

**From:** ART 4(1) B (TRADE)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 04, 2013 9:14 AM  
**To:** ART 4(1) b (TRADE); ART 4(1) b (ENER); ART 4(1) b (ENER)  
**Subject:** TTIP/ raw materials and energy: report meeting Europa's Climate and Energy Policy Group

We were invited by Europa (the European refineries/downstream association) for a presentation on the TTIP negotiations to Europa's Energy and Climate Policy Group. Present were representatives from ExxonMobil, Statoil, BP, Total, Shell, PKN Orlen, Neste Oil, Repsol, MOL, Lukoil, OGP and Hellenic Petroleum and Europa's Secretariat.

The feedback on the first round of TTIP, Commissioner Oettinger's visit to Washington, DC and an explanation on the next steps was received well. Representatives had all been able to read the position paper and the draft text for the UA DCFTA. They posed questions on the need for specific rules, on off shore safety, transparency and renewables (in which they were also interested). One representative (MOL) referred to implicit export restrictions by some EU MS. Europa asked also whether FQD was part of the negotiations. We asked Europa for further support for the raw materials and energy chapter and for further concrete input, whereby we made a reference to the text for the UA (also explaining this was a compromise text and not our preferred outcome).

Europa stated that they had no formal position on whether there was a need for a specific chapter at this stage, but they certainly supported the idea of liberalising trade and investment in energy. They would study whether they would provide further suggestions. They also asked how they could become more acquainted with the process as such (is the EU also going to organise a stake holder's event?, could they be part of the Civil Society Dialogue?, could they have any input into the Sustainability Impact Assessment that they understand that the Commission is carrying out?). During the short lunch we had some further exchanges on FQD, on fracking, etc.

Art. 4(1) b

[ ]

---

**From:** [ ]\* (TRADE)  
**Sent:** 23 October 2013 14:22  
**To:** [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (ENER); [ ] (ENER); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE);  
[ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE)  
**Cc:** [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE);  
**Subject:** Meeting CEFIC, 22/10/2013, Brussels CEFIC on TTIP and US shale gas - report

Please find below the report from the yesterday's meeting with Cefic and Fertilisers Europe. Regards, [ ]

**Present:** [ ] (Energy, Cefic), [ ] (Industrial Policy, Cefic), [ ] (Fertilisers), [ ] (TRADE), [ ] (Petrochemistry, Cefic), [ ] (Europe)

**Summary:**

Cefic appreciates the work on TTIP and advocates a strong energy chapter creating a legal framework that would also allow for access to US shale gas. In terms of tariffs, they would agree to liberalise the markets, but on a basis of phasing out relevant tariffs spread over time. The cost of energy is very high in the EU, and this would be one of the means to reduce the price gap (currently 1:3, 1:4) between US and EU. Current investments take place in US, investments in the EU almost absent. EU industry is losing out already at the bottom of supply chain (e.g. on ethylene production, the basis for many chemical applications). Commission explained that TTIP will put in the legal framework certain developments, providing legal certainty, that we should be careful not to take on board the EU shale gas discussion and that the negotiations are pitched as a global picture. We also need to reach out to relevant stakeholders (authorities, companies) but we need to do this discretely.

**Full report**



13\_10\_22\_meeting  
CEFIC.doc

\* = all [ ] relate to Article 4(1) b

Meeting CEFIC, 22/10/2013, Brussels CEFIC on TTIP and US shale gas

Present: [ ]\* [ ] [ ] [ ] (TRADE), [ ] [ ] (Petrochemistry, Cefic), [ ] [ ] (Energy, Cefic), [ ] [ ] (Industrial Policy, Cefic), [ ] [ ] (Fertilisers Europe)

Cefic appreciates the work on TTIP and advocates a strong energy chapter creating a legal framework that would also allow for access to US shale gas. In terms of tariffs, they would agree to liberalise the markets, but on a basis of phasing out relevant tariffs spread over time. The cost of energy is very high in the EU, and this would be one of the means to reduce the price gap (currently 1:3, 1:4) between US and EU. Current investments take place in US, investments in the EU almost absent. EU industry is losing out already at the bottom of supply chain (e.g. on ethylene production, the basis for many chemical applications).

