Welcome to your CDP Climate Change Questionnaire 2022

C0. Introduction

C0.1

(C0.1) Give a general description and introduction to your organization.

Aker BP is an independent exploration and production company conducting exploration, development and production activities on the Norwegian Continental Shelf (NCS). Measured in production, Aker BP is one of the largest independent oil companies in Europe. Aker BP is the operator of Alvheim, Ivar Aasen, Skarv, Valhall, Hod, Ula and Tambar, a partner in the Johan Sverdrup field and holds a total of 124 licenses, including non-operated licences.

Towards the end of 2021, Aker BP ASA made an agreement to acquire Lundin Energy's oil and gas related activities on the NCS.

Aker BP's assets and activities are mainly based in Norway and within the Norwegian offshore tax regime. The company is headquartered at Fornebu outside Oslo and has offices in Stavanger, Trondheim, Harstad and Sandnessjøen.

Aker BP ASA is owned by Aker ASA (37,14%), BP p.l.c. (27,85%) and other shareholders (35,01%). The company is listed on the Oslo Børs (Stock Exhange) with ticker "AKRBP". Information about Aker BP entities included in the consolidated financial statements is available to the public. Read more about Aker BP at www.akerbp.com

At the end of 2021, Aker BP had 1,839 employees. There were no significant changes to the organisation or supply chain in 2021. Aker BP purchased goods and services for about USD 3 billion and engaged around 1,400 direct suppliers in 2021, mainly within the oil and gas service sector. Most Aker BP suppliers are based in Norway or in Europe and are generally contracted for high-technology services such as engineering, equipment and drilling and well services, or leasing of rigs and marine services.

In 2021, the company's CO2 intensity was 4.8 kg CO2 per boe (equity share). This is about one third of the industry average, and puts us firmly among the most carbon efficient E&P companies globally. Our goal is to stay below 5 kg per boe and continue efforts to improve further. The upstream methane intensity was 0.02 percent.

All our offshore operations are in Norway and have scope 1 and scope 2 emissions. Material Scope 3 emissions are accounted for and have been a focus area in 2021.

Aker BP acknowledges the substantial challenge posed by global climate change and our responsibility to contribute to the solution. To meet the obligations in the Paris Agreement, the Norwegian government has committed to a minimum emission reduction of 50 percent by 2030. Aker BP is thus subject to this commitment. In addition to this obligation, our emission levels are controlled and limited by authority permits for each asset, strict environmental regulations

and specific Norwegian Continental Shelf (NCS) standards. Aker BP is committed to undertaking necessary changes in the way we conduct our business, and we will continue to strategically position ourselves to reach a 50 percent emission reduction in the 2030s, and close to zero emissions in 2050. We use 2005 as our base year when calculating 50 percent emission reduction in the 2030s, aligned with the NCS industry collaboration KonKraft.

C0.2

(C0.2) State the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.

	Start date	End date	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years	Select the number of past reporting years you will be providing emissions data for
Reporting year	January 1, 2021	December 31, 2021	Yes	3 years

C0.3

(C0.3) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.

Norway

C0.4

(C0.4) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.

USD

C0.5

(C0.5) Select the option that describes the reporting boundary for which climate-related impacts on your business are being reported. Note that this option should align with your chosen approach for consolidating your GHG inventory.

Operational control

C-OG0.7

(C-OG0.7) Which part of the oil and gas value chain and other areas does your organization operate in?

Row 1

Oil and gas value chain

Upstream

Other divisions

C0.8

(C0.8) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?

Indicate whether you are able to provide a unique identifier for your organization	Provide your unique identifier
Yes, an ISIN code	NO0010345853
Yes, a Ticker symbol	AKRBP

C1. Governance

C1.1

(C1.1) Is there board-level oversight of climate-related issues within your organization?

Yes

C1.1a

(C1.1a) Identify the position(s) (do not include any names) of the individual(s) on the board with responsibility for climate-related issues.

Position of individual(s)	Please explain
Board Chair	Climate challenge is recognized by Aker BP and the Board chair, together with the Board of Directors have direct ownership of climate related objectives and expectations in the Aker BP's strategy. They have a leadership and supervisory role in all corporate social responsibility matters, including climate-related issues, and review and guide the major plans of action when it comes to investment decisions for climate initiatives. As an example, for the NOAKA development project, power from shore is included as base case in the projects concept development phase, which will result in close to zero emissions from this asset. The power from shore concept for the development is broadly communicated externally and will be part of the final investment decision to be made by the Board committee in 2022. All members of the Board are considered independent of the Executive management team. Production and CO2-emissions KPI's and project targets are included as part of the company's incentive structure. Climate strategy is incorporated in the business management system and anchored in the corporate HSSEQ policy and plans for 2020.

Board-level committee	Health, Safety, Security and Environment («HSSE») and Corporate Social Responsibility («CSR») are of paramount importance to the Board of Directors of Aker BP. The Board recognizes its responsibility for the safety of people and the environment and devotes appropriate time and resources to comply with all regulations and strives to adhere to the highest HSSE standards. We have one board member that is the CEO of a listed, specialized Carbon Capture company. The reason for which is, among others, to further increase the board competence and experience on Sustainability matters. Since the Board of Directors have direct ownership of climate related objectives and expectations in Aker BP's climate strategy, they have established an Audit and Risk Committee that oversees Aker BP's Financial business risks and opportunities. The Audit and Risk Committee monitors and reviews the company's business risks, including climate risks and opportunities.

C1.1b

(C1.1b) Provide further details on the board's oversight of climate-related issues.

Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Please explain
Scheduled – some meetings	Reviewing and guiding strategy Reviewing and guiding major plans of action Reviewing and guiding risk management policies Reviewing and guiding annual budgets Reviewing and guiding business plans Setting performance objectives Monitoring implementation and performance of objectives	The company's annual strategy process has a separate work stream to quantify our climate-related performance and related risks and opportunities. We project our performance going forward, and define a target we want to achieve. Thereafter we agree initiatives to be worked on during the strategy period to achieve this target. The board has ownership to the climate related issues and review and guide the major plans of action when it comes to investment decisions for climate initiatives. The strategy, objectives and levers we use are anchored in the Executive Management Team, and communicated throughout the company. It is supported by our annual Sustainability report, which provides transparency concerning our holistic sustainability performance - including climate-related issues. Risks and opportunities are reviewed and

	Overseeing major capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures Monitoring and overseeing progress against goals and targets for addressing climate-related issues	guidance given as to how climate related risk is part of the company performance objectives. The Board will also monitor and oversee progress against goals and targets set for short-term and long-term perspectives. Business plans are reviewed alongside budgets to set the correct strategic priorities for climate related issues.

C1.1d

(C1.1d) Does your organization have at least one board member with competence on climate-related issues?

	Board member(s) have competence on climate-related issues	Criteria used to assess competence of board member(s) on climate-related issues
Row 1	Yes	As an Exploration and production company AkerBP see the need to align with the Paris agreement. Climate related issues are relevant to our business and board members are expected to stay updated on and challenge AkerBP on climate related issues relevant to AkerBP's business. The criteria includes creating value for our shareholders though making climate related decisions for the company on an ongoing basis. Several of our board members also serve on the boards of/in the management teams of companies in the green energy technology space, with expert and updated knowledge of ESG trends and technology development.

C1.2

(C1.2) Provide the highest management-level position(s) or committee(s) with responsibility for climate-related issues.

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)	Responsibility	Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Chief Financial Officer (CFO)	Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Chief Operating Officer (COO)	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly

Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Other, please specify Energy Forum	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Chief Procurement Officer (CPO)	Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Sustainability committee	Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Environmental, Health, and Safety manager	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Environment/ Sustainability manager	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Other C-Suite Officer, please specify VP Strategy & Portfolio	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly

C1.2a

(C1.2a) Describe where in the organizational structure this/these position(s) and/or committees lie, what their associated responsibilities are, and how climate-related issues are monitored (do not include the names of individuals).

Aker BP supports the Paris Agreement's goal to keep the increase in global average temperature to below 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels. To meet the obligations in the Paris Agreement, the Norwegian government has committed to a minimum emission reduction of 50 percent by 2030. Aker BP is committed to undertaking necessary changes in the way we conduct our business, and we will continue to strategically position ourselves to reach a 50 percent emission reduction in 2030, and near-zero emissions in 2050. We use 2005 as our base year when calculating 50 percent emission reduction in 2030, aligned with the NCS industry collaboration KonKraft.

Aker BP's business strategy is to integrate climate and energy management in all our operations and to implement climate efficient solutions in the entire company. The Board Chair together with the Board of Directors have direct ownership of climate-related objectives and expectations in Aker BP's climate strategy. The Board of Directors are responsible for the major investment decisions in Aker BP, hence also all major climate related investment decisions. Aker BP's KPI on CO2 emissions is included as part of the company's incentive structure.

Aker BP work by promoting and investing in innovative energy solutions and have established a long-term Research & Development (R&D) strategy to invest in climate related research. We

work with climate by setting the tone from the top leadership (Board and Executive management team) with expectations and policy setting. Our Energy forum (established in 2017) is used to support and challenge the organisation in their climate objectives and actions. Leaders and all employees take ownership and adhere to climate objectives. The entire company and all operations shall work to meet the strategic directions and objectives. We put in place efficient and well-established processes, key performance indicators (KPI) and routines for monitoring and managing climate initiatives and energy efficiency.

The roles and responsibilities are clearly stated in our common governing model for Climate and Energy Efficient Solutions. The following positions are responsible for climate related issues:

Executive management team (CEO, CFO, COO, CSO (SVP HSSEQ), C-Suite Officer Strategy & Business Development):

- Commitment and accountability to support the Paris Agreement
- Accountability to reduce our emissions in line with national and international climate expectations
- Sponsorship of the Energy Forum (COO, CSO, C-Suite Officer Strategy & Business Development)

Energy Forum:

- Nominated persons in management to identify, discuss and plan climate management activities
- Challenge and support the business to deliver in accordance with climate related objectives and expectations
- Ensure availability of information and necessary resources
- Bring in external perspectives and ensure measures for continuous improvement
- Share experience and best practice across the organisation
- Ensure climate review with the business, including risk and opportunity inputs

Leaders (CPO, Sustainability committee, Environmental Health and Safety manager, Environment/Sustainability manager and VP Strategy & Portfolio):

- Ensure all employees, assets, and installations adhere to climate related objectives and expectations
- Identify, prioritise and follow-up opportunities for improving climate and energy management performance
- Act as role models

Employees:

- All employees in our company are expected to follow our climate related objectives and expectations
- Develop a climate management mind-set and challenge established truths
- Bring in ideas and suggestions for energy efficiency initiatives including continuous improvement

Climate is monitored and managed monthly by review of key performance indicators such as CO2 intensity per asset and aggregated for the company, following market trends, operational costs including CO2 costs (taxes, climate allowances etc.)

C1.3

(C1.3) Do you provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues, including the attainment of targets?

	Provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues	Comment
Row 1	Yes	CO2 intensity goal is part of incentive structure in Aker BP through company specific KPIs.

C1.3a

(C1.3a) Provide further details on the incentives provided for the management of climate-related issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Entitled to incentive	Type of incentive	Activity incentivized	Comment
Corporate executive team	Monetary reward	Efficiency target	Efficiency target (kg CO2/boe) is one of nine company wide KPI's and incentives are based on how well Aker BP delivers on the key performing indicators.
All employees	Monetary reward	Efficiency target	All employees who are salary based can receive a monetary reward based on Aker BP's performance. Efficiency target is a company wide KPI and incentives are based on how well Aker BP delivers on the key performing indicators.
Corporate executive team	Non-monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Environmental criteria included in purchases Supply chain engagement	Supply chain is engaged in the process to include environmental criteria in purchases. Several of our supply vessels are using dual fuel (LNG+MGO). By using dual fuel, we have saved more than 2500 ton CO2 per year since 2020. Conversion of two of our long-term supply vessels, to hybrid configurations by installing batteries, has reduced these CO2 emissions by 10-12 %
Management group	Monetary reward	Efficiency target	Production KPIs and project targets are included in the incentive structure for relevant managers. Climate strategy and energy management are included in the corporate performance management system, strategic priorities, and asset specific HSSE plans.

Management group	Non-monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Energy reduction target Environmental criteria included in purchases Supply chain engagement	Employee recognition in line with our values in a team setting when achieving emissions reductions and climate focus. Energy efficiency achievements are communicated to the whole company during regular company town hall meetings. Examples of the achievements include: Several of our supply vessels are using dual fuel (LNG+MGO). By using dual fuel, we have saved more than 2500 ton CO2 per year since 2020. Conversion of two of our long term supply vessels, to hybrid configurations by installing batteries, has reduced these CO2 emissions by 10-12 %.
Chief Financial Officer (CFO)	Non-monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Energy reduction target Supply chain engagement	Performance is measured based on how well Aker BP delivers on the key performing indicators such as emission reduction targets, energy reduction targets and supply chain engagement.

C2. Risks and opportunities

C2.1

(C2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities?

Yes

C2.1a

(C2.1a) How does your organization define short-, medium- and long-term time horizons?

	From (years)	To (years)	Comment
Short-term	0	3	The short-term horizon reflects one where our measures contribute to positioning ourselves to meet the low-carbon economy recognised in the Paris Agreement and obligations for annual reductions in CO2 emissions. Risks and opportunities are pre-dominantly of operational character.
Medium-term	3	10	The medium-term horizon reflects a reduction of CO2 emissions (gross) by 50 percent within 2030 – a goal of significant importance and embedded in our low-cost, low-carbon strategy. In a medium-term perspective we consider a broader set of elements and mechanisms expected to be affected by or instituted to address the climate challenge, such as: market, regulatory, technical, reputation, physical

			and operational factors. Energy efficiency, flaring reduction, fuel switching (from diesel to gas), electrification, fugitive emissions (methane) and detailed emission reporting are mid-term strategies to Aker BP. Risks and opportunities are predominantly of tactical nature.
Long-term	10	25	The long-term horizon reflects one with highly energy efficient operations and low carbon footprint in a market still dependent on oil and gas. Supply of electrical power from shore to offshore installations is a long-term objective in our climate strategy. Our long-term horizon reflects close to zero CO2 emissions by 2050. Risks and opportunities are predominantly of strategic nature.

C2.1b

(C2.1b) How does your organization define substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

We define substantive financial impact as 20 % decrease in revenue, and greater than 5% reduction in earnings (EBITDA).

Effects of important climate risk and opportunities identified through our common Enterprise risk management process are evaluated as an integral part of our business plan process. The business plan update considers quantified effects, and the totality is measured against financial impact. Material changes to regulatory framework conditions such as emission cost or taxes meeting the financial thresholds may trigger change in strategic direction. Changes to strategic direction is managed as part of the Company governance and management processes.

C2.2

(C2.2) Describe your process(es) for identifying, assessing and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities.

Value chain stage(s) covered

Direct operations

Upstream

Risk management process

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment

More than once a year

Time horizon(s) covered

Short-term

Medium-term

Long-term

Description of process

Aker BP uses an enterprise risk management process where risks and opportunities are identified and managed at all levels (activity, asset, business unit and Company) to enable us to maximise opportunities, minimise threats and optimise achievements of performance objectives. We address and manage risks and opportunities across business units throughout the asset value chain and Aker BP, covering mainly direct operations and upstream. The time horizons covered are short-term, medium-term, and long-term as relevant. We use a common infrastructure that enables a holistic risk and barrier management approach on all levels. The Risk and Barrier Policy includes:

– Risk and barrier governing principle, bodies and reporting structure
– Risk and barrier process framework and infrastructure
– Risk reduction and barrier management

The governing structure is set up to manage risks and opportunities effectively and provide information where needed. The risk and opportunity management process is dynamic, and the risks and opportunities are updated and reported when significant changes occur. The Executive Management Team (EMT) and Board of Directors review status monthly. A quarterly review is performed by the Audit and Risk Committee as well as the Safety and Environment Assurance Committee. The EMT review risks and opportunities upfront of the Board of Directors review.

