

Abominable greenhouse gas bookkeeping casts serious doubts on climate intentions of oil and gas companies

Sergio Garcia-Vega^{1*†}, Andreas G. F. Hoepner^{1,2†}, Joeri Rogelj^{3,4†} and Frank Schiemann^{5†}

¹Smurfit Graduate Business School, University College Dublin, Republic of Ireland.

²Independent Member, Platform for Sustainable Finance, DG FISMA, EU.

³Centre for Environmental Policy and Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment, Imperial College London, UK.

⁴Energy, Climate and Environment Program, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Austria.

⁵Faculty of Social Sciences, Economics, and Business Administration, University of Bamberg, Germany.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): sergio.garcia-vega@ucd.ie;
Contributing authors: andreas.hoepner@ucd.ie;
j.rogelj@imperial.ac.uk; frank.schiemann@uni-bamberg.de;

†These authors contributed equally to this work and are listed alphabetically.

Abstract

The Paris Agreement aims to reach net zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the second half of the 21st century, and the Oil & Gas sector plays a key role in achieving this transition. Understanding progress in emission reductions in the private sector relies on the disclosure of corporate climate-related data, and the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) is considered a leader in this area. Companies report voluntarily to CDP, providing total emissions and breakdowns into categories. How reliable are these accounts? Here, we show that their

reliability is likely very poor. A significant proportion of Oil & Gas companies' emission reports between 2010 and 2019 fail a 'simple summation' mathematical test that identifies if the breakdowns add up to the totals. Companies' reports reflect unbalanced internal bookkeeping in 38.9% of cases, which suggests worryingly low quality standards for data guiding the private sector's contribution to halting climate change.

Halting global warming and meeting the Paris Agreement requires global carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions from human activities to be reduced to net zero and potentially even beyond [1]. The Oil & Gas (O&G) industry produced 56% of all energy-related CO_2 in 2019, showing a need to curb its operational emissions in order to meet international climate goals [2]. In general, the performance of O&G companies on climate change is measured using greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, which are widely used to track companies' carbon footprint [3]. However, climate data is not without accuracy challenges [4, 5], which the United Nations attributes to the application of different reporting formats and inconsistency in the scope and timeliness of reporting [6].

Data quality can be measured in various ways. Researchers often use *i*) measures of self-constructed indices, or *ii*) disclosure ratings measures [7]. CDP (formerly Carbon Disclosure Project) considers itself "the gold standard of environmental reporting with the richest and most comprehensive dataset on corporate...action" and certain stakeholders indeed credit it as the leader in terms of usefulness and quality for both investors and experts (<https://www.sustainability.com>). The CDP disclosure score evaluates the comprehensiveness of companies' response to the CDP questionnaire, considering that some questions are conditional on others (e.g., firms are first asked if they can provide a breakdown of their emissions in more granular categories, whereafter they are asked to provide details for the identified breakdowns).

The CDP scores are based on companies' answers to the CDP questionnaire and as such are based on self-reported information. One important element of CDP's questionnaire is the reporting of GHG emissions and the GHG emissions breakdowns for emissions directly resulting from a company's activities (*Scope 1*), including their purchased energy use (*Scope 2*), or additionally including emissions caused by the broader supply chain, distribution, and use of a company's products (*Scope 3*). Although previous studies show that companies' response to CDP is increasing, the quality and content of disclosure are still insufficient to satisfy the requirements of investors [8–10]. That is, the reliability and comparability of GHG emission data is questioned by investors, which leads to the criticism that CDP disclosure contributes more to "green washing" than to improving corporate transparency [8]. It is important to note, that despite such criticism, CDP is seen as the leading provider of corporate climate-related information.

Literature provides evidence that ratings of companies' Environmental, Social & Governance (ESG) performance are not always converging, meaning

that different rating agencies come to different conclusions for the same company [11]. It seems, these difference can be accounted to elements of scope, weight across indicators, and measurement. This leads to the recommendation that raw data should be used, when feasible [12]. The CDP has the advantage that it does not only provide aggregate scores, but the underlying raw data are also available from companies' answers. Therefore, investors are able to utilize the CDP dataset for detailed analyses based on the specific information contained in the questionnaire. Such analyses are especially relevant for high-emitting companies, such as in the O&G sector. A key question, however, is whether the disclosed data is reliable and of decent quality. Therefore, we analysed the quality characteristics of direct GHG emissions that are owned or controlled by 33 O&G companies (also known as *Scope 1* emissions) in the CDP database between 2010 and 2019.

Basic Bookkeeping Test

The accuracy of reported emissions is checked with simple summation tests that aim to identify the ability and intentions of the companies when voluntarily reporting their emissions. Our tests exploit the fact that, when reporting their *Scope 1* emissions to the CDP, companies are encouraged to voluntarily report their total GHG emissions broken down into Activities, Business Units, Facilities, GHG Types, and Regions.