Access to US shale gas represents i) **security of supply** through diversification ii) increased **competition** of suppliers on the EU market iii) **price stabilisation** in the context of the widening price gap between EU and US gas prices.

The company agrees that the **price impact** of shale gas imports to the EU is hard to estimate. No significant price decrease can be expected as the capacities available for exports represent 10% of EU dependency. Yet, the company sees its access to US shale gas as one of the ways to stabilise the widening EU/US gas price gap that is currently threatening the competitiveness of the EU petrochemical industry and downstream chemical industry. Also, the value added is also in diversification and increased competition (current suppliers are Russia, Norway and Qatar) on the EU market.

Gas is the main cost driver for 90% of chemical products; the widening EU/US gas price gap threatens the **competitiveness of the EU petrochemical industry** that is forced to pass on its losses down the value chain. This could lead to loss of capacity, loss of chemical industry (lot of SMEs), loss of employment and skill.

Access to US shale gas requires substantial **investment** to be deployed in LNG capacities on the US side; investments in gas hubs in Spain and Portugal, in order to improve South-North pipeline connection required on the EU side. The company projects \$100bil investments in the US; of which 40% to be deployed in the next 5 years. Such investment requires legal certainty on the trade side – removal of export restrictions (tariffs, non-automatic licencing system).

Existing **resource nationalism** on the US side needs to be addressed through awareness raising campaign among stakeholders; taking up of discussion on environmental aspect of shale gas extraction in the US/EU is to be avoided.

Currently EU shifts to US coal since shale gas is not available yet and EU gas prices are high. This raises concerns on climate aspect; to develop on a possibility to develop the idea of **transatlantic carbon market** in the context of TTIP.

\* = all [ ] relate to Article 4(1) b.

[ ]

[ ]

---

From: [ ]\* (TRADE)  
Sent: 18 February 2014 16:47  
To: [ ] (TRADE)  
Cc: [ ] (TRADE)  
Subject: meeting with CEEP (Central European Energy Partners) on TTIP - energy

We met today with CEEP. CEEP is a fairly new organisation representing energy companies and extensive energy consumers (e.g. Achema, Azoty the fertilizers in Poland, but also Arcelor Mittal in Poland) in Central and Eastern Europe (with a focus on Poland for the time being). CEEP feels it is not really aware of what is happening in TTIP, moreover, communication with governments not optimal. CEEP thinks that TTIP may have (positive) consequences for access to new energy supply and may stop or mitigate the leakage of investments to the US. So, it is of their concern.

Upfront, we explained them that we are carrying out the most open negotiations ever, with stakeholder events, consultations and even having a specific Advisory Committee. We also referred to all information that is available on the Internet (they had not seen the non-paper on RM & E). We explained the process/state of play of TTIP, the three pillar structure (market access, regulatory and global rules), the substance (by reference to the non-paper that is on our web site). We also discussed the potential consequences of US lifting the export restrictions.

CEEP satisfied with the meeting and asked whether we would be willing to contribute to their monthly magazine, explaining TTIP and energy. I said that I could not promise, but that I would discuss this. It could be helpful, but happy to hear your views (we would need to check this with [ ] and [ ] I guess). CEEP also referred to an event to be organised with the Atlantic Council in Washington, DC to be held at the end of March/in the beginning of April. He asked whether we could be present (or for that matter somebody from US DEL). They will send an invitation. Finally, they asked for an opportunity to participate in the next stakeholder event and make a presentation. We will check.

[ ]

[ ]  
[ ]



European Commission  
DG TRADE

[ ]

CHAR [ ]  
B-1049 Brussels/Belgium  
+32 2 299 [ ]

[ ]

\* = all [ ] relate to Art 4(1) b.



[ ]

all [ ] relate to Article 4(1)b.

From: [ ] (TRADE)  
Sent: 03 April 2014 19:51  
To: [ ] (TRADE)  
Cc: [ ] (TRADE)  
Subject: BG Group - 02/04/2014 - report - TTIP relevant

ENER held a meeting with BG Group on 02/04/2014. TRADE was invited to participate.