Risks and opportunities are identified both as a result from our internal activity set as well as from various sources such as regulators, industry initiatives, NGOs, public perception, investors, and mapped in appropriate tools. Risk registers are maintained and updated continuously for both activities and business processes. Important risks (including climate related risk) from across business units are communicated to and reviewed at all company levels on a regular basis. Risk management in Aker BP follows the international standard ISO 31000. Risks and opportunities are analysed, evaluated and mapped to our common company risk matrix, including consequence categories for Personnel, Environment (including climate), Financial, Reputation, and Project cost and schedule impact. The risks and opportunities are categorized based on probability and associated consequence.

Climate risk is followed up as one of the integrated company wide risks. Aker BP has implemented a policy for climate and energy efficiency reflecting the core climate risk management principles. Energy efficiency and low emission operations are a core factor shaping our business strategy. Aker BP actively analyse the potential substantive financial impact for climate related risks and opportunities to guide course of action to meet the expectations of stakeholders and the market. Actions require significant change and long-term commitments and investments.

C2.2a

(C2.2a) Which risk types are considered in your organization's climate-related risk assessments?

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Current regulation	Relevant, always included	Aker BP activities are concentrated on the Norwegian Continental shelf, as such, Aker BP is pre-dominantly affected by Norwegian regulatory framework, but also by certain industry-wide regulatory frameworks in the EU. Regulation updates are received from several reliable regulatory agencies Norwegian Environment Agency (NEA), Petroleum Safety Authority (PSA), EU, etc. On a corporate level, the regulatory regime is being continuously monitored and evaluated by the Strategy and Business Development team as well as Legal and Compliance team in Aker BP. On Business Unit level, current regulatory issues are part of the standard internal risk assessment and reporting related to the Enterprise Risk Management process. Regulatory framework issues play an important role for Aker BP's access to geographical locations, opening/closing for exploration, and restrictions/ requirements to technology proposed for production concepts. Regulatory requirements connected to our technology choices and how this links to climate: The technology chosen for a development project is closely linked to climate impacts as it often sets the boundary for the level of climate efficiency a production facility can deliver, and as such improve carbon foot-print from our production facilities. So, regulations to technology in many ways sets out the minimum threshold a production facility and the associated energy efficiency requirements it must meet. A detailed case example is that power from shore must, as part of the regulatory offshore production license application process, be evaluated as a primary source to power the offshore installation over that of prior practises – gas turbine powered offshore installation. The evaluation is mandatory for any approval submissions (Plan for Development and Operations) to the regulatory authorities.
Emerging regulation	Relevant, always included	The impact of emerging regulations with regards to climate impact and other topics is an important risk factor assessed for business implications, and investment decision-making in Aker BP. Emerging regulations notifications are typically received through the Norwegian Oil and Gas Association (NOROG) which includes options for Aker BP to comment and influence the emerging changes. Emerging regulation notifications include both national, regional and EU/international regulations. NOROG as organisation submits comments on behalf of the Norwegian oil and gas industry. For national regulations (i.e. Norwegian Environment Agency (NEA) and Petroleum Safety Authority (PSA)) Aker BP also provides an impact assessment and comments directly on notifications to the regulatory bodies. All significant anticipated effect of emerging regulations is evaluated through

		sensitivity modelling run by Strategy and Business Development team. Intelligence to support evaluation of effects of both policy and technology is sought from multiple external sources, e.g. IEA and BP. Risks related to emerging regulations are made an integral part of Aker BP's risk assessment process and assessed for economic impact (or Company robustness) based on scenario modelling against our break-even sanction target for new investments. A case example of emerging regulation risk is the climate quota permits. In a scenario of increased emissions costs, Aker BP would become more competitive relative to other impacted producers given our relatively low portfolio carbon emission levels. A material increase in taxes and fees could however impact our operating cost and hence profitability. Changes in framework conditions, e.g. CO2 price, is included in business planning and investment criteria, and the Aker BP risk matrix. All our projects are tested against a range of carbon price assumptions, which include a base case and a climate-related scenario. These assumptions are updated on a quarterly basis. Our latest revision includes (1) a base case, showing a total carbon price rising from around USD 112/tCO2 in 2021, to around USD 255/t CO2 by 2030 (in real 2021 terms), and (2) a climate-related scenario, which reflects a faster increase in price, with the total price reaching around USD 273/t CO2 by 2030 (real 2021 terms). These assumptions exceed the carbon prices under the IEA scenarios.
Technology	Relevant, always included	Aker BP has identified several concrete strategic pathways for carbon emission reduction: electrification of the greenfield developments with power supplied from shore or wind, energy optimisation and focus on technologies and processes for improved energy efficiency, as well as other R&D projects and technology developments aimed at improved emission performance such us for example reduced rig time, remote operations enabling reduced fuel consumption, reduced use of materials with high CO2 footprint etc. Aker BP could face a risk of the costs associated with these technologies being higher than forecasted, making it more expensive for the Aker BP to reach the stated emission reduction targets. As an example, a significant increase in the future power costs, may negatively affect the profitability of Aker BP's electrification projects.
Legal	Relevant, always included	Aker BP is attentive to legal proceedings that could have an impact on climate related risks and our enterprise. An example of climate related legal risk is those that could arise in conjunction with decommissioning of our assets. Meaning cessation of production and operations, offshore facility removal, onshore dismantling, and recycling. The primary exposure to climate is both during facility removal (catastrophic failure scenarios – such as

		dropping the facility to seabed), but perhaps more so during dismantling and recycling where the degree of influence and control potentially could be matured further. Consequences include long term leaks into sensitive environment or similar. The legal risk assessment / due diligence is typically applied during contractor selection to ensure appropriate historical climate performance. In addition, Aker BP also ensure that legal aspects related to implementation of new technologies are assessed by the Legal department and form part of the recommendation to proceed with development or investment. The Legal department assess potential for breach to laws and potential for legal proceeding with counter parties. Unforeseen Legal issues pertaining to environmental/ climate are managed by the Legal department along standard operating procedures. Legal aspects related to changes in external factors such as regulatory changes and legislation are also assessed with support from Legal department. Such issues are input to business plan updates and strategy process updates and assessed alongside any other element bearing on the financial and economic conditions. Legal department are directly engaging with the executive team concerning sensitive legal risks. Legal risks directly associated with one or more offshore operated assets are managed jointly with the Asset management team.
Market	Relevant, always included	Aker BP continually risk assess market conditions as part of the strategy and portfolio team scope. Emerging market trends are assessed for economic impact and material issues stress tested within the strategic framework. In addition, we screen all hydrocarbon investment projects on several criteria to account for market outlook, including CO2. Typical market risk to Aker BP includes oil price, gas price, and carbon price both in the short-, medium- and long-term horizon. Downward pressure on these oil and gas commodity prices compared to historical norm will make new hydrocarbon developments less attractive and the net present value for these developments will be significantly reduced. This may result in fewer developments being sanctioned. On a cost side, if the carbon emission costs increase above our corporate assumptions, it would increase our total costs and may negatively impact our profitability. Additional example of commodity risk include electricity prices as future developments are likely to utilize electricity from land grid to power the offshore facilities. Second, Aker BP also consider market risk relative to climate effects. A case example of an important market risk related to climate assessment and relevant for Aker BP would be a sudden and significant shift to gas consumption over oil consumption due to our significant weighting towards oil production. Such shifts could drain our

		current rather positive trend to optimise and make as carbon efficient as possible oil production.
Reputation	Relevant, always included	AkerBP consider two aspects of reputation, one of direct reputational risks as effect from climate related issues, all these risks can be risk assessed towards reputation impact within our risk and opportunity framework. Investor Relations and Communication teams, with support from Legal department evaluate significant reputation risks towards our stakeholders on an on-going basis. Reputation risks materialise in the form of negative publicity, reduced attractiveness towards investors and stakeholders, and regulators view on Aker BP as prudent operator. The climate risk and how that impact Aker BP and more importantly how we respond as an E&P company is an example of a risk with significant reputation potential. Our approach to this particular risk is at the heart of our strategy and is assessed and manged by the executive management team and the Board of Directors. The second perspective of reputation risk are those having a bearing on climate targets. Our climate targets are set under and in the context of the Paris Agreement, the Norwegian parliament, regulatory framework, investor expectations, and the public. Case example of reputation risks is that we do not achieve our climate targets, which could lead to reduced attractiveness towards for both equity and debt investors. Such consequences could very well again limit our ability to develop and pursue our climate ambitions. Another example of reputation risk is that we may not be ambitious enough in setting our climate targets. Consequences could be that we do not manage to acquire the necessary competence and capacity to underpin our climate targets.
Acute physical	Relevant, always included	Sea level rise and extreme weather are acute physical risk elements we consider climate related. Our fixed offshore installations in the North Sea are subject to acute physical risk. Extreme waves/ weather, if becoming more frequent, can lead to operational limitations and shut-in of production. Three out of five fields may be exposed to this risk - the Valhall field platforms, Tambar and Ula platforms by means of threatening safe design limits and structural integrity. The most significant factor being what is referred to as “wave-in-deck”. This factor is controlled by the air gap between sea level and deck of the installation. Risk to structural design limits is assessed as part of the quantitative risk analysis process covering one offshore asset installation each year and must demonstrate adherence to regulatory design limits.

Chronic physical	Relevant, sometimes included	Change in working environment on our offshore installations from either increase/ decrease in temperature or precipitation pattern are considered chronic physical risk elements related to climate change. All our offshore installations in the North Sea are subject to chronic physical risk. Change in precipitation patterns and extreme variability in weather pattern over time may affect working environment by reducing for example “time-in-field”, meaning the period an offshore worker may be exposed to a certain condition while performing their scope of work. Risk assessments are systematically performed by the Aker BP Working Environment team, including recommendations to improve. Working environment risks are assessed using industry standard approach and form input to infrastructure design for new facilities and typically working procedures for existing facilities. Working environment issues are governed by the regulator.

C2.3

(C2.3) Have you identified any inherent climate-related risks with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

Yes

C2.3a

(C2.3a) Provide details of risks identified with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.

Identifier

Risk 1

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Emerging regulation

Mandates on and regulation of existing products and services

Primary potential financial impact

Increased indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

Aker BP operates offshore fields on the Norwegian Continental Shelf (NCS). All oil and gas exploration and production on the NCS is regulated by common Norwegian law and regulatory framework. Current legislation promotes safe and prudent resource exploration and development through the regulation and NCS tax system. All business

operations and development in Aker BP is thus heavily influenced by the tax system, legislation and regulation. Future changes in European and/or Norwegian regulations related to climate topics, most notably taxes and fees on carbon or NOx emissions, may impact Aker BP's business by increasing our operational costs. Petroleum operations on the NCS are subject to the EUA for emissions traded under the EU ETS, in addition to the special Norwegian carbon tax. An increase in either of the two to a level above Aker BP's base case assumption, would result in increase in our direct operational costs, which would have a negative impact on our bottom line.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

More likely than not

Magnitude of impact

Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

27,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

47,000,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

Aker BP's equity emissions in 2021 amounted to 366120 tonnes. Total carbon cost (EUA and special CO2 tax) per tonne CO2 was around USD 112/t CO2 in 2021, resulting in roughly 41 USDm (366120 tonnes CO2 * 112 USD/t CO2) in operating expenses related to carbon emissions. Aker BP's base case assumption (as of 2021) projects that total carbon cost will increase to around 185 USD/t CO2 by 2025 (real 2021 basis). Assuming emissions in 2025 are flat at 2021 level, total carbon costs would amount to around 68 USDm (366120 tonnes * 185 USD/t). If instead, the total carbon price increases faster and is 30% higher than in our planning assumptions for 2025, then our total emission costs would amount to 88 USDm (366120 tonnes * 240 USD/t). As such the range of the potential cost impact is estimated between 27 USDm (68 - 41) and 47 USDm (88-41).

Cost of response to risk

7,000,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

To mitigate this risk we work with scenarios, we require the economics of all projects to be stress-tested against scenarios with higher CO2 prices, and we work continuously on

reduction of emissions in our operations. Our efforts to reduce emissions span across the entire company, from R&D and technology development to concept selection for new greenfield developments, to energy optimisation in operations. Electrification and energy efficiency are two largest contributors to emission reduction. The energy efficiency efforts undertaken in 2021, not only resulted in improved environmental performance, but also enabled a tangible reduction in direct costs, some of which will be lasting for the years to come. In 2021, the energy efficiency initiatives have enabled a saving of almost 3 MUSD in the avoided emission costs from a reduction of 22,738 tonnes of CO2 equivalents. These numbers do not include additional revenue from sales of natural gas. The targets for CO2 reduction from energy optimisation are set for all our assets annually, and the work on identifying and maturing carbon reducing initiatives is ongoing on a continuous basis in line with the process governing energy use and energy optimisation. We aim to deliver 10 000 tonnes in CO2 savings from energy efficiency annually. In 2021, we aimed at sanctioning only those energy efficiency initiatives for which the abatement cost was less or equal to 175 USD/t CO2. Assuming an abatement cost is 175 USD/t CO2, the cost of energy efficiency improvements required to generate 10 000 tonnes in CO2 reductions annually for four years (2022-2025) would result in approximately 7 USDm. 10 000 * 4 *175 = 7

Comment

Identifier

Risk 2

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Chronic physical

Sea level rise

Primary potential financial impact

Decreased asset value or asset useful life leading to write-offs, asset impairment or early retirement of existing assets

Company-specific description

The Valhall field platforms, Tambar, Ula and Ivar Aasen platforms, located offshore in the North Sea, are subjected to forces from sea waves. Extreme waves coupled with a rise in sea level is a risk for all our fixed offshore installations. One of our assets, the Valhall field center, is also exposed to subsidence. Subsidence occurs as a result from reservoir compaction, a phenomenon where the landmass compress from extracting hydrocarbons and hence increase the distance between seabed and the topside structure of the offshore installation. Subsidence results in a reduction of the installations original air gap design allowance. Air gap allowance is the minimum distance between lower deck of the installation and the sea level. Under heavy-to-

extreme conditions there is a potential for storm wave crests to reach and impact the lower-decks. This so-called wave induced loading onto the structures may result in forces onto the structure above the design tolerance level. Extreme wave impact can, in a worst-case scenario lead to structural collapse of load bearing elements. The asset may be impaired in a scenario where the air gap allowance become unacceptable.
As part of our decommissioning scope we have removed and will continue to remove and replace platforms on Valhall which have been subject to significant subsidence.

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

Unlikely

Magnitude of impact

High

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

10,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

100,000,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

Operations may be shut down at an earlier stage due to less clearance between lower deck and sea water level. A rise in sea water level may accelerate the need for modifications on the Valhall field to withstand extreme weather conditions. It is difficult to estimate the financial implications of this effect due to high uncertainty. However, modifications to risers to withstand higher loads caused by extreme weather is estimated to 10 million USD. The cost allocation for a modification is approximated to 10% engineering, 50% vessel cost, 40% material cost.
Bigger structural failures will result in an estimated financial impact of 100 mill USD . The cost allocation for such a scenario would be 20% engineering, 50% material, and 40% vessel. Both estimates are based on Aker BP standard estimation principles for modification projects (riser modification project) and capital projects (restitution of structural jacket elements) respectively. The total impact for the Aker BP will likely be in excess of both project estimates as a result of likely environmental damage and liabilities. Depending on the damage, a repair is estimated to range between 10-100 million USD.