The primary purpose of this mathematical test is to evaluate the ability of the analyzed companies in voluntarily disclosing their GHG emissions to the CDP (see Methods). The study analyzed the overall performance of these companies over the period of 2010 to 2019, using five breakdowns in Activity, Business, Facility, GHG, and Region. Our findings indicate that there is a significant proportion of reports that exhibit disparities between the reported global *Scope 1* emissions and the total sum of *Scope 1* emissions by breakdown. The upper section of Table 1 focuses on the number of unique reports that demonstrate these discrepancies, which are categorized based on breakdowns (rows) and reporting years (columns). The lower section of Table 1 presents the discrepancies in terms of the number of unique companies rather than the number of unique reports.

The last column in Table 1 shows the average number of reports containing discrepancies during the examined 10-year period. In particular, the analyzed companies typically refrained from divulging their total gross global *Scope 1* emissions categorized by Facility, i.e., only 5.6 companies disclosed their Facility breakdown every year. Moreover, a distressing 2.1 of those 5.6 firms (around 37%) are anticipated to display inconsistencies between the total sum of their Facility breakdown and their declared global emissions. This implies that only a small number of firms reported their emissions by Facility, and those that did frequently made errors in their reports. Conversely, most of the companies under analysis revealed their total gross global *Scope 1* emissions by Region; that is, 21 out of the 33 O&G companies disclosed their Region breakdown on average every year. This particular breakdown also had a low number of

reporting discrepancies per year, averaging just 3.2, making it the breakdown with the fewest mismatches (around 15%) among the five analyzed. In general, we find GHG emissions to represent unbalanced internal bookkeeping in 38.9% of the cases, which was the worst in 2010 (46.2%), while the year with the least unbalanced internal bookkeeping was 2012 (25.9%).

The performances of the analyzed companies in terms of emissions reporting to CDP are presented in detail in Table 2. This evaluation compares the number of discrepancies identified between the companies' reported global *Scope 1* emissions and the total sum of their emissions breakdowns. This provides a more in-depth view of the performance data presented in the previous analysis (Table 1), allowing a more granular assessment of individual companies. Note that the denominator values in this analysis do not exceed 10, as this represents the 10-year period between 2010 and 2019. For instance, Petrobras disclosed its emissions breakdown annually over the decade (denominator value of 10 in the Business, GHG, and Region columns). The numerator, on the other hand, indicates the number of erroneous reports submitted by each company within the same time frame. Thus, the higher the percentage, the worst the performance in terms of mismatched reports. In particular, Royal Dutch Shell had the highest number of erroneous reports (27 out of 29) during the 10-year period under review. Notably, the company did not disclose its emissions in the Activity and Facility breakdowns throughout the entire period from 2010 to 2019. However, the company did report its emissions every year (except for the Business breakdown) in other categories such as GHG and Region. Nevertheless, these reports were frequently found to be erroneous. In contrast, companies like Galp Energia SA and Total show the best performance as they did not have a single mismatched report on the 24 times that they reported in the same 10-year period.

The poor performance of companies such as Royal Dutch Shell, PTT, and Woodside Petroleum, where the percentage of discrepancies in their emissions reports is above 70%, is a matter of concern. It raises questions about their ability to use appropriate software or even basic tools like Excel spreadsheets to report their breakdowns accurately, about their management priorities and the quality standards applied to their internal management processes. Furthermore, their unreliable emissions reports pose a significant challenge for policymakers and the scientific community in designing effective policies to achieve net-zero GHG emissions. In essence, while disclosing emissions is crucial, it is equally crucial to do so accurately and properly. Failing to do so may result in incorrect policy decisions or false claims of progress towards reaching the net-zero goal.

Table 1 Overall Oil & Gas companies performance (Test 1). Note, all reported values (mismatches, total reports, and total companies) have been obtained using the preprocessing procedure described in the methods section.