Participants: [ ], BG's [ ]; BG's [ ]  
[ ], G+ [ ]  
EC: [ ] DG ENER; [ ]  
[ ] DG ENER; [ ] DG TRADE; [ ]  
[ ], DG ENER; [ ]  
[ ], DG ENER

BG Group plc is a British multinational oil and gas company headquartered in Reading, United Kingdom. It has operations in 25 countries across Africa, Asia, Australasia, Europe, North America and South America and produces around 680,000 barrels of oil equivalent per day. It has a major Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) business. As at 31 December 2009 it had total proven commercial reserves of 2.6 billion barrels (410,000,000 m3) of oil equivalent. BG Group is listed on the London Stock Exchange and is a constituent of the FTSE 100 Index. As of 6 July 2012 it had a market capitalisation of £44.9 billion, the seventh-largest of any company listed on the London Stock Exchange.

Trade related aspects of the discussions: LNG market increased over past years its capacity and flexibility (see LNG response to Fukushima disaster.) According to BG, Europe can be LNG market destination if the price signal is right. In general terms, given the lower transport costs, the price offer matching or slightly below Asian price could be already an incentive (depending how much Europeans wants to pay premium for diversification). BG holds a non FTA export licence for Lake Charles (US), [ Art 4(2) ]

[ ] estimates that in 3.5 years the DOE process for all pending applications will be over. FERC is another issue though. BG states that FERC permits are lengthy (15 months) and costly (100 million dollar figure (?) was mentioned). Yet, rather than authorisation process, the cap on development of terminals is given by interest of buyers. BG mentions that their licence/law include a possibility for the licence to be revoked in case of national interest (if no sufficient supplies are available for domestic market).

\*  
= all [ - . . . ] relate to Article 4(1) b,  
except for where otherwise indicated.





From: [ ] (TRADE)  
Sent: 03 October 2014 14:19  
To: [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (ENER)  
Cc: [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (EEAS-WASHINGTON)  
Subject: TTIP and energy: Meeting with API and oil and gas majors (01/10/2014)

Present: [ ] (CHEVRON), [ ] (ConocoPhillips), [ ] (ExxonMobil), [ ] (API), [ ] (Hess Corporation), [ ] (Shell)

API referred to the finalization of the paper that is being drafted with OGP. They indicated that they apply two tests in their paper (energy specific v. energy horizontally) and whether provisions should be part of a trade agreement or not. Industry plays specific attention to access to infrastructure and transit rules. We asked API also to elaborate on local content in their industry.

Most important part of the meeting focused on the developments in the US regarding the lifting of the oil (and gas) restrictions. Industry expects that either there may be a window of opportunity for the Administration to lift restrictions in the coming 6-9 months or that first incremental steps are being taken by the Administration leading to a bigger step later on. *ARTICLE 4(2) first indent*

Important question is whether Senate will flip to a Republican majority or not. There may be a hearing organized in Congress by Barton (Texas). Industry also mentioned that more reports are coming up (Brookings, Columbia). *ARTICLE 4(2) first indent*

reference was made by the industry to the setup of a TTIP caucus and an Energy Trade caucus on the Hill.

[ ]  
[ ]



European Commission  
DG TRADE

CHAR ( )  
B-1049 Brussels/Belgium  
+32 2 29 ( )

[ .... ] relate to Article 4(1)-b, except for where otherwise indicated.

[ ]

---

**From:** [ ]\* (TRADE)  
**Sent:** 23 October 2014 17:08  
**To:** [ ] DE: [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE-ENER)  
**Cc:** [ ] WASHINGTON); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (EEAS-WASHINGTON); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE)  
**Subject:** TTIP - report - CEEP 23/10/2014

CEEP: [ ]  
DG Trade: [ ]

Meeting was organised at the request of CEEP interested in a bilateral exchange on the progress of TTIP negotiations (RME chapter). CEEP raised three issues: (i) 'rumours' on a *de facto* pause in negotiations due to the upcoming Senate elections; (ii) cost of ETS/EU CO2 policies for EU businesses and whether this could be addressed/is discussed in TTIP; (iii) any development in the US towards having Raw Material and Energy Chapter in TTIP.

We clarified that despite political reshuffling the talks on technical level continue. EU is advocating having a specific chapter, yet, the question of form is left open for the time being. We clarified that there is no mandate to negotiate CO2 related issues within TTIP. Moreover, a clear political commitment has been made that we will not compromise on our environmental standards in order to reach an agreement in TTIP.

CEEP reiterated the importance of TTIP to deliver access to raw materials and energy for EU industry – in terms of security of supply and competitiveness. CEEP informed that it envisages to present a joint paper prepared together with Atlantic Council at Energy Global Forum in Istanbul (20/11). The paper will make point on importance of building a North-South corridor for Central Europe in order to increase the energy security of the region. In this context, TTIP will be mentioned as a vehicle for ensuring access to US LNG and facilitating construction of the appropriate infrastructure on both side of the Atlantic. CEEP might follow up on ETS point with MS.

all [ - - - ] relate to Article 4(1)b.

[ (TRADE)

From: [ (TRADE)  
Sent: 28 November 2014 15:19  
To: [ (TRADE); [ (TRADE); [ (TRADE);  
[ (TRADE); [ (EEAS-WASHINGTON); [ (TRADE);  
[ (ENER)  
Cc: [ (TRADE); [ (TRADE); [ (TRADE); [ (TRADE);  
[ (TRADE)  
Subject: TTIP and energy: meeting with OGP and several members

Present: OGP [ ] CHEVRON [ ] EXXONMOBIL [ ] and ENI [ ]  
[ ] and [ ] (DG TRADE)

Short meeting with OGP (Oil and Gas Producers) and some of its members to discuss state of play. DG TRADE sketched the current state of play of the negotiations, the discussion during the last round, the announced fresh start, incl. the meeting scheduled between Commissioner Malmstrom and USTR Froman and gave some feed back on meetings in US with API and oil and gas majors. OGP mentioned that it is preparing a paper together with API laying down their common view on the issues/principles related to energy to be covered in TTIP. Paper concentrated on substance rather than on form. Further discussion on the political development in the US as well as the importance export restrictions on oil and gas play in TTIP. OGP wants the political level to be aware of the significance of the transatlantic consensus reached across upstream and large part of downstream (winners and losers) companies on a need to lift the export restrictions as a matter of principle and credibility of the agreement. Idea of global energy rules in TTIP generally accepted, continued divide over the fear that ambitious RME chapter could delay successful conclusion. Follow-up meeting planned beginning of next year to discuss OGP/API's paper.

[ ]  
[ ]

  
**European Commission**  
DG TRADE

CHAR [ ]  
B-1049 Brussels/Belgium  
+32 2 2 [ ]  
[ ]

*all [ . . . . ] relate to Article 4(1)b.*



[ ]

---


From: [ ]  
Sent: 02 March 2015 20:38  
To: [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE)  
Cc: [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (ENER); [ ] (TRADE)  
Subject: meeting with AREVA

Present: [ ] (AREVA), [ ]  
[ ] (report)

Meeting with AREVA to discuss nuclear issues and renewable energy. Discussion on trade barriers from nuclear industry within the EU and outside the EU. Allegedly, financing of nuclear power plants is a real issue and more important than the competition on technology (cf. also discussion on Hinkley Point). [ Art 4(2) ]

Discussion on how third party rules in TTIP could facilitate trade and investment. AREVA is not in favour of harmonisation of safety standards as there are no standards at EU level. EURATOM is a more appropriate forum.

Further discussion on green goods, i.e. special technique to increase energy value of biomass (torrefaction) and off-shore wind power. According to AREVA, the latter two issues deserve special attention and should not be liberalised straight away. AREVA will supply further information.

[ ]  
[ ]  
  
European Commission  
DG TRADE  
[ ]  
CHAR [ ]  
B-1049 Brussels/Belgium  
[ ]

all [ ] relate to Article 4(1) b,  
except where otherwise indicated.

[ ]\*

---

**From:** [ ] (TRADE)  
**Sent:** 05 March 2015 19:13  
**To:** [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE-WASHINGTON);  
[ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (TRADE); [ ] (EEAS-  
WASHINGTON)  
**Cc:** [ ] (TRADE)  
**Subject:** 04/03/2015 Chevron - TTIP - report

Chevron: [ ] (law department), [ ] (Brussels office), [ ] (Weil, law firm)  
TRADE: [ ] [ ] (report)

Short meeting organised at the request of the company interested in the overall progress of the negotiations, the dynamics and the main elements of the discussion. [ ] briefed according to the usual line. On energy, [ ] presented our interest to solve in TTIP our bilateral issues, set rules on energy trade and investment beyond WTO (e.g. transit through pipelines, trading monopolies, non-discriminatory accessed to monopolised infrastructure) as a stepping stone for global standard, as well as our wish to work on consolidation of existing common environmental principles (e.g. offshore safety) and disciplines for renewable energy and energy efficiency. Several example of a geopolitical value of such a chapter were discussed (UA, Central Asia, Russia). Chevron asked principally questions on ISDS and was interested in the dynamic and arguments used in the current debate in the EU.

[ ]  
**European Commission**  
DG TRADE  
[ ]  
CHAR [ ]  
B-1049 Brussels/Belgium  
+32 2 : [ ]  
[ ]

\* = all [ ] relate to Article 4(1) b.



**From:** [REDACTED] (TRADE)  
**Sent:** 19 May 2015 17:15  
**To:** [REDACTED] (TRADE); [REDACTED] (TRADE); [REDACTED] (TRADE); [REDACTED] (TRADE); [REDACTED] (TRADE-WASHINGTON); [REDACTED] (EEAS-WASHINGTON); [REDACTED] (EEAS-WASHINGTON)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] (CAB-MALMSTROM); [REDACTED] (TRADE); [REDACTED] (TRADE); [REDACTED] (TRADE); [REDACTED] (TRADE)  
**Subject:** 19/05/2015 Dow Chemical Company - TTIP - report

TRADE: [ ] (CAB-MALMSTROM [ ]), [ ] (DG TRADE) - report  
Dow Chemical Company: attached list of participants

The meeting was organised at the company's request. [ ] outlined broadly the internal functioning of COM, relations between cabinets and DGs and inter-institutional balance. US being the most important trading partner of the EU, TTIP features high among the 10 priorities of Juncker's COM. [ ] explained the strategic, political and economic importance of this agreement, with regulatory cooperation being one of the main novelties and deliverables of the negotiations. As regards the economic interest, EU seeks further opening of the US market for services, government procurement and GIs. Dow Chemicals inquired about the expected timing of TTIP. Sequencing TPA-TTP-TTIP was briefly discussed and Dow Chemicals expressed an optimistic outlook for an early passage of TPA in the Senate (May) and in the House (June). Certain aspects of TPA amendments were briefly touched upon, in particular, LNG related ones and a politically sensitive proposal concerning imports from the Occupied Palestinian Territory. The company raised the issue of GMOs and the importance of a solution for US farmers in TTIP. [ ] responded to the claim stressing EU's respect of the Single Market and the existing authorisation framework at the first place. On energy, Dow Chemicals expressed an understanding and no opposition as such to EU's proposal for an energy title in TTIP. The company commented on the internal prospects of liberalisation of LNG exports that are likely to progress in parallel to the discussions on energy in TTIP (question of markets, not necessarily of TTIP). Crude oil trade could follow (Ex. oil condensates). Finally, the company expressed the importance of GCC and benefits of an eventual re-start of the negotiation process.



Dow Visitors  
190515.pdf

[ ]

\* = all ~~not~~ [ . . . . ] relate to Article 4(1) b.



# Embassy Field trips Brussels – USA Embassy – morning of Tuesday 19th May



	Name	Titles	DOB	Passport information	Nationality	Embassy
1	[ ]*			1	American	
2	[ ]				American	
3	[ ]				American	
4	[ ]				American	
5	[ ]				American	
6	[ ]			27	Swiss	
7	[ ]				American	
8	[ ]				American	
9	[ ]				British	
10	[ ]				German	

DOW RESTRICTED

156

# Embassy Field trips Brussels – USA Embassy – morning of Tuesday 19th May



ISASUMMIT

	Name	Titles	DOB	Passport information	Nationality	Embassy
	Back ups					
11	[ ]				American	
12	[ ]				American	

American