Cost of response to risk

200,000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

The risks for bigger structural failures, equipment and environmental impact are followed up in the risk management system for the relevant assets, i.e. Valhall, Ula and Tambar. The probability of such failures for Tambar is every 5x10-E4 years, and for Valhall it varies between 10-E2 and 10-E4 years. The weather forecasts are monitored and managed by un-manning procedures as part of overall emergency response. If the significant wave height exceeds a threshold, production will be shut in and the platform will be unmanned.

A risk of this consequential magnitude is monitored as part of the principle Major Accident Hazards and is also reported to Executive Management Level and Board of Directors. Risk reviews are conducted at least monthly in the Asset organisation where any gradual changes to the principle Major Accident Hazards are discussed, reported and managed through both operational measures such as inspection, correction and minor modifications, as well as major modification projects.

A case study: We experienced a challenging situation concerning appropriate detection and accurate location specific data collection and analysis concerning the weather forecasting required for Valhall. Our innovative approach and stakeholder engagement to resolve this challenge was to initiate collaboration with Conoco Philips through the SFOA alliance already from day one of Aker BP in 2016. We utilise both weather data and the safety and rescue resources throughout the greater Ekofisk field (non-operated asset in the vicinity of AkerBP operated asset Valhall). The effect of this collaborative approach has resulted in improved capability to support de-manning decisions and as such protecting asset safety and integrity.

Aker BP's structured Management of Change (MoC) process is used to ensure the risk is controlled. Cost of management of this risk is included in the annual budget and estimated to 200,000 USD based on 50% full time equivalent.
The elements making up the estimate for annual oversight and management is based on Aker BP's estimation standard where an approx. breakdown is 90% time-writing for operating personnel for monitoring activities and 10% for minor software engineering from vendors of monitoring system.

Comment

Identifier

Risk 3

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?

Direct operations

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver

Market

Changing customer behavior

Primary potential financial impact

Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

Company-specific description

Aker BP's revenue comes predominantly from selling crude oil and gas, and our top line is therefore highly impacted by oil and gas prices. Climate-related market risks could impact Aker BP over the longer term through lower demand and prices for oil and gas. To reduce emissions, the world will have to consume fewer hydrocarbons. While oil and gas will continue to play a major role in the energy mix over the next few decades (IEA World Energy Outlook report, 2020), the transition away from hydrocarbons is under way. This creates uncertainty around the longer-term outlook for the demand and prices for our products.

Time horizon

Long-term

Likelihood

Likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

2,163,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

Explanation of financial impact figure

To illustrate a potential financial impact in absolute terms, we provide an illustrative calculation of the potential impact on AkerBP's revenue from the sale of oil in 2030 under several oil price scenarios. We assume Aker BP's 2030 oil production at 2021 level of 76 439 thousand barrels of oil equivalents. We assume also that production is 100% oil. We consider two scenarios for oil price in 2040 – one is the IEA's NZE scenario, another is the IEA's STEPS. We calculate Aker BP's potential revenue using Brent price at USD 65/bbl (real 2021 terms). We then calculate the revenue using the oil price under the NZE (USD 36,7/bbl) and the STEPS (USD 78,5 USD/bbl) in real 2021 terms. The calculations show that, based on the assumptions above, all else equal, Aker BP's revenue from the sale of oil, would be about 2.2 billion USD lower under the IEA NZE scenario and around 1 billion USD higher under the STEPS. The figure provided in the "potential financial impact" field above shows the negative impact on Aker BP's revenue in 2030 as a result of oil prices falling to the level provided in the IEA's NZE scenario. Calculation: (56 USD/bbl - 36,7 USD/bbl) * 76439 000 barrels = 2163223700

USD or 2,2 billion USD.

Cost of response to risk

205,625

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation

We recognise a long-term risk associated with climate-related drivers to reduce oil demand, which could result in structurally lower oil prices. Consequently, in our financial planning we implement rigorous financial criteria to ensure our portfolio is financially resilient under multiple scenarios. We aim to sanction projects with breakeven oil prices of less than 30 USD/bbl (at 10% discount rate). We work with the scenarios published by the IEA (STEPS, SDS, Net Zero 2050), in addition to our internal scenarios, to assess implications of the lower oil and gas prices on our business. Aker BP's portfolio is robust even under the scenarios with low oil prices. We drive robustness through rigorous focus on lowering production cost per boe, continuous improvement of our industry-leading emission intensity performance, as well as our strict financial criteria for project sanctioning.

Cost of managing this risk is difficult to quantify as our efforts to reduce costs, increase production efficiency, drive resilience of our portfolio are integrated in our business. We can however quantify management cost of monitoring climate scenarios, maintaining financial framework, performing portfolio resilience analysis. Assuming these tasks require 0,5 full time equivalent (FTE), and assuming the cost of one FTE is USD 235/hr, and 1750hrs/year, then the total management cost would amount to 0,5 * 1750 hrs * 235 USD/hr = 205 625 USD.

Comment

C2.4

(C2.4) Have you identified any climate-related opportunities with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

Yes

C2.4a

(C2.4a) Provide details of opportunities identified with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.

Identifier

Opp1

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Direct operations

Opportunity type

Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

Primary potential financial impact

Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

Building on our already top quartile carbon intensity and our “low carbon and low cost” strategy we seek opportunities to optimise efficiency in our production. Realisation of optimisation opportunities will result in lowered emission and cost savings. Implementation of energy optimisation solutions (e.g. software) is a key vehicle to identify and manage opportunities to improve efficiency. Development and connection of simulation models from reservoir to export enables more proactive energy management. Such a total network model will enable a more proactive approach to production and energy optimization. Projects to implement or modify equipment to ensure optimal operating points will therefore be realized somewhat earlier in the life cycle, which in turn will contribute to both higher production and lower power consumption

Aker BP energy optimisation software utilises sensor data to enable data driven control of gas turbines on our gas-powered offshore installations in Norway. The software is a form of algorithm-based dashboards that guide operators on how to optimally run turbines on a day-to-day basis using real-time data in a digital oil field (DOF) . The goal with this energy optimisation opportunity is to enable energy efficient operations and to deliver online energy monitoring, including quick interactions to reduce emissions.

We expect this opportunity to improve total utilisation rate of our turbines, and potentially lower the total number of turbines in use. At higher utilisation, the carbon intensity drops per energy unit produced, reducing our emissions and costs. The opportunity is relevant for all our operations in Norway, especially the installations (platforms or floating production and storage operated vessels) located in the North Sea and Norwegian Sea powered by natural gas.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

Very likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

5,000,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

10,000,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

Financial impact of energy efficiency opportunity is estimated to a range of 5 to 10 million USD (ca. 10-15% of environmental fees paid in 2020). This estimate largely consist of 1) Reduced purchase gas /diesel to power offshore gas-turbines 2) Increased revenues from sales of gas 3) Reduced carbon and NOx tax. With the following savings approximated distribution: 40%, 10%, 50%.

Cost to realize opportunity

1,000,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

A key pillar in Aker BP strategy is to digitise the asset value chain.
Through our many strategic partnerships with companies that are in the forefront of digitalisation, we are liberating sensor data from our operations into a designated data platform, and from there combine data sources to identify optimisation opportunities related to our Asset operations.
Resources in our strategic initiative Eureka X (digital lab) are in joint effort with the partners in developing dashboards and algorithms aiming to recommend optimal turbine operations, well design, and among many other initiatives to realise our strategy.

Our Skarv asset (floating offshore production) is a good case study of opportunity realisation so far.
Through a focused effort anchored in the asset strategy revitalisation the Skarv asset in 2019 identified an important opportunity to optimise turbine recompression utilisation. The Skarv Asset decided to utilise the new Ærfugl D4 well and was supported by Aker BP low carbon and low cost strategy. By routing high-pressure gas stream from Ærfugl D4 well to off-set power consumption, the Skarv asset could attribute about 60,000 tonne CO2 emission reduction in 2020. Additional reduction measures resulted in saving another 5,400 tonnes CO2.

Cost to realise such an energy efficiency opportunity is a rough estimate of required software development cost together with our asset operations teams, as well as training and roll-out to all assets. The cost is 80% related to time-writing combined AkerBP and our partner, and 20% for CAPEX related software items.

Comment

Identifier

Opp2

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Upstream

Opportunity type

Resource efficiency

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of more efficient production and distribution processes

Primary potential financial impact

Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

Aker BP believe there will still be a need for oil and gas resources in the future, and that oil and gas will play a substantial role in the decades to come. Aker BP reports fugitive emissions of methane and CO2 transparently and we are committed to continuously improve our methods and reporting accuracy.

There is an opportunity to adapt (new) technologies enabling further reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and lower carbon footprint from oil and gas production. An important enabler to guide investment decision processes with respect to selecting such technologies for our operations is the recently developed “Best available technology” business management tool.

The tool provides an opportunity for decision maker to adapt best practise technology or technique selection for new and existing assets based on e.g. reduced emissions and footprint. The tool also provides opportunity to apply improved methods for calculation of fugitive emissions such as unburned non-methane Volatile Organic Carbon and methane, in support of our transparent reporting.

Time horizon

Medium-term

Likelihood

Virtually certain

Magnitude of impact

Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

6,720,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

15,300,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

Implementation of technologies contributing to reduce emissions and carbon footprint as aided by the “best available technology” management tool could result in 7 to 15 mill USD annual cost savings. The estimate assume that we can attribute approx. 20% of the forecasted total footprint reduction by 2030s to best available technology, resulting in approx. 60,000 ton reduction. Using our current carbon price as low-end estimate (USD 112t/CO2) and our forecasted base case carbon price as the high-end estimate (USD 255t/CO2, in real 2021 terms) provide the estimated total impact range.

Cost to realize opportunity

75,000

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

Identifying and putting to use technologies to improve our business is at the core of Aker BP’s strategy. We believe technology is a primary means to responsibly contribute not only to the development of Aker BP but also the society at large. Preparing technology require engagement from large value chains and as such is likely to create jobs, but also spread knowledge about the technologies such that it may be used by others in the industry as well by those outside of the industry.

Through applying our “best available technique” (BAT) approach we strive to identify technologies with the best contribution to commercialisation, safety, reduced emissions and carbon footprint compared to current standards. We are embedding BAT into the project development processes (management methods) to support screening activities and to ensure investment decisions are supporting our overall goals, including 5kg CO2/boe. Aker BP has been working with the BAT approach since integrated as a management method in 2017. Albeit BAT is ideal for climate related technology selection, its initial purpose was to cover HSE (Health, Safety, Environment) and Commercial in more general terms.

Case study: Skarv is powered by gas turbines, which are the main source for emissions from the production installation. Changing out these reliable and cost-efficient sources for power, in lieu of a commercially acceptable CO2 friendly alternative, our approach to exploring alternatives and opportunities was guided using BAT. In 2020, the Skarv steam turbine project was evaluated. The project aimed to increase efficiency of existing gas turbines by installation of a combined cycle power plant technology. The project struggled to meet both economic and technical hurdles, but is a good example of how Aker BP continuously work to evaluate low carbon solutions/technologies.

Implementation of BAT into the management methods is a negligible cost, estimated to 75,000 USD. The cost estimate represents time-writing to embed BAT in the management system and represents approx. 20% of a full-time equivalent at internal hourly rates with FX 8,5 USD. The elements included in this estimate are: verification, business system updates, and support to the project developments to embed BAT. The investment cost associated with the example case study is not included in the cost to realise the opportunity.

Comment

Identifier

Opp3

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?

Upstream

Opportunity type

Energy source

Primary climate-related opportunity driver

Use of lower-emission sources of energy

Primary potential financial impact

Reduced indirect (operating) costs

Company-specific description

Aker BP explore several possibilities in the alternative energy source space
The opportunity to provide electrification as main means of power source aims to replace gas or diesel fired turbines in our operations. Despite being a rather capital-intensive investment, such a realisation could significantly improve our environmental performance.
With the planned electrification using hydropower from shore on Ivar Aasen at the end of 2022, Aker BP will have ownership in three assets that are fully electrified with close to zero emissions. These fields will perform production drilling from time to time, and Aker BP, together with its alliance partners strive to implement close to zero drilling emission as these fields can connect the electricity cable to rigs that are set up to run on electricity. We currently have one of these rigs in our portfolio, the Maersk Invincible.
We are further exploring opportunities to expand the rig portfolio with rigs that can run on electricity or generate their own electricity for example via floating wind turbines, to lower our overall drilling emissions.

Time horizon

Short-term

Likelihood

Very likely

Magnitude of impact

Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?

Yes, an estimated range

Potential financial impact figure (currency)

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)

1,900,000

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)

4,335,000

Explanation of financial impact figure

Drilling activities have historically made up approximately 10% of Aker BP's total Scope 1 CO2 emissions. If we can electrify between 10-20 % of all production drilling activities the next five years, it will give the following financial impact based on lowered CO2 price.

The financial impact is estimated using our internal economic models together with business assumptions. Using Aker BP base case carbon price USD 112/t CO2 in 2020 up to USD 255/t CO2 by 2030s multiplied with the carbon emission reduction achieved (17000 tonnes) with the electrification project we expect a positive annual impact in the range of 1.9-4.3 mill USD.

Cost to realize opportunity

35,250

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation

Cost to realise such an opportunity results in a rough estimate of one full-time equivalent, for one month, assuming the cost of one FTE is 235 USD/hours. The components building up this estimate are mainly management and coordination. (1 FTE * 150 hours * 235 USD / hour = 30,000 USD).

Any upgrades to electrify the drilling rigs is subject to commercial sensitives discussions between Aker BP and its drilling rig contractors and are not included in the estimate to realise the opportunity.

Comment

C3. Business Strategy

C3.1

(C3.1) Does your organization's strategy include a transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world?

Row 1

Transition plan

Yes, we have a transition plan which aligns with a 1.5°C world

Publicly available transition plan

Yes

Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your transition plan

We have a different feedback mechanism in place

Description of feedback mechanism

We collect investor feedback through the investor meetings conducted by our Investor Relations team throughout the year, as well as via a feedback form on our website.

Frequency of feedback collection

More frequently than annually

Attach any relevant documents which detail your transition plan (optional)

AkerBP-climate-transition-plan-2022_v02.pdf

C3.2

(C3.2) Does your organization use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy?

	Use of climate-related scenario analysis to inform strategy
Row 1	Yes, qualitative and quantitative

C3.2a

(C3.2a) Provide details of your organization's use of climate-related scenario analysis.

Climate-related scenario	Scenario analysis coverage	Temperature alignment of scenario	Parameters, assumptions, analytical choices
Transition scenarios IEA NZE 2050	Company-wide		This scenario is consistent with limiting the global temperature rise to 1.5 °C without a temperature overshoot (with a 50% probability). The NZE is a normative scenario, meaning it starts with a defined goal to achieve net zero CO2 emissions by 2050, and shows an example of a pathway that could get the world to that target. In this scenario, demand for oil falls by more than 2 mb/d per year between 2020 and 2050. Demand for natural gas grows to 2025, drops after 2025 and falls well below 2020 levels by 2030. This scenario yields significantly lower long-term prices for oil and gas compared to today's level. We use this scenario to understand possible supply and demand trends for oil and gas, assess resilience of our strategy and estimate impact on our portfolio.