Breakdown	Parameter	CDP Report												Total	Average
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019				
Activity	Mismatch	1	4	2	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	19	2.1	
	Percentage Mismatch	16.7	40.0	20.0	30.0	27.3	30.0	9.1	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	25.7	26.6	
	Total Reports	6	10	10	10	11	10	11	3	3	3	74	8.2		
Business	Mismatch	5	2	4	4	6	6	6	2	3	3	43	4.3		
	Percentage Mismatch	27.8	25.0	10.5	22.2	18.2	27.3	28.6	20.0	27.3	27.3	23.5	23.4		
	Total Reports	18	20	19	18	22	22	21	10	11	11	183	18.3		
Facility	Mismatch	5	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	21	2.1		
	Percentage Mismatch	62.5	28.6	50.0	50.0	40.0	33.3	20.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	37.5	37.4		
	Total Reports	8	7	4	4	5	6	5	6	6	6	56	5.6		
GHG	Mismatch	7	6	4	6	6	7	6	6	6	6	60	6.0		
	Percentage Mismatch	31.8	26.1	18.2	28.6	27.3	28.6	30.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	28.8	29.1		
	Total Reports	22	23	22	21	22	21	20	18	18	18	208	20.8		
Region	Mismatch	3	2	1	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	32	3.2		
	Percentage Mismatch	14.3	9.1	4.3	14.3	13.6	14.3	18.2	22.2	16.7	16.7	15.2	15.4		
	Total Reports	21	22	23	21	22	21	22	18	18	18	210	21.0		
Total Mismatches		20	16	13	17	18	23	21	18	15	14	175	17.5		
Total Reports		69	78	78	74	81	80	79	55	56	56	731	73.1		
Percentage Mismatch		29.0	20.5	16.7	23.0	22.2	28.4	26.3	22.8	27.3	25	23.9	23.9		
Total Companies		26	27	27	25	26	27	27	18	18	18	248	24.8		
Mismatch Companies		12	9	7	9	8	14	12	10	8	7	96	9.6		
Percentage Mismatch Companies		46.2	33.3	25.9	36.0	30.8	51.9	44.4	37.0	44.4	38.9	38.7	38.9		

Table 2 Test 1 results on Oil & Gas companies. N/A-Not Available. FF-Filter Failed

	Organisation	Country	Breakdown				Total	Percentage	
			Activity	Business	Facility	GHG			
			Activity	Business	Facility	GHG	Region		
1	Royal Dutch Shell	Netherlands	n/a	8/9	n/a	10/10	9/10	27/29	93.1%
2	PTT	Thailand	3/4	4/4	n/a	5/5	0/1	12/14	85.7%
3	Woodside Petroleum	Australia	0/1	n/a	2/2	3/3	3/5	8/11	72.7%
4	Occidental Petroleum Corporation	USA	n/a	3/3	n/a	3/7	5/9	11/19	57.9%
5	Genovus Energy	Canada	3/7	1/7	1/2	7/8	n/a	12/24	50%
6	Neste Oyj	Finland	4/7	3/8	7/8	2/7	2/8	18/38	47.4%
7	Devon Energy Corporation	USA	5/6	1/8	ff	8/8	0/8	14/30	46.7%
8	Chevron Corporation	USA	1/3	4/8	n/a	2/8	2/8	9/27	33.3%
9	Oil & Natural Gas	India	n/a	0/2	n/a	2/2	0/2	2/6	33.3%
10	Marathon Oil Corporation	USA	n/a	0/2	n/a	2/3	0/1	2/6	33.3%
11	Ecopetrol	Colombia	0/4	2/6	2/5	2/5	n/a	6/20	30%
12	Petrobras	Brazil	n/a	3/10	n/a	4/10	1/10	8/30	26.7%
13	Inpex Corporation	Japan	n/a	1/4	1/3	1/4	2/8	5/19	26.3%
14	Novatek	Russia	n/a	2/7	1/1	0/1	0/3	3/12	25%
15	eni	Italy	2/9	1/10	4/6	2/10	1/10	10/45	22.2%
16	Canadian Natural Resources	Canada	n/a	1/6	n/a	2/3	1/10	4/19	21.1%
17	Lukoil	Russia	0/1	n/a	n/a	0/2	1/2	1/5	20%
18	BP	UK	n/a	2/8	n/a	1/8	1/8	4/24	16.7%
19	OMV	Austria	1/1	2/10	0/1	0/10	1/10	4/32	12.5%
20	Oil Search	Australia	n/a	n/a	0/4	1/5	0/2	1/11	9.1%
21	Repsol	Spain	0/7	1/9	1/9	1/10	1/10	4/45	8.9%
22	Hess Corporation	USA	n/a	0/7	0/2	0/9	2/10	2/28	7.1%
23	Suncor Energy	Canada	0/7	2/8	1/10	0/10	0/10	3/45	6.7%
24	EOG Resources	USA	0/6	n/a	n/a	1/2	0/7	1/15	6.7%
25	Imperial Oil	Canada	n/a	1/7	n/a	0/8	0/1	1/16	6.3%
26	Exxon Mobil Corporation	USA	n/a	0/7	n/a	1/7	0/8	1/22	4.5%
27	ConocoPhillips	USA	n/a	1/10	n/a	0/10	0/10	1/30	3.3%
28	Equinor	Norway	n/a	0/9	1/2	0/10	0/9	1/30	3.3%
29	Galp Energia	Portugal	0/2	0/6	n/a	0/8	0/8	0/24	0%
30	Total	France	n/a	0/8	n/a	0/8	0/8	0/24	0%
31	Apache Corporation	USA	0/3	n/a	n/a	0/6	0/6	0/15	0%
32	Noble Energy	USA	0/6	ff	n/a	ff	0/6	0/12	0%
33	CNOOC	China	n/a	n/a	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/4	0%
Total			19/74	43/183	21/56	60/208	32/210	175/731	

Acting in Good Faith Test

The previous section presented a mathematical evaluation that aimed to determine whether the analyzed companies experienced any challenges in utilizing appropriate software to guarantee the accuracy of their emissions disclosure. Thus, taking into account the findings of the preceding section, the current mathematical test aims to identify the intentions of these companies when such errors were committed (see Methods). In other words, this examination transcends the identification of inconsistencies in their reported emissions and aims to determine whether these firms adhered to the ‘Precautionary Principle’ as mandated by the EU’s Paris Aligned Benchmarks for their emission breakdown reporting.

