Sales and emissions intensity of production by hydrocarbon type - (1 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2013)

OG5.1

Please provide values for annual sales of the hydrocarbon types (in units of BOE) for the years given in the following table. The values required are aggregate values for the reporting organization. The values for 2014 are forward-looking estimates

Product	Sales (BOE) - Reporting year	Sales (BOE) - 2014 estimate
Other: Consolidated sales volumes - crude oils	350000000	
Other: Consolidated sales volumes - natural gas	289000000	
Other: Total liquids and gas production estimate		652000000

OG5.2

Please provide estimated emissions (Scope 1 + Scope 2) intensities for the a) exploration, production and gas processing, b) storage, transportation and distribution, and c) refining associated with different hydrocarbon types based on the current production and operations

Year ending	Hydrocarbon type	Emissions intensity: exploration, production & gas processing (metric tonnes CO2e per thousand BOE)	Emissions intensity: storage, transportation & distribution (metric tonnes CO2e per thousand BOE)	Emissions intensity: refining (metric tonnes CO2e per thousand BOE)
2013	Other: Conventional oil and gas	8.9		
2012	Other: Conventional oil and gas	8.1		
2013	Heavy oil	14		
2012	Heavy oil	17		
2013	Extraheavy oil	70		
2012	Extraheavy oil	56		
2013	Other: LNG	27		
2012	Other: LNG	26		
2013	Shale oil	46		
2012	Shale oil	44		

OG5.3

Is your organization involved in the extraction of bitumen from oil sands?

Yes

OG5.3a

Please explain the techniques you have most commonly used and their relative energy intensity

Statoil is currently operating one oil sand asset; the Leismer Demonstration Project (Kai Kos Dehseh) in Canada. The asset is developed in situ using steam assisted gravity drainage (SAGD).
The annual average direct CO2 intensity was 69,7 kg CO2 per barrel in 2013 (Extra heavy oil above).

OG5.4

Please clarify how each of the emissions intensities has been derived and supply information on the methodology used where this differs from information already given in answer to the methodology questions in the main information request

Statoil has disclosed 2020 CO2 intensity targets for the production segments Conventional oil&gas, Heavy oil, Extra heavy oil, LNG and Tight oil. Annual progress against the targets are given in the Annual Report (first time this year) and is verified by auditor

Further Information

Page: OG6. Development strategy - (1 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2013)

OG6.1

For each relevant capital allocation area, please provide financial information for the reporting year

Capital allocation area	Sales generated	Earnings Before Interest, Taxation, Depreciation, Amortization (EBITDA)	Net assets	Capital expenditure	Comment
Other: Consolidated	637400000000	227700000000	356000000000	117400000000	Numbers are representative of our consolidated financial statements in 2013, which can be found in our Annual report. Please refer to page 146, 148 and 86.

OG6.2

Please describe your future capital expenditure plans for different capital allocation areas

Capital allocation area	Capital Expenditure	Total return expected from capital expenditure investments	Comment
Other: Consolidated	120000000000		Based on an exchnage rate 1USD/6NOK, consolidated capital expenditure is expected to be 120 billion in 2014. This is as per our consolidated financial statement, which includes the following detail. The figure is based on Statoil developing organically, and it excludes possible expenditures relating to acquisitions. A substantial proportion of our 2014 capital expenditures will be spent on ongoing and planned development projects in Norway such as Aasta Hansteen and Gina Krog in addition to various extensions, modifications and improvements on currently producing fields, like Gullfaks,

Capital allocation area	Capital Expenditure	Total return expected from capital expenditure investments	Comment
			Oseberg and Troll. We currently estimate that a substantial proportion of our 2014 capital expenditure will be spent on the following ongoing and planned development projects internationally: CLOV in Angola, Mariner in UK, Shah Deniz in Azerbaijan, Marcellus, Eagle Ford and Bakken onshore US and developments offshore US. We currently estimate that most of the 2014 capital expenditures spent on midstream and downstream projects will be related to Polarled, transport solutions for Marcellus Shale Gas and Eagle Ford in the US and on the NCS. Total return expected from capital expenditure investments is based on 2013 RoACE of 11.3%, which as stated in our Annual Report, is expected to stabilise at the 2013 level, based on an oil price of USD 100 per barre l (real 2013).

OG6.3

Please describe your current expenses in research and development (R&D) and future R&D expenditure plans for different capital allocation areas

Capital allocation area	R&D expenses – Reporting year	R&D expenses – Future plans	Comment
Other: Consolidated	3200000000		As per our consolidated financial statement.

Further Information

Page: OG7. Methane from the natural gas value chain - approach & quantification

OG7.1

Please indicate the consolidation basis (financial control, operational control, equity share) used to prepare data to answer the questions in OG7 and OG8

Segment	Consolidation basis
Production	Operational Control
Gathering	Operational Control
Processing	Operational Control
Transmission	Operational Control
Storage	Operational Control

Segment	Consolidation basis
Distribution	Operational Control

OG7.1a

Please provide clarification for cases in which different consolidation bases have been used

There are no cases in which the consolidation basis is different

OG7.2

Does your organization have written operating procedures and/or policies covering the reduction of methane leakage and venting?