Transition scenarios IEA SDS	Company-wide		Similar to the NZE, the SDS charts a path that is aligned with the Paris Agreement. However, in this scenario, only the advanced economies reach net zero emissions by 2050, while China achieves net zero by 2060, and all other countries by 2070. Without assuming any net negative emissions, this would allow to limit the global temperature rise to 1.65 °C (with a 50% probability). In this scenario, by 2030 oil demand is slightly below 2020 level, while demand for natural gas is slightly above 2020 level. Oil and gas prices in this scenario are higher than in the NZE, but are significantly lower compared to today's level. We use this scenario to understand possible supply and demand trends for oil and gas, assess resilience of our strategy and estimate impact on our portfolio.
Transition scenarios IEA APS	Company-wide		This scenario appears for the first time in the WEO-2021. It assumes that all climate commitments made by governments around the world, including Nationally Determined Contributions and longer term net zero targets as of mid-2021, will be met in full and on time. In the APS, global oil demand peaks soon after 2025 and then falls by around 1 mb/d per year to 2050. Demand for natural gas also reaches its maximum level soon after 2025 and then declines slowly. We use this scenario to understand possible supply and demand trends for oil and gas, assess resilience of our strategy and estimate impact on our portfolio.
Physical climate scenarios Customized publicly available physical scenario	Company-wide	1.6ºC – 2ºC	In the joint industry project NS1200, Phase II, Aker BP have assessed the effect of future climate changes on the reliability of offshore jacket structures. This has been determined by forcing a wave model with wind fields from a range of climate models. The results have been used in order to provide an ensemble of future predictions for wave conditions across the North Sea. These have been input into a structural reliability analysis where the uncertainty in the future climate has been contrasted with that in the existing climate model. Ten CMIP-5 atmosphere coupled climate models have been run for the RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 projections for near term-term (up to 2040) and long-term (up to 2100) prediction. Wave fields have been generated in the WW3 wave model with wind forcing from the climate models.

			The results from the study may be summarized in the following way: • Climate model ensembles can provide useful information, providing they are calibrated against historical data. • An important (and challenging) requirement in any climate change analysis is to separate climate change effects from natural variability. • No consistent evidence of a significant trend in wave height across all the models. • Climate change uncertainty provides a small contribution to the hazard curve - if accounted for correctly • Differences in the hazard curve (compared to historical data) are dominated by other effects (e.g. non-linear / breaking wave kinematics and extrapolation uncertainty)

C3.2b

(C3.2b) Provide details of the focal questions your organization seeks to address by using climate-related scenario analysis, and summarize the results with respect to these questions.

Row 1

Focal questions

How robust is Aker BP's portfolio in the light of climate-related risks and opportunities?
How does the net present value (NPV) of Aker BP's portfolio change under the assumptions with low oil and gas prices?
When sanctioning a project, is a project resilient against low oil and gas prices and/or higher environmental costs?
What breakeven price requirement for our new projects is needed to ensure resilience of our portfolio?
How sensitive is our portfolio to higher carbon prices?
How robust is our business strategy given the long-term trends for oil and gas under various climate-related scenarios?

Results of the climate-related scenario analysis with respect to the focal questions

The IEA's SDS and NZE scenario show that, even though demand for oil and gas declines towards 2050, oil and gas are still present in the energy mix. Industries with hard to abate emissions will continue to need hydrocarbons, and will have to install carbon capture technology in order to meet their net zero targets. On a broader strategic

level, this supports our our strategy to supply cost efficient, low emission barrels, while generating returns and paying taxes, which can be reinvested to drive the green shift.
To understand the robustness of our portfolio against low oil and gas prices, we calculate how the NPV of our portfolio changes when Aker BP's base case/planning assumptions for oil and gas prices are substituted with prices from the selected scenarios by the International Energy Agency, including scenarios aligned with the below 2-degree target. Under the IEA's STEPS, the NPV of Aker BP's portfolio is 26% higher, reflecting the higher oil and gas price assumptions in this scenario compared with Aker BP's planning assumptions. When tested with the assumptions from the APS, the NPV of the portfolio is 10% higher. Under the SDS, the NPV decreases by 7%. While this indicates a lower value generation compared to our base case, the analysis shows that, even under one of the most ambitious energy transition scenarios, the impact on our portfolio value is limited to 7%. In the NZE scenario, oil prices plummet, reaching 36 USD/bbl and 24 USD/bbl (in real 2020 terms) in 2030 and 2050 respectively, while European natural gas prices fall from late 2021's extraordinary highs of up to 60 USD/mmbtu (daily average) to 3.9 USD/mmbtu in 2030 and 3.6 USD/mmbtu in 2050 (in real 2020 terms). In this normative scenario there are no new oil and gas fields approved for development beyond already committed projects as of 2021. This collapse in prices is fully dependent on the assumed dramatic reduction in demand, with oil demand falling by 75%and natural gas demand falling by 57% by 2050 vs 2019 level. Currently, the level of investment in clean energy and efforts to reduce demand are not matching the level needed for this scenario to materialise. As such, this scenario illustrates a pathway the world should strive for, however a major gap remains to be bridged to bring the world closer to this path. When tested using the assumptions from the NZE, the net present value of the portfolio is 30% lower compared to the planning assumptions. The estimates are uncertain and do not reflect possible price fluctuations, portfolio changes and future cost levels, however we believe this is still a useful analysis that helps us gauge the risks and compare resilience of our portfolio to our peers.
We also assess portfolio sensitivity against higher carbon prices. This analysis showed that even in a scenario with carbon prices exceeding the SDS & NZE scenarios, the NPV of the future carbon costs is limited to 1.5% of the total portfolio NPV.

C3.3

(C3.3) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy.

	Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?	Description of influence
Products and services	Yes	Over the next ten years, global climate gas emissions must be halved if we are to succeed in halting global warming. Climate-related drivers are changing oil and gas markets, and only the most carbon-efficient companies will supply tomorrow's oil and gas. While our strategy to be a pure play

		Exploration & Production company remains, the urgency to minimise carbon footprint of our operations has intensified. We have made it our strategic priority to be among the most carbon-efficient producers. In 2021, our CO2 emissions intensity was below 5 kg CO2 per boe, which is approximately one-third of the world average for our industry. In 2021 our goal was to remain below 5 kg CO2/boe, and in 2022 the ambition was updated to below 4 kg CO2e/boe. Further, we aim to reduce our CO2 emissions by 50% within 2030, and by 2050 our emissions will be close to zero. We are also strategically evaluating both to bring more gas production into the mix and to expand use of renewable power sources, mainly hydro-power and wind-power, to support our operations. Time horizon: The company's performance on the CO2 emission intensity KPI and its deliverables on specific CO2-reducing projects are part of the monthly assessment by the EMT. Assessment of the performance against climate-related targets is also part of the semi-annual company-wide performance evaluation for bonus determination. Case study: Task: Reduce the upstream carbon intensity of oil and gas that we produce. Action: One of the key priorities in our decarbonisation plan is electrification of offshore fields using power from shore, which in Norway comes almost entirely from the renewable sources (in 2020 hydro and wind accounted for around 96% of Norway's total power production, NVE, Nordpool 2021). All our new field developments will be powered by renewable energy and thereby have close to zero emissions. Valhall already has power from shore while Ivar Aasen, which currently receives power from Edvard Grieg, will receive power from shore in 2022. Another concrete case is NOAKA, which is one of the largest remaining area developments on the Norwegian continental shelf. NOAKA will be powered from shore, which will bring emissions from production close to zero. The target is a final investment decision before the end of 2022. Production start is targeted for 2027.
Supply chain and/or value chain	Yes	Aker BP works closely with our alliance partners and suppliers on finding opportunities to reduce greenhouse gasses from the design stage of our projects. In cases where new energy-intensive equipment is purchased, the equipment must be as energy-efficient as possible and preference is given to technology with superior emission performance. During 2021 we have continued the process of mapping our scope 3 emissions, resulting in a more detailed overview and understanding

		of these emissions. We will further continue the process of mapping the scope 3 emission categories that are still not identified, and thus only emissions identified so far are included in the report. Categories 1 and 2 are the two largest categories, covering all upstream emissions for Purchased goods and services and Capital goods. Along with other operators on the NCS, Aker BP has developed a joint practice for suppliers to report scope 3 emissions within these areas: steel, cement and big bulk chemicals. These areas are considered the main contributors to scope 3 category 1 and 2 emissions. In 2021, we developed a common methodology to report on scope 3 emissions through Magnet JQS. The database contains relevant scope 3 emission data from suppliers, and we are continuing our work to further map emission data related to steel, cement and big bulk chemicals. Case study: Task: Minimise carbon emissions footprint related to our supply chain. Action: Work with our marine suppliers to reduce emissions related to the platform supply vessels (PSVs). PSVs represents the vessel category with highest emissions in Aker BP portfolio. During 2021, we have implemented several operational measures to improve the energy efficiency of these vessels. We have continued optimising routes and collaborated with other operators on the NCS to reduce the number of vessels operating, and hence emissions. Further, we have been focusing on cleaning the hulls of several vessels, leading to CO2 reduction. These efforts enabled a 6,4% reduction in CO2 per ton transported by PSVs (2020-2021).
Investment in R&D	Yes	Our commitment to reduce emissions and minimise environmental impact of our operations is reflected in our Technology Strategy and R&D roadmap. We are continuously monitoring new technologies and engage in technology developments that have potential to contribute to our emission reduction goals. Case study. Task: The PSVs accounts for 20 percent of Aker BPs identified upstream Scope 3 emissions. In November 2021, Aker BP entered a joint technology project together with one of our strategic partners, Eidesvik AS, and Alma Clean Power, a future Norwegian provider of fuel cells. This project explores the opportunity of installing fuel cells on existing PSVs, aiming to significantly reduce emissions by using ammonia as fuel. The project will

		explore installation of ammonia fuel cell technology on NS Frayja as well as Viking Lady, with the option to include further vessels in the scope of the project as well. The ability to produce green ammonia in a commercially acceptable way will be a game-changer and a prerequisite to transform our fleet to low emission operations. Developing new low emission technology to existing vessels is important as building new ships are both energy and capital intensive. The target for the first ammonia fuel cell on ships working for Aker BP is 2024.
Operations	Yes	CO2 emissions reduction is identified as one of the top objectives on our Operations team's scorecard. Case study: Task: Reduce carbon intensity of our operations. Action: Several emission reduction measures were carried out in 2021, yielding a total reduction of 22,738 tonnes of CO2e. Initiatives with "largest" GHG emission reductions are listed below. Rebundling of compressors on Alvheim enabled increased production and reduced both instability and energy consumption. This measure resulted in 4,000 tonnes CO2 reduced per year due to reduction in number of flare pops as well as normal power consumption. Rerouting of gas from cold vent to flare was implemented in November 2021. This methane reduction measure will together with an increased tolerance for O2 in cargo tank gas reduce the potential methane emissions, equivalent to approximately 6,600 tonnes CO2 equivalents. Energy efficiency improvements on Deepsea Nordkapp resulted in additional CO2 emission reductions during drilling of Volund sidetrack and Kameleon Infill West (KIW). The installation of variable speed drives on miscellaneous equipment resulted in better fuel consumption, and thereby reducing our CO2 emissions by 952 tonnes of CO2. On Skarv, two of the measures executed in 2021, were related to reduction of injection discharge pressure and export discharge pressure, which resulted in less need for power, hence lower CO2 emissions from power production. These measures resulted in 2,640 tonnes of CO2 reduced. Additionally, the optimised power generation during D04 well intervention and optimisation during gas injections resulted in 3,650 tonnes of CO2 reduced. These reductions are a result of efforts to reduce running of three turbines to two turbines when possible. Two other optimisations related

		to gas processing and export, led to reduction of 2,500 tonnes of CO2.

C3.4

(C3.4) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your financial planning.

	Financial planning elements that have been influenced	Description of influence
Row 1	Revenues Direct costs Capital expenditures Capital allocation Acquisitions and divestments Access to capital Assets Liabilities	Direct costs: The carbon emission costs contribute to a considerable share of our direct costs and represent a risk that may negatively impact our profitability. As part of Norway's climate action plan announced in January 2021, Norway has set a target to gradually increase the total cost per tonne of CO2 to around USD 255 in 2030 (in real 2020 terms). While this provides some line of sight on the future development of CO2 prices, there is a risk that prices will increase beyond this level. To mitigate this risk we work with scenarios, we require the economics of all projects to be stress-tested against scenarios with higher CO2 prices, and we work continuously on reduction of emissions in our operations. We believe that Aker BP's industry leading low carbon intensity will be one of Aker BP's key strategic differentiation points in the increasingly more competitive oil and gas industry. Case study: Task: Mitigate the risks related to increasing cost of carbon emissions, further strengthen Aker BP's position as a "low-cost, low-carbon" producer. Action: Our efforts to reduce emissions span across the entire company, from R&D and technology development to concept selection for new greenfield developments, to energy optimisation in operations. The emission reduction efforts undertaken in 2021, not only resulted in improved environmental performance, but also enabled a tangible reduction in direct costs, some of which will be lasting for the years to come. In 2021, the energy efficiency initiatives have enabled a saving of almost 3 MUSD in the avoided emission costs from a reduction of 22,738 tonnes of CO2 equivalents. For reference, AkerBP's total Scope 1 emissions were above 800,000 tonnes of CO2e in 2021 (gross emissions). These numbers do not include additional revenue from sales of natural gas, which otherwise would have been used as a fuel gas for energy production offshore. The targets for CO2 reduction from energy optimisation are set for all our assets annually, and the work on identifying and maturing carbon reducing initiatives is ongoing on a continuous basis in line with the process governing energy use and energy optimisation. . We believe our focus on seeking carbon reducing opportunities sets us firmly on track for achieving emission targets. We aim to reduce our CO2 emissions by 50 percent by 2030, and by 2050 our emissions will be close to zero.

		Revenue: Aker BP's revenue comes predominantly from selling crude oil and gas, and our top line is therefore highly impacted by oil and gas prices. We recognise a long-term risk associated with climate-related drivers to reduce oil demand, which could result in structurally lower oil prices. Consequently, in our financial planning we implement rigorous financial criteria to ensure our portfolio is financially resilient under multiple scenarios. We aim to sanction projects with breakeven oil prices of less than 30 USD/bbl (at 10% discount rate). Capital expenditures: The impact of emissions and related costs are forecasted and factored into the quarterly capital allocation process. In addition to the financial impact from taxes and fees, the emissions targets and projected performance against these are assessed for all investments considered. Acquisitions and divestments: We evaluate impact of climate related risks on all our acquisition or divestment plans. We have a global industry leading carbon intensity in our production and aim to not dilute that competitive position. Access to capital: The scrutiny from the investment community on the climate-related topics and our climate performance and risks has been increasing. AkerBP operates in Norway, one of the world's leading countries in developing and producing low carbon intensity energy. This is seen as a competitive advantage in the context of the global oil and gas industry. We consider increased financing costs for the oil and gas industry as a risk. Our corporate finance team continuously engages with the market on the topic of proactive management of climate change risks. Assets: Aker BP's emissions and related costs are forecasted and factored into the quarterly business planning process. The emissions costs hence are factored into our asset valuation and the impairments we make on our balance sheet. Liabilities: The company's operations are subject to extensive regulatory requirements that may change and are likely to become more stringent over time. We could incur additional costs in the future due to compliance with the new requirements or because of violations of, or liabilities under, laws and regulations, such as fines, penalties, clean-up costs and third-party claims. Therefore, HSSE risks, should they materialise, may result in material negative effect to our financial condition. These considerations are factored in our financial planning.

C3.5

(C3.5) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's transition to a 1.5°C world?

No, but we plan to in the next two years

C4. Targets and performance

C4.1

(C4.1) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Absolute target

Intensity target

C4.1a

(C4.1a) Provide details of your absolute emissions target(s) and progress made against those targets.

Target reference number

Abs 1

Year target was set

2020

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2 accounting method

Scope 3 category(ies)

Base year

2005

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1,100,000

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

1,100,000

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

Target year

2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]

550,000

Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

852,310

Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

852,310

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]

45.0345454545

Target status in reporting year

Revised

Is this a science-based target?