The overall performance and companies ranking, similarly to the previous section, are shown in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. In particular, as seen in Table 3, we found GHG emissions to represent downward biased unbalanced internal bookkeeping in 15.5% of the cases, worst in 2015 (25.9%), best in 2013 (4%). This implies that out of the 9.6 companies that exhibited inconsistent internal bookkeeping on average over the 10-year period analyzed in the previous mathematical examination (see Table 1), roughly 40% (equivalent to 3.8 companies) failed to adhere to the ‘Precautionary Principle’, indicating that errors were made in favor of the company rather than in favor of the planet.

Research on sustainability disclosure argues that companies opt for assurance to increase the credibility of the disclosed information [13]. Indeed, experimental evidence shows that investors value sustainability assurance [14]. This increase in credibility can be attributed to the assumption that assured information is, on average, more accurate. Transferred to our setting of carbon emission data, this means when company indicate that their emissions data is assured, one can reasonably expect more consistent emissions breakdowns.

We report descriptive data on carbon assurance as provided by companies via the CDP questionnaire in Table 5, where lower values are better. Table 6 shows low correlation coefficients for the correlations of the *Mismatch Percentage*. Additionally, we created binary variables for each sample year, which are one for any indication of assurance and zero otherwise (see Table 9). Overall, we see no convincing evidence of improved carbon breakdowns for companies which provide (higher quality) assurance. That means, the voluntary assurance of carbon emission is not (yet) an effective tool to improve the quality of emissions breakdowns.

Table 3 Overall Oil & Gas companies performance (Test 2). Note, all reported values (mismatches, total reports, and total companies) have been obtained using the preprocessing procedure described in the methods section.

Breakdown	Parameter	CDP Report											Total	Average	
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019				
Activity	Mismatch		0	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	7	0.8
	Percentage Mismatch		0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	18.2	10.0	10.0	33.3	0.0	9.5	10.2
	Total Reports	6	6	10	10	10	10	11	11	10	3	3	74	8.2	
Business	Mismatch	1	2	0	0	4	4	0	2	0	0	1	14	1.4	
	Percentage Mismatch	5.6	10.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	18.2	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	7.7	7.1	
	Total Reports	18	20	19	18	22	22	22	21	10	11	183	18.3		
Facility	Mismatch	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0.3	
	Percentage Mismatch	12.5	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	5.4	4.3	
	Total Reports	8	7	4	4	5	5	5	5	6	6	56	5.6		
GHG	Mismatch	2	2	0	0	3	2	3	3	2	1	18	1.8		
	Percentage Mismatch	9.1	8.7	0.0	0.0	13.6	9.5	14.3	15.0	11.1	5.6	8.7	8.7		
	Total Reports	22	23	22	21	22	21	21	20	18	18	208	20.8		
Region	Mismatch	1	1	1	0	3	3	1	2	2	0	14	1.4		
	Percentage Mismatch	4.8	4.5	4.3	0.0	13.6	13.6	4.8	9.1	11.1	0.0	6.7	6.6		
	Total Reports	21	22	23	21	22	22	21	22	18	18	210	21.0		
Total Mismatches		5	6	2	1	11	11	5	7	5	3	56	5.6		
Total Reports		69	78	78	74	81	81	80	79	55	56	731	7.7		
Percentage Mismatch		7.2	7.7	2.6	1.4	13.6	13.6	6.3	8.9	9.1	5.4	7.7	7.7		
Total Companies		26	27	27	25	26	27	27	27	18	18	248	24.8		
Mismatch Companies		5	3	2	1	5	7	4	4	4	3	38	3.8		
Percentage Mismatch Companies		19.2	11.1	7.4	4.0	19.2	25.9	14.8	14.8	22.2	16.7	15.3	15.5		

Table 4 Test 2 results on Oil & Gas companies. N/A-Not Available. FF-Filter Failed