Yes

OG7.2a

Please attach the relevant document(s) in the further information field or describe how the written procedures/policies cover these emissions sources

Statoil requirements related to methane emissions are described in Technical Environment standards for design, modification and operation on offshore plants (TR1009) and offshore plants (TR1011).

• Air emissions, including, but not limited to, CO2, NOx, CH4,nmVOC, H2S, SOx and particulates, shall be minimised. Focus shall be given to reduce air emissions by process design and through energy optimisation.

• Production flaring/continuous flaring for gas disposal is not acceptable. Flaring for safety reasons is acceptable, however, the process systems shall be designed to minimise flaring. Each plant/installation shall have operational guidelines in order to minimise flaring.

• Cold venting (venting of unburned gas) shall be avoided

• Methods for controlling and reducing fugitive emissions shall be considered and implemented in the design, operation and maintenance of onshore and offshore facilities. The selection of appropriate valves, flanges, fittings, seals and packings should consider safety and sustainability requirements as well as their capacity to reduce gas leaks and fugitive emissions. Additionally, leak detection and repair programs should be implemented.

• For shale gas operations the following requirements for flow back water or produced water are stated: VOC's (including methane) shall either
a) be captured and made available for use as fuel gas or sales gas

b) ve injected into a geological formation
c) be flared, however, flaring shall be minimised and is only accepted for existing facilities as a temporary solution bases upon an application for deviation

OG7.3

Has your organization set quantitative or qualitative goals for reducing methane leakage and venting?

No

OG7.4

Has your organization published a policy position on the regulation of methane emissions?

No

OG7.5

Does your organization inventory and quantify the methane emissions associated with your operations?

Yes

OG7.5a

Please indicate the proportion of methane emissions inventory estimated using the following methodologies (+/- 5%)

Methodology	Proportion of total methane emissions estimated with methodology	What area of your operations does this answer relate to?
Direct detection and measurement	0%	All
Engineering calculations	>75%	All
Source-specific emission factors (IPCC Tier 3)	5% to <10%	All
IPCC Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 emission factors	0%	All

OG7.5b

Do your operations include the production, gathering and processing stages?

Yes

OG7.5c

Please use the following table to report the proportion of your organization's natural gas production that is emitted into the atmosphere during production (differentiating if possible between production from hydraulically-fractured wells and non-hydraulically-fractured wells), gathering and processing

Stage	Estimate gas leaked or vented expressed as % of gas produced
Overall figure for production (all wells), gathering and processing	0%

Further Information

Proportion of Statoil gas production emitted to the atmosphere during production, transportation and processing is neglectable compared to the total gas production

Page: OG8. Methane from the natural gas value chain - control measures

OG8.1

Are reduced emission completions relevant to your operations?

Yes

OG8.1a

For natural gas wells that are hydraulically-fractured, please complete the table

What proportion of completions and work-overs in the reporting year used reduced emission completion technology for these wells?	If gas is not utilized via reduced emission completion technology, please explain if it is flared or vented	What area of your operations does this answer relate to?
100%	No natural gas wells in Bakken, only oil wells. Gas is flared, not vented	USA only

OG8.2

Is liquids unloading (de-watering) of natural gas wells relevant to your operations?

Yes

OG8.2a

For gas wells with liquids accumulation requiring venting into the atmosphere or some form of artificial liquids unloading, please complete the table

What proportion has technologies in place that reduce methane venting from the liquids unloading process?	If you wish, please add context to this figure	What area of your operations does this answer relate to?
100%	Only stabilized liquids are transferred to tank trucks for transportation, so most vapours are removed prior to transfer	USA only

OG8.3

Does your organization have a program for identifying and replacing or retrofitting high-bleed rate pneumatic controllers powered by natural gas (i.e. controllers that vent more than 6 standard cubic feet per hour)?

Yes

OG8.3a

Please complete the table on high-bleed rate pneumatic controllers

What proportion of the organization's high-bleed controllers have been replaced with low-emission alternatives?	If you wish, please add context to this figure	What area of your operations does this answer relate to?
100%	OG8.3 No pneumatic devices in the Bakken	USA only

OG8.4

Are natural gas compressors relevant to your operations?

Yes

OG8.4a

Please complete the table on natural gas compressors

What proportion of compressors, including those at the wellhead and in gathering and processing, are either reciprocating compressors or centrifugal compressors operating wet seals?	What proportion of these compressors is vented to the atmosphere?	What area of your operations does this answer relate to?
		All

OG8.4b

Please explain measures you are taking to reduce emissions from these sources

OG8.5

Is associated gas relevant to your organization?

Yes

OG8.5a

What is your organization's overall approach for dealing with associated gas in terms of its relative use of venting, flaring and capture (e.g. for sale, re-injection or use as a fuel)? Organizations may differentiate their approach between circumstances where there is/is not a market

Associated gas must be utilized as much as possible, under economic, technological and geological realities (promoting infrastructure, re injection availability, fuel combustion on-site, etc).If none of these options are available for a period of time, a dispensation from company requirements (flaring dispensation) must be given and justified since Statoil has a no production flaring policy. This is the case of our operations in Bakken (North Dakota)

OG8.5b

Outline the measures undertaken to reduce venting for example from tank and casing-head gas

Gas is captured via VRTs, VRUs, or is combusted.

Further Information

CDP