No, but we anticipate setting one in the next 2 years

Target ambition

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Aker BP has committed to reduce CO2 emissions in line with the Paris agreement.
Target covers all our operated assets.
Revised target from 50% emission reduction by 2033 to 50% reduction by 2030.
We consider this a science-based target, however it is unable to be validated by SBTi at the time being as a methodology is not yet available for the Oil & Gas sector.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Plan for achieving target:
Energy efficiency initiatives have a high focus in AkerBP which will result in GHG emission reductions.
New installations are being designed with power from shore (using hydro power, hence low emissions).
In addition we are evaluating low carbon emission solutions to further reduce our emissions.

Progress in the reporting year:
Two of our rigs have been upgraded with energy efficiency systems and battery packages.
Energy efficiency initiatives implemented in the reporting year resulted in reduction of 23,000 t CO2e.
New projects progressing with power from shore using hydro power main energy source.

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

Target reference number

Abs 2

Year target was set

2018

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s)

Scope 2

Scope 2 accounting method

Location-based

Scope 3 category(ies)

Base year

2018

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

96,887

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

96,887

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

Target year

2023

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

94

Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]

5,813.22

Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

82,925

Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

82,925

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]

15.3304277038

Target status in reporting year

Underway

Is this a science-based target?

No, but we anticipate setting one in the next 2 years

Target ambition

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target includes scope 2 emissions from Valhall and Ivar Aasen. Aker BP plans to implement power from shore to Ivar Aasen at the end of 2022, so reductions will be approximately 94% in 2023.

We consider this a science-based target, however it is unable to be validated by SBTi at the time being as a methodology is not yet available for the Oil & Gas sector.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Power from shore (hydro power, hence low emissions) will be implemented end of 2022 which will significantly reduce emissions.

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

Target reference number

Abs 3

Year target was set

2020

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2

Scope 2 accounting method

Location-based

Scope 3 category(ies)

Base year
2005

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
1,100,000

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
96,169

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)
1,196,169

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1
100

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2
100

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes
100

Target year
2030

Targeted reduction from base year (%)
54

Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]
550,237.74

Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
852,310

Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)
82,925

Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

935,235

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]

40.3965586059

Target status in reporting year

Revised

Is this a science-based target?

No, but we anticipate setting one in the next 2 years

Target ambition

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Aker BP has committed to reduce CO2 emissions in line with the Paris agreement.
Target covers all our operated assets.
We consider this a science-based target, however it is unable to be validated by SBTi at the time being as a methodology is not yet available for the Oil & Gas sector.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Scope 1:
Plan for achieving target:
Energy efficiency initiatives have a high focus in AkerBP which will result in GHG emission reductions.
New installations are being designed with power from shore (using hydro power, hence low emissions).
In addition we are evaluating low carbon emission solutions to further reduce our emissions.

Progress in the reporting year:
Two of our rigs have been upgraded with energy efficiency systems and battery packages.
Energy efficiency initiatives implemented in the reporting year resulted in reduction of 23,000 t CO2e.
New projects progressing with power from shore using hydro power main energy source.

Scope 2:
Power from shore (hydro power, hence low emissions) will be implemented end of 2022 which will significantly reduce emissions.

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

Target reference number

Abs 4

Year target was set

2020

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s)

Scope 1
Scope 2

Scope 2 accounting method

Location-based

Scope 3 category(ies)

Base year

2005

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1,100,000

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

96,169

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

1,196,169

Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

Base year Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

Target year

2050

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

99

Total emissions in target year covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]

11,961.69

Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

852,310

Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

82,925

Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

935,235

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]

22.0344865123

Target status in reporting year

Is this a science-based target?

No, but we anticipate setting one in the next 2 years

Target ambition

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Aker BP has committed to reduce CO2 emissions in line with the Paris agreement, and has set a target to reach close to zero emission by 2050 for all our operated assets. We consider this a science-based target, however it is unable to be validated by SBTi at the time being as a methodology is not yet available for the Oil & Gas sector.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

C4.1b

(C4.1b) Provide details of your emissions intensity target(s) and progress made against those target(s).

Target reference number

Int 1

Year target was set

2019

Target coverage

Other, please specify

Operated and non-operated assets, equity share

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2 accounting method

Scope 3 category(ies)

Intensity metric

Other, please specify

Kg CO2 per barrel of oil equivalent (BOE)

Base year

2019

Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

6.9

Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

6.9

% of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

95

% of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

% of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories) covered by this Scope 3 intensity figure

% of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

95

Target year

2025

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

28

Intensity figure in target year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity) [auto-calculated]

4.968

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

30

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

0

Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

4.8

Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

4.8

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]

108.6956521739

Target status in reporting year

Achieved

Is this a science-based target?

No, but we anticipate setting one in the next 2 years

Target ambition

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Aker BP has a CO2 Intensity target of less than 5 kg CO2 per barrel of oil equivalent (boe), that is based on equity share (includes our share of production and CO2 emissions from operated and non-operated fields). This is a continuous goal to keep the emission intensity below 5 kg CO2 per boe due to maturation of fields which will impact production and hence emission intensity. In 2019, Johan Sverdrup came on stream in Q4. Johan Sverdrup is electrified with power from shore, and has very low emissions. This has positively affected our equity based emission intensity.
We consider this a science-based target, however it is unable to be validated by SBTi at the time being as a methodology is not yet available for the Oil & Gas sector.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

Scope 1 progress in the reporting year:
Two of our rigs have been upgraded with energy efficiency systems and battery packages.
Energy efficiency initiatives implemented in the reporting year resulted in reduction of 23,000 t CO2e.
New projects progressing with power from shore using hydro power main energy source.
Three of six (operated and non-operated) assets will have hydro power by the end of 2022.

Target reference number

Int 2

Year target was set

2019

Target coverage

Company-wide

Scope(s)

Scope 1

Scope 2 accounting method

Scope 3 category(ies)

Intensity metric

Other, please specify

Methane Intensity (methane per saleable gas %)

Base year

2019

Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0294

Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0294

% of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

3

% of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

% of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories) covered by this Scope 3 intensity figure

% of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

3

Target year

2025

Targeted reduction from base year (%)

7

Intensity figure in target year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity) [auto-calculated]

0.027342

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

0.2

% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

0

Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0244

Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0244

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]

242.954324587

Target status in reporting year

Achieved

Is this a science-based target?

No, and we do not anticipate setting one in the next 2 years

Target ambition

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target includes methane emisssions from oil platforms and FPSO's, in addition to drilling rigs.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

Rerouting of gas from cold vent to flare was implemented in November 2021. This methane reduction measure will together with an increased tolerance for O2 in cargo tank gas reduce the potential methane emissions by 229 tonnes, equivalent to approximately 7000 tonnes CO2 equivalents.

C4.2

(C4.2) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Target(s) to increase low-carbon energy consumption or production
Target(s) to reduce methane emissions
Other climate-related target(s)

C4.2a

(C4.2a) Provide details of your target(s) to increase low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Target reference number
Low 1

Year target was set
2021

Target coverage
Site/facility

Target type: energy carrier
Electricity

Target type: activity
Consumption

Target type: energy source
Renewable energy source(s) only

Base year
2018

Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)
132,780

% share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year
0

Target year
2023

% share of low-carbon or renewable energy in target year
95

% share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year
0

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]
0

Target status in reporting year
New

Is this target part of an emissions target?
Yes, power on Ivar Aasen will be covered by mostly renewable power from shore instead of gas turbines. This supports our emissions target Abs 2.

Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Other, please specify

To be in line with the Paris Agreement and SDG13 Climate Action.

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Ivar Aasen will change from gas power to mainly hydropower, the coverage includes all scope 2 emissions on this asset.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Ivar Aasen will change from gas power to mainly hydropower by end of 2022.

List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

C4.2b

(C4.2b) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Target reference number

Oth 1

Year target was set

2019

Target coverage

Site/facility

Target type: absolute or intensity

Absolute

Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Energy consumption or efficiency

GJ

Target denominator (intensity targets only)

Base year

2019

Figure or percentage in base year

13,824,322

Target year

2025

Figure or percentage in target year

12,580,133

Figure or percentage in reporting year

13,420,419

% of target achieved relative to base year [auto-calculated]

32.4631547136

Target status in reporting year

Underway

Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes, the target will support the Aker BP intensity target Int 1.

Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers company wide energy consumption from non-renewable sources.

Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Plan for achieving target:
Energy efficiency initiatives have a high focus in AkerBP which will result in GHG emission reductions.
New installations are being designed with power from shore (using hydro power) instead of non-renewable energy.

Progress in the reporting year:
Two of our rigs have been upgraded with energy efficiency systems and battery packages.
Energy efficiency initiatives implemented in the reporting year resulted in reduction of 23,000 t CO2e.
New projects progressing with power from shore using hydro power as main energy source.

List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

C4.3

(C4.3) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Yes

C4.3a

(C4.3a) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	44	
To be implemented*	24	45,365
Implementation commenced*	15	20,198
Implemented*	13	22,738
Not to be implemented	72	

C4.3b

(C4.3b) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Machine/equipment replacement

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

2,823

Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

Payback period

1-3 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

11-15 years

Comment

Energy Efficiency measures have been implemented on rigs hired by AkerBP. Incentive agreements are in place for energy reduction.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

Process optimization

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

15,915

Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

936,047

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

Payback period

<1 year

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

1-2 years

Comment

Costs are included in operational expenditure. Process optimizations need to be looked at on an ongoing basis.

Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
Machine/equipment replacement

Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

4,000

Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Scope 1

Voluntary/Mandatory

Voluntary

Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

709,302

Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

6,511,628

Payback period

4-10 years

Estimated lifetime of the initiative

16-20 years

Comment

Alvheim rebundling of re-compressors. This project was completed for the benefit of energy savings and increased production capacity.

C4.3c

(C4.3c) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Method	Comment
Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards	Energy management system according to int. standards (ISO 50001) is a regulatory requirement which results in asset specific energy reduction plans and actions.
Dedicated budget for energy efficiency	Asset budget in place to support energy improvement initiatives.
Internal incentives/recognition programs	Company expects all assets to have a short list of minimum three energy reducing initiatives that are being followed up throughout each year. Quarterly external business presentations include CO2 status. CO2 intensity goal is a company KPI, and the climate performance is linked to bonus payment for employees and executive management team.

C4.5

(C4.5) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Yes

C4.5a

(C4.5a) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Level of aggregation

Product or service

Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

Other, please specify

Natural gas replaces coal.

Description of product(s) or service(s)

Natural Gas Sales: Natural Gas replaced coal when sold to UK or continental Europe. Natural Gas from Aker BP fields has a carbon intensity that is 35-40 % lower than coal. Assuming that 50% of sales go to UK or continental Europe.

Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Yes

Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Other, please specify

Greenhouse gas protocol

Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Use stage

Functional unit used

GJ of energy

Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Use of coal for energy.

Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Use stage

Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

4,385,412

Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

Calculated emissions from the use of gas compared to the emissions from use of coal for the same amount of energy. The total is based on assuming 50% of AkerBP natural gas sales go to UK or continental Europe, where coal would have been used for energy otherwise. Emissions factors for use in UK sourced from DEFRA.

Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

11

C-OG4.6

(C-OG4.6) Describe your organization's efforts to reduce methane emissions from your activities.

The majority of Aker BPs methane emissions originate from non-combusted gas, and is released through cold vent, fugitive sources, and from loading and storage on our FPSOs. As an operating company on the NCS we are only permitted to conduct safety flaring. Flaring in general is very limited and four out of five assets have closed flares.

Aker BPs upstream operated methane intensity was 0.02 % CH4 of saleable gas in 2021, which is significantly lower than the industry average of 0.20 % as measured by the Oil and Gas Climate Initiative (OGCI 2020 performance data).

Methane reduction initiatives are part of Aker BP's climate strategy and we have integrated methane reduction initiatives in our asset energy reduction plans . Aker BP continuously work to reduce safety flaring and quantify emissions of non-combusted hydrocarbon gases . We see a positive trend over the last three years where the safety hydrocarbon flaring has been reduced.

Case study: In 2021, one of our assets, Alvheim, rerouting of gas from cold vent to flare was implemented in November 2021. This methane reduction measure will together with an increased tolerance for O2 in cargo tank gas reduce the potential methane emissions by 229 tonnes methane. This is equivalent to approximately 7000 tonnes CO2 equivalents.

C-OG4.7

(C-OG4.7) Does your organization conduct leak detection and repair (LDAR) or use other methods to find and fix fugitive methane emissions from oil and gas production activities?

Yes

C-OG4.7a

(C-OG4.7a) Describe the protocol through which methane leak detection and repair or other leak detection methods, are conducted for oil and gas production activities, including predominant frequency of inspections, estimates of assets covered, and methodologies employed.

Aker BP has a procedure for planning, performance and follow-up of possible leaks and seeps in the production facilities offshore in Norway. The procedure called ‘Search and follow-up of seeping and leaks in hydrocarbon systems’ is documented in our Management system. All offshore facilities follow this procedure. The procedure outlines planning, implementation and follow-up of searches for seeping and possible leaks. The main steps in the procedure are: Planning, Implementation, Reporting of leaks and seeping, Conducting risk assessment and root cause analysis, Monitoring, Closing and Verification. For each step an activity description and associated roles and responsibilities are outlined.
The Operations Businesses Unit is responsible for this process. For our sector new initiatives and guidelines are provided through Norwegian Oil and Gas participation.
As methane is sensitive to Infrared light (IR-light), the use of IR cameras has been implemented for detection of methane possible seeps in the process area on our assets.
This is performed every 12 months as a minimum and for all assets and includes capturing data in a data base for hydrocarbon leakage and sweat logging, including a risk assessment of each of the leaks and seeps, individual follow-up, trending and continuous improvement. Data is also reported on an ongoing basis if leaks are identified.
Aker BP has implemented internal KPI's for following up leaks and seeps and this is a weekly topic in operational management meetings. An example of such an KPI, is the seepage rates

of methane. If the seepage develops and exceeds the set KPI, action is taken to mitigate and repair.

Case Study - Leakage Example from Hydrocarbon Leakage Log:

- Description: Drip leakage from stem/packing box.
- Compensatory measures: The area is checked several times per shift, the operator must be present each time the valve is to be run/adjusted
- Category: Leakage of hydrocarbon
- Size: 1 Drop per minute
- Registration date: 2020-04-05
- Frequency of follow-up: 1 time per shift (12t)
- Closing Action: 2020-04-17 - Packbox overhauled, no leak detected after startup.

C-OG4.8

(C-OG4.8) If flaring is relevant to your oil and gas production activities, describe your organization's efforts to reduce flaring, including any flaring reduction targets.

Aker BP does not continuously flare hydrocarbons in its operations. Only safety (non-routine) flaring is allowed in Norway, and hence in Aker BP. Aker BP continuously works to reduce safety flaring and quantify emissions of non-combusted hydrocarbon gases.
All new developments shall be designed with closed flares.
Safety flaring policies and procedures are implemented on all Aker BP assets to further reduce the safety flaring and hence limit emissions. Flaring volumes are operational KPIs on all Aker BPs assets. Flaring reduction initiatives are captured and pursued as part of our energy management process.
Annual targets are set and regulated by having quarterly safety flaring permits for each operation. For example on the Skarv asset the safety flaring target was set to maximum of 1.1 million Sm3 for 2021 and performance reviewed on a monthly basis via KPI dashboards.

C5. Emissions methodology

C5.1

(C5.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

No

C5.1a

(C5.1a) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

Row 1

Has there been a structural change?

No

C5.1b

(C5.1b) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?	Details of methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition change(s)
Row 1	Yes, a change in methodology	Scope 1 GHG emissions have been updated for the last 3 years using assessment report 6 global warming potential factors. Scope 2 emissions have been updated for the latest available national grid emissions factor to the corresponding year. Additionally, scope 2 purchase of electricity from Edvard Grieg data is more accurate due to higher data granularity and reporting improvements. Scope 2 market based emissions are now calculated in addition to location based scope 2 emissions.

C5.1c

(C5.1c) Have your organization's base year emissions been recalculated as result of the changes or errors reported in C5.1a and C5.1b?