	Organisation	Country	Breakdown					Total	Percentage
			Activity	Business	Facility	GHG	Region		
1	Royal Dutch Shell	Netherlands	n/a	4/9	n/a	5/10	6/10	15/29	51.7%
2	Woodside Petroleum	Australia	0/1	n/a	1/2	0/3	1/5	2/11	18.2%
3	Marathon Petroleum	USA	n/a	0/2	n/a	1/3	0/1	1/6	16.7%
4	Ecopetrol	Colombia	0/4	1/6	1/5	1/5	n/a	3/20	15%
5	Chevron Corporation	USA	0/3	1/8	n/a	2/8	1/8	4/27	14.8%
6	PTT	Thailand	1/4	1/4	n/a	0/5	0/1	2/14	14.3%
7	Devon Energy Corporation	USA	2/6	0/8	ff	2/8	0/8	4/30	13.3%
8	Canvus Energy	Canada	2/7	1/7	0/2	0/8	n/a	3/24	12.5%
9	Canadian Natural Resources	Canada	n/a	1/6	n/a	1/3	0/10	2/19	10.5%
10	Occidental Petroleum Corporation	USA	n/a	0/3	n/a	1/7	1/9	2/19	10.5%
11	Eni	Italy	2/9	1/10	0/6	1/10	0/10	4/45	8.9%
12	BP	United Kingdom	n/a	1/8	n/a	0/8	1/8	2/24	8.3%
13	Novatek	Russia	n/a	1/7	0/1	0/1	0/3	1/12	8.3%
14	Neste Oyj	Finland	0/7	1/8	0/8	1/7	1/8	3/38	7.9%
15	EOG Resources	USA	0/6	n/a	n/a	1/2	0/7	1/15	6.7%
16	Imperial Oil	Canada	n/a	1/7	n/a	0/8	0/1	1/16	6.3%
17	Impex Corporation	Japan	n/a	0/4	0/3	0/4	1/8	1/19	5.3%
18	Exxon Mobil Corporation	USA	n/a	0/7	n/a	1/7	0/8	1/22	4.5%
19	Hess Corporation	USA	n/a	0/7	0/2	0/9	1/10	1/28	3.6%
20	Petrobras	Brazil	n/a	0/10	n/a	1/10	0/10	1/30	3.3%
21	OMV	Austria	0/1	0/10	0/1	0/10	1/10	1/32	3.1%
22	Repsol	Spain	0/7	0/9	1/9	0/10	0/10	1/45	2.2%
23	Suncor Energy	Canada	0/7	0/8	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/45	0%
24	ConocoPhillips	USA	n/a	0/10	n/a	0/10	0/10	0/30	0%
25	Equinor	Norway	n/a	0/9	0/2	0/10	0/9	0/30	0%
26	Galp Energia	Portugal	0/2	0/6	n/a	0/8	0/8	0/24	0%
27	Total	France	n/a	0/8	n/a	0/8	0/8	0/24	0%
28	Apache Corporation	USA	0/3	n/a	n/a	0/6	0/6	0/15	0%
29	Noble Energy	USA	0/6	ff	n/a	ff	0/6	0/12	0%
30	Oil Search	Australia	n/a	n/a	0/4	0/5	0/2	0/11	0%
31	Oil & Natural Gas	India	n/a	0/2	n/a	0/2	0/2	0/6	0%
32	Lukoil	Russia	0/1	n/a	n/a	0/2	0/2	0/5	0%
33	CNOOC	China	n/a	n/a	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/4	0%
Total			7/74	14/183	3/56	18/208	14/210	56/731	

Table 5 Quality of assurance-related questions as provided by each company via CDP. *Average Score* – average quality of answers. *N/A Percentage* – percentage of unanswered questions.

Organisation	Mismatch Percentage	Assurance	
		Average Score	N/A Percentage
Royal Dutch Shell	93.1	2.9	0
PTT	85.7	3.1	40.9
Woodside Petroleum	72.7	2.4	0
Occidental Petroleum Corporation	57.9	3.3	13.6
Cenovus Energy	50	2.6	18.2
Neste Oyj	47.4	1.8	0
Devon Energy Corporation	45.2	2.8	9.1
Chevron Corporation	33.3	2.8	18.2
Marathon Oil Corporation	33.3	3.9	68.2
Oil & Natural Gas	33.3	5.5	90.9
Ecopetrol	30	6.0	72.7
Petrobras	26.7	3.1	22.7
Inpex Corporation	26.3	2.6	22.7
Novatek	25	5.3	63.6
Eni	22.2	2.4	0
Canadian Natural Resources	21.1	2.6	0
Lukoil	20	3.0	77.3
BP	16.7	2.8	18.2
OMV	12.5	2.4	0
Oil Search	9.1	3.2	59.1
Repsol	8.9	2.5	0
Hess Corporation	7.1	2.9	0
Suncor Energy	6.7	2.7	0
EOG Resources	6.7	3.8	72.7
Imperial Oil	6.3	1.8	18.2
Exxon Mobil Corporation	4.5	2.4	22.7
ConocoPhillips	3.3	2.6	0
Equinor	3.3	2.0	81.8
Total	0	2.5	0
Galp Energia	0	2.6	18.2
Apache Corporation	0	2.8	45.5
Noble Energy	0	4.9	63.6
CNOOC	0	3.0	86.4

Table 6 Correlation between studied variables. *Average Score* – average quality of answers. *N/A Percentage* – percentage of unanswered questions.

