

XXXX, 2020

Dear Sir/Madam:

**Re: Commission of Inquiry into Anti-Alberta Energy Campaigns - Participation for
Commentary**

I write in connection with the work of the Commission of Inquiry into Anti-Alberta Energy Campaigns (“**Inquiry**”). I am the Commissioner of the Inquiry and write to you as a Participant who has been granted standing as a Participant for Commentary in accordance with the Rules for Procedure and Practice issued on September 14, 2020 (the “**Rules**”). More particularly, I write to invite your submissions regarding certain matters in respect of which your perspective and commentary may be of assistance to the Inquiry in providing policy recommendations regarding the subject matter of the Inquiry.

For context, as is set forth under Section VI of the Rules, the Inquiry has commissioned certain reports (the “**Commissioned Reports**”), as follows:

1. Background Report on Changes in the Organization and Ideology of Philanthropic Foundations with a Focus on Environmental Issues as Reflected in Contemporary Social Science Research – Dr. Barry Cooper. (“**Cooper Report**”)
2. A New Global Paradigm: Understanding the Transnational Progressive Movement, the Energy Transition and the Great Transformation Strangling Alberta’s Petroleum Industry, including an October 2020 supplement – Dr. T. L. Nemeth. (“**Nemeth Report**”)
3. Foreign Funding Targeting Canada’s Energy Sector- Energy in Depth. (“**Energy In Depth Report**”)

In addition to the Commissioned Reports, the following publications have come to the Inquiry’s attention:

1. A World Class Environmental Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting System for Alberta – The Report of the Alberta Environmental Monitoring Panel (“**Alberta Environmental Monitoring Panel Report**”)
2. False Alarm: How Climate Change Costs Us Trillions, Hurts the Poor, and Fails to Fix the Climate - Bjorn Lomborg
3. Apocalypse Never: Why Environmental Alarmism Hurts Us All – Michael Shellenberger
4. Mines, Minerals, and “Green” Energy: A Reality Check- Mike Mills

(together with the Commissioned Reports, the “**Reports**”).

I wish to make it clear that the information and opinions expressed in the Reports do not represent findings or positions taken by the Inquiry, and instead are intended to provide a platform to obtain perspectives and positions on policy issues of potential interest to the Inquiry.

The Inquiry recognizes that the majority of the Reports approach the subject matter of the Inquiry from a common perspective and as such the Inquiry wishes to invite commentary from Participants for Commentary regarding the Reports and subject matter addressed therein so that the Inquiry can consider a variety of perspectives and viewpoints in forming policy recommendations regarding the subject matter of the Inquiry.

In order to provide a framework for your input, the Inquiry poses the following statements and questions, while noting that these statements and questions, as with the Reports and documents referenced therein, should not be taken to reflect positions or findings of the Inquiry. You may choose to respond to all, or only some, of the questions posed below.

1. The Nemeth Report may be read as suggesting that environmental non-governmental organizations and activists are key players in a movement funded by well-endowed foundations and interested governments, which movement operates as a decentralized network that is aligned and ideologically motivated to act in concert to end the use of fossil fuels.

Do you agree or disagree with Dr. Nemeth's conclusion? Why? From a policy perspective, what are your views on the role of foreign foundations and governments funding efforts in Alberta to reduce or end the use of fossil fuels?

2. The Nemeth Report suggests that the North American Tar Sands Coalition Strategy of 2008 was an early campaign of a movement to create a new energy paradigm for the world, and such campaign was not concerned with making Alberta or Canada suffer in particular, but rather was concerned about transforming western industrial economies and societies to shift off fossil fuels. The Nemeth Report may further be read as suggesting that in this context Alberta's oilsands reserves were an easy target that gained prominence when they were acknowledged as a proven reserve, increasing Canada's reserves to among the largest in the world.

Do you agree or disagree with Dr. Nemeth's conclusion? Why?

3. The Nemeth Report may be read as suggesting that some advocacy programs are directed at children.

Do you agree or disagree with Dr. Nemeth's conclusion? Why? Do you believe that there are any compelling policy considerations that arise in regards to interactions between advocacy organizations and youth? If so, to what extent are these policy considerations different if foreign funding plays a role in such advocacy programs?

4. The Cooper Report refers to a "Design to Win" project advanced by certain foundations (see page 14), in which Dr. Cooper asserts replacing existing electricity generation capacity with nuclear energy, and substituting natural gas for coal, appears to have been ignored.

Instead, Dr. Cooper refers to a strategic objective of the project to mobilize public demand for legislative action, through what Dr. Cooper describes as alarmist rhetoric.

Do you believe that, as a general matter, issues related to the energy industry seem to be increasingly polarized and as a result, partisan debate is intensified? If so, do you consider this to be part of a deliberate strategy by any party or parties; and if so, on what basis do you draw this conclusion?

5. The Alberta Environmental Monitoring Panel Report proposes the need for a new approach to environmental monitoring, evaluation and reporting in Alberta and recommends the institution of a province wide system to achieve this (Recommendation 5).

Are you aware of whether any improvements to environmental monitoring, evaluation and reporting in Alberta have been instituted subsequent to the Report? Do you believe that Albertans have sufficient access to reliable information regarding environmental monitoring, evaluation and reporting in the province? If not, what can be done to improve Albertans' access to such information?

6. The Cooper Report suggests that certain organizations are involved in strategically funding activist organizations in Canada or organizations that are in the US but are opposed to Canadian interests. The Cooper Report may be read as suggesting that funds flow from these organizations to smaller organizations that are ideologically aligned, thus giving the appearance of a grass roots movement.

Do you agree or disagree with Dr. Cooper's conclusion? Why? From a policy perspective, if the Cooper Report is correct on the flow of funds from foreign entities, what are your views on this claimed means of funding advocacy? Does this create any concerns regarding transparency of funding? If so, should measures be taken to enhance transparency? Are there negative consequences that would arise from enhanced transparency?

7. The Energy In Depth Report (at page 25) refers to the role of a law firm with registered charitable status in a letter writing campaign encouraging BC municipalities to sue a proponent of Canadian energy projects, including projects relating to the transportation of oil and gas, for climate-related damages.

What, in your view, are the advantages and disadvantages, or broader policy issues, with permitting law firms with focused objectives to have charitable status, such that their funding qualifies as charitable donations for the donors? To what extent are these advantages/disadvantages, or policy considerations, different where the funding comes from foreign sources?

8. The Reports generally may be read as advancing the proposition that a small number of extremely well-endowed foundations advance the philosophy of their funders, management or boards of directors to influence public policy, and that they are less publicly accountable than politicians or industry.

Do you agree or disagree with this proposition? Why? If you agree with the proposition, do you consider it to be problematic from a policy perspective? Why? What, if any, solutions might offer a fair and proportionate mechanism to address the policy concerns you consider to exist?

These questions are not intended to be an exhaustive list of relevant considerations arising from the Reports. You are invited to provide additional comments on other issues you consider to be relevant to the mandate of the Inquiry, as in set out in the Statement on Interpretation, that emerge from the Reports, or to draw the Inquiry's attention to any additional material on related topics. While responses to the foregoing questions may be provided in writing, you may request an interview to be conducted via videoconference to address these questions and your comments orally with the Commissioner and/or Inquiry staff.

Your assistance and participation in this process is very much appreciated and the Inquiry is hopeful that it will enable the Inquiry to propose policy recommendations regarding the subject matter of the Inquiry that will be beneficial for all Albertans.

I would be grateful to hear from you by XXXX, 2020.

Yours truly,

J. Stephens Allan

Commissioner, Public Inquiry into Anti-Alberta Energy Campaigns