	Base year recalculation	Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold
Row 1	No, because the impact does not meet our significance threshold	Change is estimated to be 1%, which is within the tolerance threshold of 5%.

C5.2

(C5.2) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

Base year start

January 1, 2005

Base year end

December 31, 2005

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1,100,000

Comment

Includes emission for all our operated assets and exploration.
Base year set to 2005 to align with the parliaments expectations to the Norwegian oil and gas industry to reduce emission with 50% based on the 2005 emissions.

Scope 2 (location-based)

Base year start

January 1, 2018

Base year end

December 31, 2018

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

96,887

Comment

This includes scope 2 emissions from power purchased from Edvard Grieg to Ivar Aasen and energy consumed in processing and exporting production from Ivar Aasen through Edvard Grieg.
Also includes electricity from Valhall which receives power from shore from the national grid in Norway which is hydro power.

Scope 2 (market-based)

Base year start

January 1, 2018

Base year end

December 31, 2018

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

316,116

Comment

Calculated using the residual mix electricity factor for Europe.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

Base year start

January 1, 2021

Base year end

December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

31,917

Comment

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

Base year start
January 1, 2021

Base year end
December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
16,928

Comment

Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

Base year start
January 1, 2020

Base year end
December 31, 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
113,378

Comment

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

Base year start
January 1, 2020

Base year end
December 31, 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
69,859

Comment

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

Base year start
January 1, 2021

Base year end
December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
11,566

Comment

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

Base year start
January 1, 2020

Base year end
December 31, 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
1,644

Comment

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

Base year start
January 1, 2020

Base year end
December 31, 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
14,145

Comment

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

Base year start
January 1, 2020

Base year end
December 31, 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
0

Comment
Not relevant, not included in base year emissions.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

Base year start
January 1, 2020

Base year end
December 31, 2020

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24,507

Comment

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

Base year start

January 1, 2021

Base year end

December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

Comment

Not relevant, not included in base year emissions.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

Base year start

January 1, 2021

Base year end

December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

43,401,390

Comment

Scope 3 category 12: End of life treatment of sold products

Base year start

January 1, 2021

Base year end

December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

Comment

Not relevant, not included in base year emissions.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

Base year start

January 1, 2021

Base year end

December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

Comment

Not relevant, not included in base year emissions.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

Base year start

January 1, 2021

Base year end

December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

Comment

Not relevant, not included in base year emissions.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

Base year start

January 1, 2021

Base year end

December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

Comment

Not relevant, not included in base year emissions.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

Base year start

January 1, 2021

Base year end

December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

Comment

Not relevant, not included in base year emissions.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

Base year start
January 1, 2021

Base year end
December 31, 2021

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
0

Comment
Not relevant, not included in base year emissions.

C5.3

(C5.3) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

European Union Emission Trading System (EU ETS): The Monitoring and Reporting Regulation (MMR) – General guidance for installations
IPIECA's Petroleum Industry Guidelines for reporting GHG emissions, 2nd edition, 2011
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

C6. Emissions data

C6.1

(C6.1) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
852,310

Start date
January 1, 2021

End date
December 31, 2021

Comment

Past year 1

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
847,200

Start date

January 1, 2020

End date

December 31, 2020

Comment

Past year 2

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

934,218

Start date

January 1, 2019

End date

December 31, 2019

Comment

Past year 3

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

911,362

Start date

January 1, 2018

End date

December 31, 2018

Comment

C6.2

(C6.2) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

Row 1

Scope 2, location-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

Scope 2, market-based

We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

Comment

Location-based calculation: Ivar Aasen purchase power and processing/export capacity from the Lundin operated Edvard Grieg field. Aker BP use our share of the fuel and flare numbers from Edvard Grieg combined with the emissions factors for Edvard Grieg

to calculate our scope 2 emissions from Ivar Aasen. On Valhall Aker BP get the electricity from the national grid. The Norwegian national grid is dominated by hydro power and wind power. Location based scope 2 emissions for Valhall are calculated using the national grid factor for the reporting year.

Aker BP calculates the scope 2 emissions based on a location-based method. Market-based scope 2 emissions are calculated for comparison purposes.

C6.3

(C6.3) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

Scope 2, location-based

82,925

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)

259,250

Start date

January 1, 2021

End date

December 31, 2021

Comment

AkerBP uses location-based scope 2 emissions in reporting and target setting. Market-based scope 2 emissions are calculated for comparison purposes.
For 2021 the market-based factor is based on the average of the prior 3 years, as 2021 factor is not yet published.

Past year 1

Scope 2, location-based

100,525

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)

265,532

Start date

January 1, 2020

End date

December 31, 2020

Comment

Past year 2

Scope 2, location-based
96,169

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)
238,947

Start date
January 1, 2019

End date
December 31, 2019

Comment

Past year 3

Scope 2, location-based
96,887

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)
316,116

Start date
January 1, 2018

End date
December 31, 2018

Comment

C6.4

(C6.4) Are there 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?

No

C6.5

(C6.5) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

31,917

Emissions calculation methodology

Supplier-specific method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

Please explain

The data set for this category is based on steel in wells and cement in wells.
Environmental product declaration (EPD) was used to calculate the emissions from steel in wells.
Supplier specific values were used to calculate emissions from cement in wells.

Capital goods

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

16,928

Emissions calculation methodology

Average data method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

Please explain

The data set for this category is based on steel amounts used in subsea and facility infrastructure. Global factors for each type of metal were used to calculate emissions.

Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

138,356

Emissions calculation methodology

Fuel-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

Please explain

The data set for this category is based on fuel used in each of the vessels, and multiplied by the diesel CO2 emissions factor.

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

56,639

Emissions calculation methodology

Fuel-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

Please explain

The data set for this category is based on fuel used in each of the platform supply vessels, and multiplied by the diesel CO2 emissions factor.

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

11,566

Emissions calculation methodology

Waste-type-specific method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

Please explain

The data set for this category is based on incineration of waste from AkerBP installations in addition to a thermal cutting cleaner process of drilling waste.

Business travel

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1,393

Emissions calculation methodology

Distance-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

Please explain

The data set for this category is based on air distance travel.

Employee commuting

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

12,142

Emissions calculation methodology

Fuel-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

Please explain

The data set for this category is based on fuel used for Helicopter commuting offshore.

Upstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Electricity to the offices is provided from the national grid which is mainly from renewable energy and therefore the emissions is estimated to be close to 0.

Downstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

17,040

Emissions calculation methodology

Fuel-based method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

Please explain

The data set for this category is based on fuel used for oil tankers from Alvheim and Skarv.

Processing of sold products

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Aker BP is an upstream only company and has no processing activities, hence no control of sold products

Use of sold products

Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

43,401,390

Emissions calculation methodology

Average product method

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

Please explain

Gross emissions reported. Calculated by converting volume of oil and gas sold to energy units. IPPC emission factors for oil and gas were used to calculated emissions. Net emissions were also calculated for comparison, which is 29,993,410.

End of life treatment of sold products

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Aker BP is an upstream only company and has no direct sales to consumers, hence no end of life treatment

Downstream leased assets

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Aker BP is an upstream only company

Franchises

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Aker BP is an upstream only company, we have no franchises

Investments

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Aker BP is an upstream only company and we have no investments in renewable energy or offsetting activities

Other (upstream)

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Aker BP has no additional activities that are not accounted for.

Other (downstream)

Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

Please explain

Aker BP has only upstream activities.

C6.5a

(C6.5a) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

Start date

End date

Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 data is not restated as there is no change in emissions methodology and they are not recalculated.

Past year 2

Start date

End date

Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 data is not restated as there is no change in emissions methodology and they are not recalculated.

Past year 3

Start date

End date

Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

Comment

Scope 3 data is not restated as there is no change in emissions methodology and they are not recalculated.

C6.7

(C6.7) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

No

C6.10

(C6.10) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Intensity figure

0.000165

Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

935,235

Metric denominator

unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total

5,668,747,000

Scope 2 figure used

Location-based

% change from previous year

51

Direction of change

Decreased

Reason for change

Aker BP's gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions in 2021 decreased by 12,490 tCO2e, compared to 2020.
Additionally, revenue increased by 90% in 2021 compared to 2020, the increase was mainly driven by a significant increase in oil and gas prices.

C-OG6.12

(C-OG6.12) Provide the intensity figures for Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e) per unit of hydrocarbon category.

Unit of hydrocarbon category (denominator)

Other, please specify

1000 bbls of oil equivalents

Metric tons CO2e from hydrocarbon category per unit specified

7.66

% change from previous year

6

Direction of change

Increased

Reason for change

Slightly higher scope 1 emissions and lower production resulted in 6% increase in intensity. The reason for this is operational challenges beyond our control.

Comment

C-OG6.13

(C-OG6.13) Report your methane emissions as percentages of natural gas and hydrocarbon production or throughput.

Oil and gas business division

Upstream

Estimated total methane emitted expressed as % of natural gas production or throughput at given division

0.025

Estimated total methane emitted expressed as % of total hydrocarbon production or throughput at given division

0.009

Comment

Decrease in the first value is due to higher gas throughput in 2021 compared to 2020. Increase in the second value is due to slightly higher methane emissions and lower total production. The reason for this is operational challenges beyond our control.

C7. Emissions breakdowns

C7.1

(C7.1) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Yes

C7.1a

(C7.1a) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used greenhouse warming potential (GWP).

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)	GWP Reference
CO2	818,247	IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)
CH4	32,741	IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)
N2O	1,321	IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

C-OG7.1b

(C-OG7.1b) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions from oil and gas value chain production activities by greenhouse gas type.

Emissions category

Combustion (excluding flaring)

Value chain

Upstream

Product

Unable to disaggregate

Gross Scope 1 CO2 emissions (metric tons CO2)

757,625

Gross Scope 1 methane emissions (metric tons CH4)

258

Total gross Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

766,502

Comment

Emissions category

Flaring

Value chain

Upstream

Product

Unable to disaggregate

Gross Scope 1 CO2 emissions (metric tons CO2)

60,623

Gross Scope 1 methane emissions (metric tons CH4)

5

Total gross Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

60,904

Comment

Emissions category

Venting

Value chain

Upstream

Product

Unable to disaggregate

Gross Scope 1 CO2 emissions (metric tons CO2)

0

Gross Scope 1 methane emissions (metric tons CH4)

21

Total gross Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

618

Comment

Emissions category
Fugitives

Value chain
Upstream

Product
Unable to disaggregate

Gross Scope 1 CO2 emissions (metric tons CO2)
0

Gross Scope 1 methane emissions (metric tons CH4)
505

Total gross Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
15,058

Comment

Emissions category
Other (please specify)
Loading

Value chain
Upstream

Product
Unable to disaggregate

Gross Scope 1 CO2 emissions (metric tons CO2)
0

Gross Scope 1 methane emissions (metric tons CH4)
310

Total gross Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
9,227

Comment

C7.2

(C7.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region.

Country/Region	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Norway	852,310

C7.3

(C7.3) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

By business division
By facility
By activity

C7.3a

(C7.3a) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Operations Business Unit	837,343
Exploration Business Unit	14,967

C7.3b

(C7.3b) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility.

Facility	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Latitude	Longitude
Alvheim including Volund & Boeyla.	225,050	59.57	2
Skarv including Ærfugl.	346,181	65.7	7.59
Ivar Aasen	21,585	58.92	2.19
Ula including Tambar.	215,131	57.11	2.85
Valhall including Hod	29,395	56.28	3.4
Exploration	14,967	65.31	6.36

C7.3c

(C7.3c) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Operations (including production drilling)	828,116
Exploration	14,967
Oil Loading	9,227

C-CE7.4/C-CH7.4/C-CO7.4/C-EU7.4/C-MM7.4/C-OG7.4/C-ST7.4/C-TO7.4/C-TS7.4

(C-CE7.4/C-CH7.4/C-CO7.4/C-EU7.4/C-MM7.4/C-OG7.4/C-ST7.4/C-TO7.4/C-TS7.4) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

	Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e	Comment
Oil and gas production activities (upstream)	852,310	Includes operation and exploration
Oil and gas production activities (midstream)	0	Aker BP does not have any midstream activity
Oil and gas production activities (downstream)	0	Aker BP does not have any downstream activity

C7.5

(C7.5) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by country/region.

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Norway	82,925	

C7.6

(C7.6) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

By business division
By facility
By activity

C7.6a

(C7.6a) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Operations Business Unit	82,925	
Exploration Business Unit	0	
Project Business Unit	0	

C7.6b

(C7.6b) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility.

Facility	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Alvheim	0	
Skarv	0	
Ivar Aasen	78,397	
Ula	0	
Valhall incl. Hod	4,528	
Exploration	0	
Projects	0	

C7.6c

(C7.6c) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Operations	82,925	
Exploration	0	
Oil Loading	0	
Decomissioning	0	

C-CE7.7/C-CH7.7/C-CO7.7/C-MM7.7/C-OG7.7/C-ST7.7/C-TO7.7/C-TS7.7

(C-CE7.7/C-CH7.7/C-CO7.7/C-MM7.7/C-OG7.7/C-ST7.7/C-TO7.7/C-TS7.7) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

	Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e	Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e	Comment
Oil and gas production activities (upstream)	82,925		
Oil and gas production activities (midstream)	0		Aker BP does not have any midstream activity
Oil and gas production activities (downstream)	0		Aker BP does not have any downstream activity

C7.9

(C7.9) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Decreased

C7.9a

(C7.9a) 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.

	Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Direction of change	Emissions value (percentage)	Please explain calculation
Change in renewable energy consumption	1,178	Increased	0.1	Increase in Scope 2 grid emissions factor in 2021 compared to 2020. Grid electricity is mainly hydropower. 4,528-3,350=1,178 tCO2e 1,178 / 935,235 x 100 = 0.1%
Other emissions reduction activities	22,738	Decreased	2.4	Emissions reduction measures implemented in 2021 resulting in a total decrease of 22,738 tCO2e in forecast emissions. 22,738 / 935,235 x 100 = 2.4%.
Divestment				
Acquisitions				
Mergers				
Change in output				
Change in methodology	5,153	Increased	0.6	Increase in scope 1 emissions due to update GWP factors (AR6). 852,310 - 847,157 =5,153 tCO2e 5,153 / 935,235 x 100 = 0.6%.
Change in boundary				
Change in physical operating conditions	3,917	Increased	0.4	An increase in emissions of 3,917 tCO2e due to operational increases in Skarv. 3,917 / 935,235 x 100 = 0.4%.

Unidentified				
Other				

C7.9b

(C7.9b) Are your emissions performance calculations in C7.9 and C7.9a based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Location-based

C8. Energy

C8.1

(C8.1) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%

C8.2

(C8.2) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Yes

C8.2a

(C8.2a) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

	Heating value	MWh from renewable sources	MWh from non-renewable sources	Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	LHV (lower heating value)	0	4,027,729	4,027,729
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity		411,654	125,224	536,878
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy		0		0
Total energy consumption		411,654	4,152,953	4,564,607

C8.2b

(C8.2b) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	No

C8.2c

(C8.2c) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

Heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

Comment

Other biomass

Heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

Comment

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

Heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

Comment

Coal

Heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

Comment

Oil

Heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

Comment

Gas

Heating value

LHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

3,627,936

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

3,332,102

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

34,712

Comment

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization includes flare fuel consumption.

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

Heating value

LHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

399,794

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

395,793

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

4,001

Comment

Diesel

Total fuel

Heating value

LHV

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4,027,729

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

3,727,894

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

38,713

Comment

C8.2d

(C8.2d) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

	Total Gross generation (MWh)	Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)	Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)	Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)
Electricity	1,224,589	1,224,589	0	0
Heat	38,713	38,713	0	0
Steam	0	0	0	0
Cooling	0	0	0	0

C8.2e

(C8.2e) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in C6.3.