	Mismatch Percentage	Average Score	N/A Percentage
Mismatch Percentage	1		
Average Score	0.03	1	
N/A Percentage	-0.19	0.63	1

Conclusions

In our analysis of the *Scope 1* emissions reported by companies from the Oil & Gas industry and their respective breakdowns, we found a considerably large amount of misreporting. First, on average, we find that 38.9% of the companies do not add up to the sum of *Scope 1* emissions reported. This proportion of mismatches seems especially high when considering that the reporting of breakdowns is voluntary and that validation of the reported amounts is relatively straightforward. While this first analysis provides insights into basic mistakes of bookkeeping, our second test focusses on the potential intentions of companies and finds that in 15.5% of the cases, the sum of the breakdowns

exceeds the total *Scope 1* emissions reported by the company. It seems that in such cases, companies do not follow the precautionary principle in their reporting of total *Scope 1* emissions.

Our results are especially surprising and noteworthy, because our analysis focusses on voluntary reporting to the CDP, which is perceived as one of the most reliable sources of corporate climate-related information. Other data providers and rating agencies rely on data provided via the CDP and carbon emissions are a central indicator of companies' climate impacts. Misreporting on a central matter, such as *Scope 1* emissions, provides a cautionary tale to users of such data. A certain amount of noise seems unavoidable - at least under the currently existing systems. It should also be noted that *Scope 1* emissions only constitute a small, yet very easiest-to-report fraction of the GHG emissions O&G companies are responsible for through their activities, adding to the overall concerns surrounding companies' low reporting standards.

The recent development towards more mandatory reporting regulation around the world (e.g., SEC, ISSB, EFRAG) might lead to improvements in disclosure quality. For example, the EFRAG-proposal of European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) also proposes breakdowns on countries and operating segments in its Application Guidance (paragraphs 52 & 53) to ESRS E1. Such breakdowns can be useful to better understand transitory risks of companies due to country- or industry-specific developments. This raises the question whether such disclosure mandates, including the requirement for assurance and the connection to fines for misreporting, can help to improve the quality of reported carbon emissions and their respective breakdowns.

Methods

We analyse the GHG emissions reported by O&G companies on the CDP database (see Table 7), which is a not-for-profit organization that runs a global disclosure system for investors, companies, cities, states and regions to manage their environmental impacts [4].

Data

The CDP collects corporate climate-related data every year through a questionnaire and its content is managed with prescribed-format answers. The GHG emissions are required to be provided into three different groups or 'Scopes' in the CDP database: *Scope 1*, which are direct emissions owned or controlled by a company, i.e., stationary combustion, mobile combustion, fugitive emissions, and process emissions; *Scope 2*, which are indirect GHG emissions released in the atmosphere, from the consumption of purchased electricity, steam, heat and cooling; *Scope 3*, representing all indirect emissions (not included in *Scope 2*) that occur in the value chain of the reporting company. In addition, when reporting their *Scope 1* emissions to the CDP, companies are encouraged to voluntarily report their total GHG emissions broken down into Activities, Business Units, Facilities, GHG Types, and Regions (see Table 8).

In this article, we focus on 33 O&G companies from the CDP database between 2010 and 2019. We use the O&G classification provided by the Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI), which distributes companies according to the management of their GHG emissions and opportunities related to the low-carbon transition. That is, O&G companies are classified within the following four levels: *i)* Awareness; *ii)* Building Capacity; *iii)* Interacting into Operational Decision Making; *iv)* Strategic Assessment.

Testing Abilities and Intentions

We analyzed the (breakdowns of) GHG emissions of 33 O&G companies as reported to the CDP between 2010 and 2019 based on two tests:

1. **Basic Bookkeeping (Test 1)**, which raises concerns about *ability*. That is, if companies had a suitable software or just an accurate Excel spreadsheet for their voluntary GHG breakdown reporting, the following equation should hold:

$$\alpha = \beta = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \quad (1)$$

where α is the reported global *Scope 1* emissions (given in metric tonnes CO₂e), while β indicates the sum of *Scope 1* emissions over the breakdown in n elements.

2. **Acting in Good Faith (Test 2)**, which raises concerns about *intentions*. Here, if companies struggled with a suitable software or an accurate Excel sheet but followed the *Precautionary Principle* ('If in doubt, err on the side of the planet not on the side of the company') as required by the EU's Paris Aligned Benchmarks for their voluntary GHG breakdown reporting, Equation (2) should hold:

$$\alpha \geq \beta \quad (2)$$

We investigate in Test 1 and Test 2, if Equations (1) and (2), respectively, hold in the entire CDP database between 2010 and 2019 for all 5 breakdown dimensions (Activities, Business Units, Facilities, GHG Types, and Regions) in *Scope 1* emissions.

