From: [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE)

Sent: 26 November 2015 12:11
To: [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE)

Subject: FW: 28/05/2015 TTIP - ConocoPhillips - report

fout of scopel

From: [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE)

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 12:16 PM

To: GARCIA BERCERO Ignacio (TRADE); [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE); (TRADE-WASHINGTON); (EEAS-WASHINGTON); (TRADE)

Cc: [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE); [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE); (TRADE)

Subject: 28/05/2015 TTIP - ConocoPhillips - report

ConocoPhillips: [Art. 4.1(b)]

FleishmanHillard:

Trade

The meeting was organised at company's request. The discussion focused on the US export ban on crude oil and why lifting of the ban should be an EU ask, within or outside TTIP. The company presented its geopolitical, systemic and economic arguments in favour of the lifting of the ban and inquired about the state of play of the discussion on this topic within TTIP. The company reiterated that unlike in case of LNG, the mere fact of concluding an FTA will not deliver the desired result as the lifting of the ban remains largely a domestic issue. The company explained that while there is a general agreement on the principle among the producers in the US, some might be satisfied with a targeted removal (e.g. CAN, MX, condensates) without spending too much of the PR capital for the ban to be lifted globally. The company wondered, in case the lifting of the ban would remain attached to TTIP discussion, whether we would not be heading for rather long term perspective and inquired also about the EU position should the US move towards a domestic decision outside TTIP to remove the ban. COM (PS) indicated that the EU would welcome any early solution that could be found domestically, without TTIP being needed to feature in such debate.

[out of scope]

 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{[Art. 4.1(b)]} \\ \textbf{Policy Officer - Energy and Conflict Minerals} \end{array}$

European Commission

DG TRADE

Unit G3 Market Access, Industry, Energy and Raw Materials

[Art. 4.1(b)]