Sourcing method

None (no active purchases of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling)

Energy carrier

Low-carbon technology type

Country/area of low-carbon energy consumption

Tracking instrument used

Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

Comment

Electricity is purchased from the Norwegian electricity grid, which is mainly hydropower. Location based emissions factors are used in emissions accounting.

C8.2g

(C8.2g) Provide a breakdown of your non-fuel energy consumption by country.

Country/area

Norway

Consumption of electricity (MWh)

411,654

Consumption of heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

Total non-fuel energy consumption (MWh) [Auto-calculated]

411,654

C9. Additional metrics

C9.1

(C9.1) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Description

Waste

Metric value

21,314,242

Metric numerator

Flared hydrocarbons SM3

Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

% change from previous year

46

Direction of change

Increased

Please explain

The amount of flared hydrocarbons increased 46% from 2020 to 2021 is due to several necessary operational shutdowns on Skarv, Valhall, Ula and Alvheim.

Description

Waste

Metric value

6,767

Metric numerator

ML produced water discharged to sea

Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

% change from previous year

21

Direction of change

Increased

Please explain

The amount of produced water discharged to sea increased by 21% from 2020 to 2021

C-OG9.2a

(C-OG9.2a) Disclose your net liquid and gas hydrocarbon production (total of subsidiaries and equity-accounted entities).

	In-year net production	Comment
Crude oil and condensate, million barrels	59	

Natural gas liquids, million barrels	3.5	
Oil sands, million barrels (includes bitumen and synthetic crude)	0	
Natural gas, billion cubic feet	78	

C-OG9.2b

(C-OG9.2b) Explain which listing requirements or other methodologies you use to report reserves data. If your organization cannot provide data due to legal restrictions on reporting reserves figures in certain countries, please explain this.

Aker BP ASA's reserves and contingent resources volumes have been classified in accordance with the Society of Petroleum Engineer's (SPE) "Petroleum Resources Management System". This classification system is consistent with Oslo Stock Exchange's requirements for the disclosure of hydrocarbon reserves and contingent resources

C-OG9.2c

(C-OG9.2c) Disclose your estimated total net reserves and resource base (million boe), including the total associated with subsidiaries and equity-accounted entities.

	Estimated total net proved + probable reserves (2P) (million BOE)	Estimated total net proved + probable + possible reserves (3P) (million BOE)	Estimated net total resource base (million BOE)	Comment
Row 1	802	0	802	3P reserves not disclosed.

C-OG9.2d

(C-OG9.2d) Provide an indicative percentage split for 2P, 3P reserves, and total resource base by hydrocarbon categories.

	Net proved + probable reserves (2P) (%)	Net proved + probable + possible reserves (3P) (%)	Net total resource base (%)	Comment
Crude oil/ condensate/ natural gas liquids	82	0	82	3P reserves not disclosed.
Natural gas	18	0	18	3P reserves not disclosed.
Oil sands (includes bitumen and synthetic crude)	0	0	0	

C-OG9.2e

(C-OG9.2e) Provide an indicative percentage split for production, 1P, 2P, 3P reserves, and total resource base by development types.

Development type

Shallow-water

In-year net production (%)

86

Net proved reserves (1P) (%)

91

Net proved + probable reserves (2P) (%)

91

Net proved + probable + possible reserves (3P) (%)

0

Net total resource base (%)

91

Comment

3P reserves not disclosed. Net total resource base (%) is the proven plus probable.

Development type

Deepwater

In-year net production (%)

14

Net proved reserves (1P) (%)

9

Net proved + probable reserves (2P) (%)

9

Net proved + probable + possible reserves (3P) (%)

0

Net total resource base (%)

9

Comment

3P reserves not disclosed. Net total resource base (%) is the proven plus probable.

C-CE9.6/C-CG9.6/C-CH9.6/C-CN9.6/C-CO9.6/C-EU9.6/C-MM9.6/C-OG9.6/C-RE9.6/C-ST9.6/C-TO9.6/C-TS9.6

(C-CE9.6/C-CG9.6/C-CH9.6/C-CN9.6/C-CO9.6/C-EU9.6/C-MM9.6/C-OG9.6/C-RE9.6/C-ST9.6/C-TO9.6/C-TS9.6) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities?

	Investment in low-carbon R&D	Comment
Row 1	Yes	

C-CO9.6a/C-EU9.6a/C-OG9.6a

(C-CO9.6a/C-EU9.6a/C-OG9.6a) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for your sector activities over the last three years.

Technology area	Stage of development in the reporting year	Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years	R&D investment figure in the reporting year (optional)	Comment
Other, please specify Seabird tracking	Applied research and development	≤20%		Mapping of migration routes for seabirds, breeding and colonies. Juvenile seabirds using light-logging Technology and GPS loggers
Other energy efficiency measures in the oil and gas value chain	Applied research and development	≤20%		Development of the next generation discharge and emissions tracker for the oil and gas industry. The tracker's objective is to help optimise chemical consumption and discharge in the oil and gas industry.
Other energy efficiency measures in the oil and gas value chain	Applied research and development	≤20%		Collaboration with Haliburton to develop a tool next generation field development planning. This will allow for data driven decisions for entire field concepts covering both subsurface and well construction. This way AkerBP gains a much better understanding of uncertainty and risks associated with field

				development concepts. This enables us to make decisions much earlier and with better quality in the design including environmental footprint.

C-OG9.7

(C-OG9.7) Disclose the breakeven price (US$/BOE) required for cash neutrality during the reporting year, i.e. where cash flow from operations covers CAPEX and dividends paid/ share buybacks.

40

C10. Verification

C10.1

(C10.1) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	Third-party verification or assurance process in place

C10.1a

(C10.1a) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Reasonable assurance

Attach the statement

AkerBP_Valhall_AER_2021_Verification_Report_Approved.pdf

AkerBP_Ula_AER_2021_Verification_Report_godkjent.pdf

AkerBP_Skarv_AER_2021_Verification_Report_Approved.pdf

AkerBP_Alvheim_AER_2021_Verification_Report_Approved.pdf

AkerBP_Ivar_Aasen_AER_2021_Verification_Report_Approved.pdf

Page/ section reference

AER verification reports - The verification statement is on page 4 in all reports. The emissions details are on page 1 in all reports.
All pages of the reports are relevant for each asset.

Relevant standard

European Union Emissions Trading System (EU ETS)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

94

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

DNV Verification_statement_2022(EN)_Final.pdf

Page/ section reference

All pages.

Relevant standard

ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

2

C10.1b

(C10.1b) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Scope 2 approach

Scope 2 location-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Reasonable assurance

Attach the statement

Edvard Grieg-Verification_report_Approved.pdf

Page/ section reference

Edvard Grieg-Verification_report_Approved.pdf - The verification statement is on page 4. The emissions details are on page 1. All pages of the report is relevant. Ivar Aasen scope 2 emissions are part of the total emissions verified for Edvard Grieg.

Relevant standard

European Union Emissions Trading System (EU ETS)

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

95

C10.1c

(C10.1c) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Scope 3 category

Scope 3: Purchased goods and services
Scope 3: Capital goods
Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution
Scope 3: Waste generated in operations
Scope 3: Business travel
Scope 3: Employee commuting
Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

KPMG _Aker BP Sustainability Report limited assurance statement signed.pdf

Sustainability report 2021 - ESG in Aker BP (1).pdf

Page/section reference

Document: KPMG _Aker BP Sustainability Report limited assurance statement signed.pdf, All pages.
Document: Sustainability report 2021 - ESG in Aker BP (1).pdf, pages Pages 55 - 57.

Relevant standard

ISAE3000

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Scope 3 category

Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

Verification or assurance cycle in place

Annual process

Status in the current reporting year

Complete

Type of verification or assurance

Limited assurance

Attach the statement

DNV Verification_statement_2022(EN)_Final.pdf

Page/section reference

All pages.

Relevant standard

ISO14064-3

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

C10.2

(C10.2) Do you verify any climate-related information reported in your CDP disclosure other than the emissions figures reported in C6.1, C6.3, and C6.5?

Yes

C10.2a

(C10.2a) Which data points within your CDP disclosure have been verified, and which verification standards were used?

Disclosure module verification relates to	Data verified	Verification standard	Please explain
C4. Targets and performance	Progress against emissions reduction target	ISAE3000	Data related to CO2 emissions (scope 1, 2 and 3), and CO2 reductions as stated in our Sustainability Report 2021 (pages 55-57) have been assured by KPMG. Please refer to their assurance statement on page 96 of our Sustainability Report (attached). 1

[1]Sustainability report 2021 - ESG in Aker BP (1).pdf

C11. Carbon pricing

C11.1

(C11.1) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?

Yes

C11.1a

(C11.1a) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impacts your operations.

EU ETS

Norway carbon tax

C11.1b

(C11.1b) Complete the following table for each of the emissions trading schemes you are regulated by.

EU ETS

% of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

94

% of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

94

Period start date

January 1, 2021

Period end date
December 31, 2021

Allowances allocated
95,729

Allowances purchased
707,336

Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e
803,065

Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e
77,634

Details of ownership
Facilities we own and operate

Comment

C11.1c

(C11.1c) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.

Norway carbon tax

Period start date
January 1, 2021

Period end date
December 31, 2021

% of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax
94

Total cost of tax paid
48,157,702

Comment

C11.1d

(C11.1d) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?

Norway has among the highest environmental taxes in the world, and in addition to these, AkerBP also pay for CO2 quotas under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS).
The management strategy in Aker BP is:

1. To purchase necessary allowances for emissions subject to EU ETS and Norway tax system
2. To implement energy efficiency in all operations and operational models
3. To comply with the field specific monitoring plans related to EU ETS
4. To invest in economically feasible emission reduction technology:

This strategy is applied each year through reporting and verification of the scope 1 covered CO2 emissions. Verifications are performed by a 3rd party each year in Q1 for prior reporting year. CO2 emission verifications are submitted to the Norwegian Environmental Agency at the end of March. CO2 quota accounting is done quarterly. Energy efficiency measures are implemented annually to reduce CO2 emissions and hence CO2 taxes. In 2021 the carbon reduction was 16,000 tCO2. Each field is reviewed quarterly to comply with the EU ETS. Aker BP has research and development, technology, and digitalization forums to assess feasible solutions for reducing CO2 emissions.
For new projects it is important to design and install sustainable solutions for reducing CO2 emissions. The time scale for implementing these sustainable solutions in new projects is longer term.

C11.2

(C11.2) Has your organization originated or purchased any project-based carbon credits within the reporting period?

No

C11.3

(C11.3) Does your organization use an internal price on carbon?

Yes

C11.3a

(C11.3a) Provide details of how your organization uses an internal price on carbon.

Objective for implementing an internal carbon price

Stakeholder expectations
Change internal behavior
Drive energy efficiency
Drive low-carbon investment
Stress test investments
Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities
Supplier engagement
Other, please specify

Measure climate risk in our business

GHG Scope

Scope 1

Application

Aker BP has two sets of internal carbon scenarios: 1) a base case used for planning and investment decisions and 2) a climate-related scenario used for stress testing of our portfolio risks. Both scenarios reflect carbon price assumptions that exceed prices under the IEA scenarios. We use the internal carbon price for assessment and management of carbon related risks, forecasting our future operating costs, future-proofing our assets and investments against regulatory risks (ETS and Norwegian CO2 tax), identification, prioritisation and selection of the emission reduction initiatives and R&D investment decisions as well as for driving investments in energy efficiency efforts and other emission reduction efforts.

Actual price(s) used (Currency /metric ton)

230

Variance of price(s) used

Aker BP's internal base case assumption exceeds prices assumed under the IEA's SDS and NZE scenario. Petroleum operations on the NCS are subject to the EUA for emissions traded under the EU ETS, in addition to the specific Norwegian carbon tax. As part of Norway's climate action plan announced in January 2021, Norway has set a target to gradually increase the total cost per tonne of CO2 to around USD 255 in 2030 (in real 2020 terms). This means that the national carbon tax will be regulated in a manner that considers the EUA prices, ensuring that by 2030, the total cost of emissions amounts to USD 255/tCO2 by 2030. Accordingly, in 2021, our base case scenario projected the total carbon price to increase from around USD 112/t CO2 in 2021 to around 255 USD/t CO2 by 2030 (real 2021 basis), while in our climate-related scenario we showed an increase to USD 273/tCO2 by 2030 (in real 2021 terms). These assumptions are reviewed on a quarterly basis, and in 2022 we updated the scenarios to reflect an even faster increase in carbon prices, showing the total carbon cost rising to USD 267/t CO2 by 2030 in the base case, and to slightly below USD 365/t CO2 in the climate-related scenario (in real 2022 terms).

Our approach to pricing is uniform, as the same set of carbon price assumptions is applied throughout the company independent of a business unit or type of decision.

Type of internal carbon price

Shadow price

Other, please specify

Our internal carbon price is not one figure but a price per each year from 2020 to 2030, increasing from 80 to 240 USD t/CO2 in 2030 (real 2021 terms). The breakeven CO2 cost hurdle (USD 175/tCO2) reflects the average price during this period.

Impact & implication

Case study: In 2021, all our assets used a uniform set of the internal carbon price assumptions, which reflect a year on year increase towards 2030 and exceed the CO2 costs under the IEA scenarios. In 2021 we used our internal base case carbon price assumptions to assess commercial feasibility of the selected carbon reducing initiatives. All assets are required to work on a pipeline of energy efficiency projects and evaluate

economics of these projects based on the company's latest set of the internal carbon price assumptions. When assessing feasibility of the carbon reducing projects, we compare the costs of an initiative vs savings from the avoided CO2 costs, and we calculate a carbon price required for a project to break even. In 2021, based on our internal carbon price, the carbon breakeven cost was set to 175 USD/t CO2. In 2022 we increased our carbon price assumption and the breakeven cost was increased to 230 USD/t CO2. Projects that break even at or below this hurdle level are prioritised. Using the projections for higher carbon prices helps us drive investments in emission reduction activities. Our carbon price assumptions are used to test commercial feasibility of the projects aimed at improved energy efficiency, which is one of the most important sources for carbon reduction in our operations. Following this approach, several of the energy efficiency improvements were identified as feasible and were implemented in 2021, yielding a total reduction of 22,738 tonnes of CO2e. One example of such initiatives implemented in 2021 is rebundling of compressors on Alvheim, which enabled reduced energy consumption, resulting in 4,000 tonnes CO2 reduced per year. Another example is energy efficiency effort on Skarv, where two of the measures executed in 2021, were related to reduction of injection discharge pressure and export discharge pressure, which resulted in less need for power, hence lower CO2 emissions from power production. These measures resulted in 2,640 tonnes of CO2 reduced. Additionally, the optimised power generation during D04 well intervention and optimisation during gas injections resulted in 3,650 tonnes of CO2 reduced.

C12. Engagement

C12.1

(C12.1) Do you engage with your value chain on climate-related issues?

Yes, our suppliers

Yes, other partners in the value chain

C12.1a

(C12.1a) Provide details of your climate-related supplier engagement strategy.

Type of engagement

Engagement & incentivization (changing supplier behavior)

Details of engagement

Run an engagement campaign to educate suppliers about climate change

Climate change performance is featured in supplier awards scheme

% of suppliers by number

0.6

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

3.5

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5

24

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

Aker BP have had increased focus on emissions from supply/shipping vessels and aviation in 2020 and 2021. These suppliers make up 0.6 % of Aker BPs direct suppliers and represents approximately 3.5 % of all direct supplier procurement spend. Aker BP has focused on these activities due to the improvement potential by reducing CO2 emissions through smarter logistics and sailing patterns and low carbon technology. 24% of the Scope 3 in C6.5 accounts for the emission sources that we can influence (categories 1-9).