To illustrate, Figure 1 shows a representative example of the methodology used to validate the proposed tests. Note: *i)* The reporting period is not always equal to the calendar year (e.g., when the fiscal year does not equal the calendar year, and the company chose to report emissions for the fiscal year). We always considered reporting periods of a duration of 12 months. This 12 months period lies within the range from January 1st of the previous CDP year to December 31st of the current CDP year. *ii)* Only numeric values were considered when computing *Total Scope 1 Emissions*, i.e., values like 'null' or 'n/a' were treated as 0 and therefore do not increase the total sum on each breakdown. *iii)* Tolerance was computed based on the number of decimals a company used to report its *Scope 1* emissions. For example, some companies reported *Scope 1* emissions with three decimals while others rounded to nearest 1,000 or even 1,000,000 metric tons of *Scope 1* emissions. We considered

the number of decimal places on reported global *Scope 1* emissions or rounding to the nearest multiple of 10. In particular, it was assumed that the following companies used the latter method: BP, Exxon Mobil Corporation, Marathon Oil Corporation, Occidental Petroleum Corporation, Oil & Natural Gas, and Total.




Fig. 1 A representative example for testing abilities (Test 1) and intentions (Test 2). The example shows that the analyzed company failed to pass Test 1, as the reported global *Scope 1* emissions (24,531,046 metric tons CO₂e) is different from the total sum of the breakdown (36,951,047 metric tons CO₂e), i.e., $\alpha \neq \beta$. Similarly, the analyzed company failed to pass Test 2, as the total sum of the breakdown (36,951,047 metric tons CO₂e) is greater than the reported global emissions (24,531,046 metric tons CO₂e), i.e., $\alpha < \beta$.

References

- [1] IPCC: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA (2021)
- [2] Bouckaert, S., Kim, T., McNamara, K., Wanner, B., McGlade, K., Olejarnik, P., Adam, Z., Arboleya Sarazola, L., Arsalane, Y., Baruah, B., et al.: World Energy Outlook 2019. Paris, International Energy Agency (2019)
- [3] Dietz, S., Gardiner, D., Jahn, V., Noels, J.: How ambitious are oil and gas companies' climate goals? *Science* **374**(6566), 405–408 (2021)
- [4] Depoers, F., Jeanjean, T., Jérôme, T.: Voluntary disclosure of greenhouse gas emissions: Contrasting the carbon disclosure project and corporate reports. *Journal of Business Ethics* **134**(3), 445–461 (2016)

- [5] Mateo-Márquez, A.J., González-González, J.M., Zamora-Ramírez, C.: The influence of countries' climate change-related institutional profile on voluntary environmental disclosures. *Business Strategy and the Environment* **30**(2), 1357–1373 (2021)
- [6] Mooney, C., Eilperin, J., Butler, D., Muyskens, J., Narayanswamy, A., Ahmed, N.: Countries climate pledges built on flawed data, post investigation finds. *The Washington Post* (2021)
- [7] Lemma, T.T., Feedman, M., Mlilo, M., Park, J.D.: Corporate carbon risk, voluntary disclosure, and cost of capital: South african evidence. *Business Strategy and the Environment* **28**(1), 111–126 (2019)
- [8] Dragomir, V.D.: The disclosure of industrial greenhouse gas emissions: a critical assessment of corporate sustainability reports. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **29**, 222–237 (2012)
- [9] Peng, J., Sun, J., Luo, R.: Corporate voluntary carbon information disclosure: Evidence from china's listed companies. *The World Economy* **38**(1), 91–109 (2015)
- [10] Li, L., Liu, Q., Wang, J., Hong, X.: Carbon information disclosure, marketization, and cost of equity financing. *International journal of environmental research and public health* **16**(1), 150 (2019)
- [11] Chatterji, A.K., Durand, R., Levine, D.I., Touboul, S.: Do ratings of firms converge? implications for managers, investors and strategy researchers. *Strategic Management Journal* **37**(8), 1597–1614 (2016)
- [12] Berg, F., Koelbel, J.F., Rigobon, R.: Aggregate confusion: The divergence of esg ratings. *Review of Finance* **26**(6), 1315–1344 (2022)
- [13] Simnett, R., Vanstraelen, A., Chua, W.: Assurance on sustainability reports: An international comparison. *The Accounting Review* **84**(3), 937–967 (2009)
- [14] Reimsbach, D., Hahn, R., Gürtürk, A.: Integrated reporting and assurance of sustainability information: An experimental study on professional investors' information processing. *European Accounting Review* **27**(3), 559–581 (2018)

Supplementary Information

Table 7 Analysed Oil & Gas companies. *TPI*–Transition Pathway Initiative. *ID*–Carbon Disclosure Project ID, which is a unique number assigned to each company (also known ‘Account’) in the CDP database.

	ID	Company	Country	TPI Level
1	13823	Oil & Natural Gas	India	1
2	11347	Marathon Oil Corporation	USA	
3	11043	Lukoil	Russia	
4	13838	Oil Search	Australia	2
5	5767	EOG Resources	USA	
6	3527	CNOOC	China	
7	13395	Noble Energy	USA	
8	15297	PTT	Thailand	
9	20771	Woodside Petroleum	Australia	
10	29789	Cenovus Energy	Canada	
11	12937	Neste Oyj	Finland	
12	4678	Devon Energy Corporation	USA	
13	3191	Chevron Corporation	USA	
14	22341	Ecopetrol	Colombia	3
15	13542	Novatek	Russia	
16	2667	Canadian Natural Resources	Canada	
17	17929	Suncor Energy	Canada	
18	8886	Imperial Oil	Canada	
19	6136	Exxon Mobil Corporation	USA	
20	804	Apache Corporation	USA	
21	16012	Royal Dutch Shell	Netherlands	
22	13649	Occidental Petroleum Corporation	USA	
23	14654	Petrobras	Brazil	
24	9134	Inpex Corporation	Japan	
25	2083	BP	UK	
26	5634	Eni	Italy	
27	13870	OMV	Austria	4
28	15669	Repsol	Spain	
29	8274	Hess Corporation	USA	
30	19257	Total	France	
31	3751	ConocoPhillips	USA	
32	23132	Equinor	Norway	
33	7042	Galp Energia	Portugal	

Table 8 Scope 1 Breakdown questions in CDP database.

CDP Questionnaire	Breakdown	Question	N/A	Description
2010	Activity	N/A		
	Business Division	12.4.		Please also break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	12.5.		Please also break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility
	GHG Type Region	12.6C3. 12.2.		Scope 1 Emissions (Metric tonnes CO ₂ e) Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region
2011	Activity	9.2d.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity
	Business Division	9.2a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	9.2b.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility
	GHG Type Region	9.2c. 9.1a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region
2012	Activity	9.2d.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity
	Business Division	9.2a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	9.2b.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility
	GHG Type Region	9.2c. 9.1a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region
2013	Activity	9.2d.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity
	Business Division	9.2a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	9.2b.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility
	GHG Type Region	9.2c. 9.1a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region
2014	Activity	CC9.2d.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity
	Business Division	CC9.2a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	CC9.2b.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility
	GHG Type Region	CC9.2c. CC9.1a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region
2015	Activity	CC9.2d.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity
	Business Division	CC9.2a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	CC9.2b.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility
	GHG Type Region	CC9.2c. CC9.1a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region
2016	Activity	CC9.2d.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity
	Business Division	CC9.2a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	CC9.2b.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility
	GHG Type Region	CC9.2c. CC9.1a.		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region
2017	Activity	CC9.2d C2		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity
	Business Division	CC9.2a C2		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	CC9.2b C2		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility
	GHG Type Region	CC9.2c C2 CC9.1a C2		Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region
2018	Activity	C7.3c-C2		Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity
	Business Division	C7.3a-C2		Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	C7.3b-C2		Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility
	GHG Type Region	C7.1a-C2 C7.2-C2		Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region
2019	Activity	C7.3c-C2		Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity
	Business Division	C7.3a-C2		Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division
	Facility	C7.3b-C2		Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility
	GHG Type Region	C7.1a-C2 C7.2-C2		Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region

Table 9 Correlation Matrix (Binary Score). AS-Assurance Score. MP-Mismatch Percentage.

	AS 2010	AS 2011-I	AS 2012-I	AS 2013-I	AS 2014-I	AS 2015-I	AS 2016-I	AS 2017-I	AS 2018-I	AS 2019-I
AS 2010	1									
MP 2010	0.1									
AS 2011-I	0.82	1								
MP 2011	-0.15	-0.12								
AS 2012-I	0.69	0.77	1							
MP 2012	0.14	0.16	0.16							
AS 2013-I	0.43	0.52	0.73	1						
MP 2013	0.03	0.06	0.09	0.37						
AS 2014-I	0.56	0.65	0.86	0.86	1					
MP 2014	0.12	0.15	0.18	0.18	0.18					
AS 2015-I	0.43	0.52	0.73	0.86	0.86	1				
MP 2015	0.17	0.21	0.19	0.51	0.38	0.32				
AS 2016-I	0.37	0.58	0.53	0.67	0.67	0.8	1			
MP 2016	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.25	0.12	0.31	0.44			
AS 2017-I	0.3	0.52	0.59	0.73	0.73	0.86	0.94	1		
MP 2017	0.19	0.28	0.2	0.39	0.2	0.2	0.23	0.2		
AS 2018-I	0.06	0.14	0.22	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.42	0.48	1	
MP 2018	0.12	0.15	0.1	0.25	0.1	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.4	
AS 2019-I	-0.17	-0.07	-0.05	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.19	0.23	0.82	1
MP 2019	0.26	0.28	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.3	0.3