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

Aker BP have made concrete achievements in supporting our strategy for lowering our Scope 3 emissions:

- Several of our supply vessels are using dual fuel (LNG+MGO), which has 15-20 % less CO2 and 85 % less NOx emission, compared to vessels that only use MGO. By using dual fuel, we have saved more than 2500 ton CO2 in 2020. In 2021 the savings were less.
- During 2019, we converted two of our long term supply vessels, NS Orla and NS Frayja, to hybrid configurations by installing batteries. This reduced these vessel's CO2 emissions by 10-12% per vessel. Aker BP will install hybrid configurations on three more platform supply vessels (PSVs) which will reduce emissions even further.
- All of our supply vessels normally operating out of our supply base in Stavanger are using ASCO's shore based electricity power supply at Risavika in Norway. The electricity power supply at Risavika is generated with a close to zero CO2 emission,as hydropower is the main source of electricity. Powering the supply vessels from shore reduces the need for fuel and corresponding emissions. Shore based power is also being installed in Sandnessjøen in 2022, which will further reduce CO2 emissions.
-Implemented hull cleaning of the vessels to reduce resistance in the water, and thus reduces both fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Results suggest a 1-2% CO2 saving when cleaning hulls annually.
- Logistics and optimization of supply vessel routes to further reduce emissions.
- Remote condition monitoring of equipment from field center control room reduces number of helicopter flights.

Comment

Type of engagement

Innovation & collaboration (changing markets)

Details of engagement

Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce climate impacts on products and services

% of suppliers by number

2.7

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

47

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5

21

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

Aker BP purchased goods and services for about 2,8 billion USD and engaged around 1400 direct suppliers in 2021, mainly within the oil and gas service sector. Our suppliers are generally contracted for high-technology services such as engineering, well and drilling services, or rental of rigs and marine services. A vital core in Aker BP's strategy and the environmental part of it is extensively facilitated by engagement through strategic partnerships and alliances with key suppliers – where we achieve joint environmental value creation based on a long-term sustainability approach. The nine alliance partners represent 47% of Aker BP’s direct spend, and that share is expected to increase the coming years when our CAPEX spend is increasing. Aker BP’s strategic alliance partners make up the majority of our procurement spend relative to the number of suppliers. We encourage and work closely with our strategic alliance suppliers to innovate and choose solutions that contributes to our work in reducing our carbon footprint. An example of such a cooperation is the Drilling & Wells innovation board where climate issues are discussed bi-monthly. Aker BP has a responsibility to ensure that suppliers and sub-suppliers behave ethically and responsibly. This is done by addressing supplier’s policies and performance with regards to Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) indicators. Aker BP requires all new suppliers to sign a «Supplier Declaration» to confirm their commitment to key principles for anti-corruption, environmental protection, health and safety, labour rights and human rights, and that they also follow up on these principles in their own supply chain. This focus is increased in 2022 to comply with the new transparency act legislation. As other operators on the Norwegian continental shelf, Aker BP selects suppliers based on information uploaded in the Magnet JQS register, which is a qualification system used by purchasers in the Norwegian oil and gas sector.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success

Aker BP is working to reduce the carbon footprint significantly, and to continue to produce oil and gas with a CO2 intensity of below 5 kg, 4,8kg in 2021, CO2 per boe equity share. Aker BP’s engagement with alliance partners has lead to some concrete achievements in supporting our strategy and reduction goals. Case Study: In 2021, the drilling rig Maersk Integrator underwent a series of upgrades to turn it into a hybrid, low-emission rig. The upgrades included the use of hybrid power, consisting of batteries as energy storage system for "peak shaving" (Spikes in energy load). It also included Energy Emission Efficiency software providing data intelligence to further reduce fuel consumption and CO2 emissions. In addition, a Selective Catalytic Reduction system was installed to capture NOx exhausts and use ammonia injections to convert the gas into harmless water and nitrogen. These upgrades allowed to reduce fuel consumption on Maersk Integrator from 19,5 t/day to 14,1 t/day, reduce CO2 emissions by 25% and NOx emissions by 97%. During the period from October 2020 to May 2021, the

implemented upgrades resulted in a reduction of CO2 emissions by 3,367 tonnes. The achieved improvements in emission performance are lasting. In addition, the drilling rig Deepsea Nordkapp is undertaking a similar hybrid, low emission upgrade to reduce CO2 and NOx emissions, which is expected to be completed in 2022. These upgrades will enable energy savings and reduction in Aker BPs absolute emissions and emission intensity on our assets.

Comment

C12.1d

(C12.1d) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with other partners in the value chain.

Aker BP have made it a strategic priority to be among the best producers of low-carbon oil and gas, and our goal is to minimise emissions from activities on the NCS by choosing energy-efficient solutions and operations. To achieve this, we work closely together with several partners and players in our supply chain and we use cross-company energy forums and sustainability forums to combine and drive our efforts towards reaching our emission reduction obligations.

Case studies:

Aker BP hosts an annual contractors and safety day for direct suppliers. ESG is in continuous focus in relation to collaboration in the supply chain and how to reach common emission reduction goals. This interaction has led to increased focus on collaboration with regards to climate related topics this year, and several engagement meetings and engagement forums have been established in addition the safety day.

Innovation boards and one-to one meetings with the alliance partners within drilling and wells suppliers (Maersk, Odfjell and Halliburton) subsea suppliers (Subsea 7 and Aker Solutions), platform construction suppliers (Kværner, Aker Solutions, ABB and Siemens), modification suppliers (Aker Solutions) and intervention suppliers (Stimwell services and Schlumberger) where relevant ESG topics are being discussed on either a monthly, bi-monthly or quarterly basis.

A Joint Operator initiative between Aker BP and other major operators on the Norwegian Continental Shelf is in place since 2020. The goal of this initiative is to work together on challenges related to climate in the Oil & Gas supply chain, and secure more transparency within this area. The focus of the initiative has been main suppliers of materials such as steel, cement and big bulk chemicals as they are identified to have the largest CO2 emission intensity. As a result of this joint initiative a common practice for climate reporting has been established and is in use among the suppliers. The collaboration has also lead to a greater common climate momentum in the NCS supply chain and has raised the awareness around mapping and reductions of CO2 emissions in the supply chain. It has also enabled the involved companies from both sides to work closely together to find sustainable solutions.

C12.2

(C12.2) Do your suppliers have to meet climate-related requirements as part of your organization’s purchasing process?

Yes, climate-related requirements are included in our supplier contracts

C12.2a

(C12.2a) Provide details of the climate-related requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process and the compliance mechanisms in place.

Climate-related requirement

Climate-related disclosure through a non-public platform

Description of this climate related requirement

Major suppliers are required to report CO2 footprint for their business through Magnet JQS (a tool used by oil and gas industry to evaluate suppliers). Our major suppliers and alliance partners report additional climate-related disclosures. Suppliers exceeding a spend of $1million are considered major suppliers. This results in 59% of Aker BP's total spend on suppliers.

% suppliers by procurement spend that have to comply with this climate-related requirement

7

% suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this climate-related requirement

59

Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this climate-related requirement

Supplier self-assessment
Second-party verification
Off-site third-party verification
On-site third-party verification
Supplier scorecard or rating

Response to supplier non-compliance with this climate-related requirement

Retain and engage

C12.3

(C12.3) Does your organization engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate?

Row 1

Direct or indirect engagement that could influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the climate

Yes, we engage indirectly through trade associations

Does your organization have a public commitment or position statement to conduct your engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement?

Yes

Attach commitment or position statement(s)

climate-and-energy-policy-principles.pdf

Sustainability report 2021 - ESG in Aker BP (1).pdf

Describe the process(es) your organization has in place to ensure that your engagement activities are consistent with your overall climate change strategy

Norwegian Oil and Gas (NOROG) is Aker BP's key network for reviewing and responding to relevant public issues related to framework conditions, regulations or other significant issues. Aker BP is represented on NOROG's board as well as in various committees in the NOROG organisation. NOROG's views on relevant policy issues are publicly available at www.norog.no.

In addition to the engagement conducted by NOROG, Aker BP engages directly with elected political representatives in the Norwegian Parliament who are members of the Energy and Environment Committee. After the 2021 election, Aker BP conducted company presentation meetings with representatives from the political parties represented in the mentioned committee. Aker BP proactively engages with the network of companies in Aker ASA's portfolio. Aker ASA has a long tradition of cooperation on employment matters between the main shareholder, management and union representatives, alongside an open dialogue with authorities and other partners. This is referred to as the "Aker model" and also describes the Aker BP's way of collaborating. The Aker model is described in more detail in Aker ASA's ESG-reports available on akerasa.com/en/esg .

Aker BP's employees are in a position to exert formal influence on decisions, and four employee representatives serve on the board of Aker BP. Data on public affairs and lobbying is gathered from Aker BP's Communication department. This unit covers all consolidated activities. Approximately 1,0 full-time equivalent (FTE) was dedicated to public affairs and public policy development in 2021. According to our Code of Conduct, Aker BP may not make financial contributions to political parties. We have no indications that such contributions took place in 2021.

C12.3b

(C12.3b) Provide details of the trade associations your organization engages with which are likely to take a position on any policy, law or regulation that may impact the climate.

Trade association

Other, please specify

Norwegian Oil and Gas association (NOROG)

Is your organization's position on climate change consistent with theirs?

Consistent

Has your organization influenced, or is your organization attempting to influence their position?

We publicly promote their current position

State the trade association's position on climate change, explain where your organization's position differs, and how you are attempting to influence their position (if applicable)

The Norwegian Oil and Gas (NOROG) Association support the UN intergovernmental panel on climate change, and want an ambitious international climate treaty. All reputable forecasts nevertheless show that oil and gas will be key energy sources for the foreseeable future and that reflects growing energy demand and the fact that renewable sources alone cannot meet these requirements. NOROG believes that ensuring the lowest possible emissions from the fossil energy, which the world needs, should be a high-priority climate measure.

NOROG have launched a joint industry project to enhance energy efficiency to enable reduction of greenhouse gas and emissions. Aker BP and the other oil and gas companies are collaborating with each other here to exchange experience, transfer knowledge and find good ways to implement energy efficiency measures. Encouraging more demonstration and pilot projects for emission-reducing technology is also an aim. NOROG are working actively with the environmental authorities to secure even better data on methane emissions and to identify possible reductions. Methane is a powerful greenhouse gas, and reducing its emissions could provide first aid for the climate.

NOROG see the Industry's future from a climate perspective, as an important step to put CO2 prices in place – preferably globally, but at least nationally and regionally – which make the most polluting fossil energy sources less profitable. Consumption can thereby be transferred to forms of energy which release less greenhouse gases. Exploring for, finding and delivering natural gas from Norway to the markets is important for ensuring stable energy supplies in addition to the share met by renewables. Emissions from oil and gas production on the Norwegian continental shelf (NCS) are 50 per cent below the world average.

Funding figure your organization provided to this trade association in the reporting year, if applicable (currency as selected in C0.4) (optional)

Describe the aim of your organization's funding

Have you evaluated whether your organization's engagement with this trade association is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement?

Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

C12.4

(C12.4) 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

In mainstream reports

Status

Complete

Attach the document

aker-bp-annual-report-2021.pdf

Page/Section reference

Aker BP annual report 2021: Letter from CEO page 4, Key figures page 8, Highlights 2021 page 10, Board of Directors report pages 36-52, reporting of payments to governments pages 54-55, BoD's report on corporate governance page 56-67

Content elements

Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics

Comment

Publication

In voluntary sustainability report

Status

Complete

Attach the document

aker-bp-sustainability-report-2021 (5).pdf

Page/Section reference

All pages

Content elements

Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets
Other metrics

Comment

Publication

Other, please specify

Climate and Energy Policy

Status

Complete

Attach the document

climate-and-energy-policy-principles.pdf

Page/Section reference

All pages

Content elements

Governance
Strategy

Comment

C15. Biodiversity

C15.1

(C15.1) Is there board-level oversight and/or executive management-level responsibility for biodiversity-related issues within your organization?

	Board-level oversight and/or executive management-level responsibility for	Description of oversight and objectives relating to biodiversity

	biodiversity-related issues	
Row 1	Yes, executive management-level responsibility	Biodiversity is included as part of the external environment policy. The expectations and policy is set by top management. Ownership: The various assets and different business units are responsible for the environmental performance, including biodiversity related issues. The external environment role functions organizationally as advisory and has an extra responsibility to ensure that AkerBP comply with environmental legislation and requirements given in permits. All employees in Aker BP are expected to follow the external environment processes and specifications, including biodiversity. In addition, seek environmental improvement within their responsibilities. AkerBP commits to manage the environmental impact and preserve biodiversity and sensitive areas in the marine environment of particular importance AkerBP shall continuously acquire information about the ecosystems in areas where we have activity and map out what potential effects and impacts our activities can have. This information shall be used when AkerBP plan how and when we carry out the activities. AkerBP have a special focus on vulnerable coastal habitats, spawning grounds for fish, areas that are important for seabirds, coral reefs and other vulnerable seabed habitats, and impacts on fisheries. Our environmental responsibility also includes our contractors, and we have a duty to ensure that they comply with all applicable environmental regulations.

C15.2

(C15.2) Has your organization made a public commitment and/or endorsed any initiatives related to biodiversity?

	Indicate whether your organization made a public commitment or endorsed any initiatives related to biodiversity	Biodiversity-related public commitments	Initiatives endorsed
Row 1	Yes, we have made public commitments and publicly endorsed initiatives related to biodiversity	Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species	SDG

C15.3

(C15.3) Does your organization assess the impact of its value chain on biodiversity?

	Does your organization assess the impact of its value chain on biodiversity?
Row 1	Yes, we assess impacts on biodiversity in our upstream value chain only

C15.4

(C15.4) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

	Have you taken any actions in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?	Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments
Row 1	Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments	Land/water management Species management Education & awareness

C15.5

(C15.5) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
Row 1	Yes, we use indicators	Pressure indicators Response indicators

C15.6

(C15.6) Have you published information about your organization's response to biodiversity-related issues for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s).

Report type	Content elements	Attach the document and indicate where in the document the relevant biodiversity information is located
In other regulatory filings	Impacts on biodiversity Details on biodiversity indicators	Environmental monitoring Gråsel, B07 FIELD REPORT, PRE-DRILLING PHASE 1
In voluntary sustainability report or other voluntary communications	Content of biodiversity-related policies or commitments Governance Impacts on biodiversity	Pages: 14, 42, 52 and 53 2

	Details on biodiversity indicators Biodiversity strategy	
In other regulatory filings		ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY - Visual survey report – Ørn to Skarv FPSO 3
In other regulatory filings	Content of biodiversity-related policies or commitments Biodiversity strategy	Biodiversity sampling programs 4, 5
In other regulatory filings	Impacts on biodiversity Details on biodiversity indicators	Coral Surveys for exploration wells: Site Survey at Storjo East; Site Survey at Newt-Barlindåsen 6, 7

[1]Field report Gråsel 27.04.2021.pdf

[2]aker-bp-sustainability-report-2021.pdf

[3]Ørn SKASO-P0051-DOG-O-RA-0015_0_IFR_01.pdf

[4]Program region 2_Final.pdf

[5]Utkast_Program Region 6_gjeldende_2021_01_28_8.pdf

[6]194760V00_Vol3_ABP21307_Newt-Barlindasen_Habitat_Final.pdf

[7]194785V00_Vol3_ABP21308_Storjo East_Habitat_Final.pdf

C16. Signoff

C-FI

(C-FI) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

Towards the end of 2021, Aker BP ASA made an agreement to acquire Lundin Energy's oil and gas related activities on the NCS. This will be relevant for CDP reporting data for 2022.

C16.1

(C16.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.

	Job title	Corresponding job category
Row 1	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?

English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

	I understand that my response will be shared with all requesting stakeholders	Response permission
Please select your submission options	Yes	Public

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms