

**From:** John Donovan [john@shellnews.net]  
**Sent:** 07 March 2007 10:20  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF; Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC  
**Subject:** Shell Fatalities

Dear Mr Ruddock

**We have received information from a trusted Shell insider source regarding Shell fatality statistics.**

The following are extracts from communications received from the relevant source.

***"... there were a total of 29 fatalities in Shell's operations in 2006. There have been 9 fatalities during January and February 2007."***

***"throughout Shell those fatality numbers are provoking some serious soul searching – regrettably there are always some fatalities, but these numbers are horrific. There are plenty of people who see a connection between Brinded's and Botts' style of management and the fatalities. Three years ago, Botts promised a 30% increase in production with a 30% reduction in costs by 2007. Instead, there has been a 30% increase in costs with a 30% reduction in production....."***

***"Shell's other accident/incident statistics (which are easily massaged/unreported) all suggest an improvement in HSE. It is rather harder to massage fatality numbers."***

I sent an email to Shell Media Dept yesterday seeking verification and comment, but there has been no response.

In view of these "horrific" figures, we are drafting a follow-up to our article relating to the Brent Bravo Scandal which was the subject of my recent correspondence with you.

It will cover other related topics e.g. the whistleblower warnings by Dr John Huang about helicopter and oil platform safety issues allegedly ignored by Shell. In his capacity as a Shell Malaysia production geologist, Dr Huang issued written safety warnings in relation to alleged problems in the design of an offshore platform in the Labalu Field Development Project allegedly rendering the platform unsafe and liable to sink. Dr Huang claims that he was punished for raising his concerns by being sidelined and demoted. Dr Huang later also raised concerns about the safety of Shell's helicopter fleet in Malaysia after being given responsibility for such matters. His written warnings that the lives of passengers and crew were being recklessly put at risk were allegedly ignored. You will probably be aware of the subsequent accidents when helicopters inconveniently crashed into the sea.

The ruthless Datuk Jon Chadwick, now apparently skulking in Singapore, left a considerable legacy from his years as Chairman of Shell Malaysia, mostly negative in the extreme as far as Shell employees are concerned. He was clearly a paid up subscriber to the **profits before safety** culture at Shell.

I assume that you will not wish to take up our standing invitation for advance sight of the draft so that you have an opportunity to comment, but I would ask for confirmation of the quoted numbers of fatalities. If they are inaccurate, please supply the correct figures.

**If there is no response, we will assume that the figures quoted are correct.**

21/03/2007

11

egards  
ohn Donovan

S. EIGHT Royal Dutch Shell companies are collectively suing Dr Huong for defamation and have issued multiple injunctions against him for postings made on our website under his name as well as proceedings seeking his imprisonment for alleged contempt of court in relation to further postings on our website. That was his reward for engaging in conscience driven internal whistle blowing. Dr Huong is suing Shell for alleged wrongful dismissal. Shell is still insisting that my partly disabled father, who will be 90 years old in April and has many serious medical problems, must travel to Malaysia for cross-examination in the High Court. Naturally we are less than impressed with Shell's disregard for his advanced age and fragility but will do our best to remain neutral in our reporting.

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 19 February 2007 13:59  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Re: [REDACTED] v Shell

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. I am currently in Singapore about to return overnight our time here to Amsterdam. I will respond to you properly once I am back in Europe.

In the meantime, we have always indicated to [REDACTED] that we believe that it is in the best interests of all parties to try to resolve these matters without resorting to litigation and we continue to believe that this is the case. Accordingly, I confirm that we would welcome an opportunity to try to resolve these matters through discussion with you on behalf of [REDACTED] on a without prejudice basis.

One immediate concern which I would like to raise with you now, however, is that I have received an email earlier today from Mr John Donovan. Mr Donovan and his father Alfred are long-standing critics of Shell and operate an avowedly anti-Shell website. I will forward you Mr Donovan's email separately which is very sparse in its detail but which appears to indicate that he is about to publish material on his website which he may have been obtained from [REDACTED]. It is not clear whether some of this material may also relate to the content of the without prejudice discussions and communications we have held with [REDACTED] since last August. I am sure you will understand that from our perspective it would be unfortunate to say the least if such details were to be released into the public domain in this way. This would certainly colour any future settlement discussions we may seek to undertake with you or with [REDACTED]. Accordingly, to the extent that [REDACTED] is in a position to prevent publication of this material, we would request that he does so. If this material was not provided to Mr Donovan by [REDACTED] then I apologise for the misunderstanding.

I will be in contact again shortly.

Regards

Internet: <http://www.shell.com>

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]  
CC: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Mon Feb 19 14:13:39 2007  
Subject: [REDACTED] v Shell

Good afternoon, [REDACTED]

I am making contact at this stage simply to report that I have been consulted by [REDACTED] with a view to trying to resolve his dispute with Shell without having to resort to litigation. I am aware that you have already had 2 informal meetings with him and there appears to be a willingness on the part of Shell to 'discuss' matters on a without-prejudice basis.

19

I am not yet up-to-speed on all aspects of the case but I look forward to receiving some suggested dates from you in, say, early March when you might be free to meet with me for a candid but without-prejudice exchange of views.

Regards

[REDACTED]

This e-mail and any files attached with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the addressee. It may contain information which is covered by legal, professional or other privilege and will be protected by copyright. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately. If you are not the intended addressee, you must delete this e-mail and not disclose, copy or take any action on reliance of this transmission. To the extent that this e-mail is passed on by the intended addressee, care must be taken to ensure that it is in a form which accurately reflects the information contained in the original e-mail.

E-mail is an informal means of communication and may be subject to data corruption accidentally or deliberately. For this reason it is inappropriate to rely on advice in an e-mail without obtaining written confirmation of it first. This email is not intended to have contractual effect and does not form part of any contract.

This e-mail has been swept by BlackSpider MailControl for the presence of computer viruses. Although we have taken reasonable precautions to ensure that any attachment has been swept for viruses we cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses.

Morisons LLP is a limited liability partnership incorporated in Scotland with registered number SO300995 and having its registered office at Erskine House, 68 Queen Street, Edinburgh, EH2 4NN. Morisons LLP is registered by the Law Society of Scotland. We use the word partner to refer to a member of Morisons LLP. A list of members is available for inspection at the registered office and other offices.

[REDACTED]

80



[REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 09 March 2007 15:28  
To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Legally Privileged and Confidential - [REDACTED] and Donovan follow up

[REDACTED]

Following the recent activity around [REDACTED] and the Donovans, N/Sea integrity etc., it was agreed that a follow-up on the broader strategy relating particularly to handling the Donovans would be valuable. This is intended to start the process.

It stands we are on the back foot and our aim should be to develop a strategy (or options) that puts us in a more active and secure position.

Things to consider (my brain dump - in no particular order):

- Review handling the media - e.g. creation/ratification of one blanket statement as way forward - proactive approach with selected journo.
- [REDACTED]
- Qs and As for the AGM - See attached - need to update, but possibly change stance. Would one strong blanket response be more effective than several rebuttals? Should we be more forthright about the site and our views on it? What might happen (leafleting in the past)?
- Strategy to detach [REDACTED] from the Donovans (in his best interests - and ours). Positive engagement with [REDACTED] (who and how?) alongside demonstration that we won't tolerate the Donovans' approach unchallenged any longer? Way forward.
- Scenarios - see attached first draft from [REDACTED]. Are there others? Are we prepared? How do we prepare/respond?
- Blockers and enablers, strengths and weaknesses. Do we fully understand our own position. Are there on-going issues that we need to know about/fix. Ensure we are on solid ground. Are we making the most of what we've got.

While this note is going to everyone on the address list I don't expect everyone to participate. However, participation will depend on the areas we finally decide to concentrate on - thus, please let me know if you have areas not covered above that need consideration (or consider that some of the above do not need attention now) and then let me know if you would like to take part in the follow up.

Date - asap - format and location to be confirmed. Clear agenda and deliverables, working event (no presentations except to establish baselines), round table working group. Will need to keep to workable size!

Please respond soonest and I will work to get this off the ground asap.

By copy to [REDACTED] - [REDACTED] has suggested that you be included in this note given your experience.

Thanks and regards



2006 - Q1 - North Sea  
ired Donovan.docety Scenarios.doc

[REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 20 February 2007 06:11  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: Latest on Donovan

[REDACTED]

Jon has kept me informed on the latest on [REDACTED] and Donovan. Can you copy me in as well so we make sure we cover for each other's absences?

I take it you are keeping [REDACTED] informed?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 20 February 2007 13:52  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Brent Bravo Scandal

Many thanks for all your recent e-mails. I shall discuss the content of the most recent with [REDACTED] the terms of which I have noted without comment and without prejudice. I have passed on your earlier remarks regarding [REDACTED] as my client says, he cannot control what Donovan does. Nevertheless, he and I will bring such influence to bear as we can in all the circumstances.

I am happy to meet at a location which is convenient to you. If you wish to come to Edinburgh, so much the better – I dare say it will seem like only a short 'hop' to you, given the amount of travelling you must do in the ordinary course of events!

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 20 February 2007 13:34  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: Brent Bravo Scandal

Given that [REDACTED] has now engaged a lawyer, and that you will no doubt now be reviewing the correspondence passing, there is one issue where I believe I need to put the position formally on record so as to avoid the potential for future misunderstandings.

As previously indicated to [REDACTED] after the very positive meeting held with him on 24 November, 2006, [REDACTED] and I were taken aback by the tone and content of his email to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] dated 30 November, 2006, and copied to me, and also of his note of 9th December, 2006, to [REDACTED] which was in turn forwarded to me. I asked my colleagues at the time not to respond directly to [REDACTED] as I believed that refutation of the points made by him with the underlying explanations, and any subsequent dialogue, would only serve to create a hardening of respective positions and would not assist in achieving the mutually acceptable resolution which we were trying to work towards at that stage.

However, I should now record that the lack of a rebuttal from [REDACTED], [REDACTED] or indeed me, did not in any way constitute an acceptance on their part or the part of Shell, of any of the points made by [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

83

[REDACTED] in those two notes, many of which we consider to be grossly inaccurate or made completely out of context. Accordingly, the positions of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] myself personally and Shell are formally reserved.

For similar reasons, I also purposely did not respond to the points [REDACTED] made in his email to me of 30th November, 2006, many of which again were inaccurate. I had believed that, at that stage, a formal rebuttal would again not move us towards the resolution which we were all seeking to achieve. Again, for the avoidance of doubt, my not responding to the points [REDACTED] raised in that email does not constitute an acceptance either by me or by Shell of the points he made and our respective positions are reserved.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Internet: <<http://www.shell.com/>>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 10:46  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Brent Bravo Scandal  
**Importance:** High

[REDACTED]

I attach a further email received from Mr Donovan. As it appears that this material has been provided to him by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I would ask you to consider urgently with your client whether publication of this material on the Donovan website in this manner is really in the best interests of furthering [REDACTED] case with Shell and of helping continue the constructive dialogue which we have been undertaking in good faith with him.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

DX

Internet: <<http://www.shell.com/>>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:[john@shellnews.net](mailto:john@shellnews.net)]

**Sent:** 20 February 2007 10:17

**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP

**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF

**Subject:** Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Ruddock

Re: My email dated 19 February 2007.

We had wanted Shell to have the opportunity to comment on a draft article based on information from documents in our possession and were prepared to take into account in a final draft, any comments made by Shell, particularly in relation to factual accuracy.

To give you some idea of the content, the following are extracts from the current comprehensive draft which contains devastating allegations and commentary about Shell and its senior management: -

· Campbell says that Shell's Chief Internal Auditor, Jakob Stausholm, admitted to him in a taped telephone conversation that the allegations made by Shell against Campbell in the releases were known by him (Stausholm) to be "*false and misleading*".

· Stausholm also clearly stated in the recorded conversation from June 2004 that the EP internal communiqué did not take into account factual evidence from his investigation report. The evidence was ignored as a conscious decision to strengthen the rebuttal to allegations attributed to Campbell in an article published by UpstreamOnline. Stausholm accepted that this had the secondary effect of punishing Campbell.

· In the same taped conversation, Stausholm disassociated himself and his colleague, Richard Sykes, the EP Group Environmental Advisor, from the formation of the wording in the press release and EP internal communiqué.

· Missing files: Campbell says that files held in the Internal Audit department in Aberdeen and at the EPS-HE library in The Hague relating to the PSMR disappeared. Related records of interviews with senior Brent Bravo management when important admittances were made had also conveniently disappeared. The same applied to logbooks, maintenance records, statements by inspectors etc.

· That contrary to Shell press statements no audit was carried out on Brent Bravo in 2000.

· Jeroen van der Veer has sent a Letter of Censure to Brinded. It concluded that Brinded was wrong to dismiss Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Brinded was also required to apologise personally to PSMR team members. A note to be issued by Brinded to EP staff and audit professionals was drafted. The tone implied that Brinded was on

first name terms with "Bill". In fact they had not spoken for a decade.

· Kieron McFayden admitted at a meeting with Campbell in the presence of a witness, David Richmond (a retired Shell platform manager), that when he learned about the "touch fuck all" policy, he was "thoroughly ashamed".

· Campbell says: *"I have been thoroughly sickened by the whole process that a Company with such published principles and standards can lie, cheat, falsify and corrupt and defame the character of a respected employee who has been commended various times throughout his long career."*

Campbell has continued to publicly campaign about the alleged disregard for safety out of concern that unless past wrongdoing is exposed and culprits punished, another major accident is inevitable and that more preventable deaths will be the outcome.

Since we have not even received the courtesy of an acknowledgement, it seems reasonable to conclude that Shell is not interested in the offer. Consequently, unless we hear from you by 2pm UK time today we will assume that Shell does not wish to take up the offer and will not bother Shell further on the matter.

While writing, I would also like to draw your attention to the following article.

ShellNews.net: Update on lawsuits against Royal Dutch Shell  
<<http://royaldutchshellplc.com/2007/02/20/shellnewsnet-update-on-lawsuits-against-royal-dutch-shell/>>

No doubt Shell will let us know if it disputes what we say in this article.

Regards

John Donovan

Click [here <https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/wQw0zmjPoHdJTZGyOCrrhg==>](https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/wQw0zmjPoHdJTZGyOCrrhg==) to report this email as spam.

Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP

---

From: John Donovan [john@shellnews.net]  
Sent: 20 February 2007 10:17  
To: Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
Cc: van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
Subject: Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Ruddock

Re: My email dated 19 February 2007.

We had wanted Shell to have the opportunity to comment on a draft article based on information from documents in our possession and were prepared to take into account in a final draft, any comments made by Shell, particularly in relation to factual accuracy.

To give you some idea of the content, the following are extracts from the current comprehensive draft which contains devastating allegations and commentary about Shell and its senior management: -

- Campbell says that Shell's Chief Internal Auditor, Jakob Stausholm, admitted to him in a taped telephone conversation that the allegations made by Shell against Campbell in the releases were known by him (Stausholm) to be "*false and misleading*".
- Stausholm also clearly stated in the recorded conversation from June 2004 that the EP internal communiqué did not take into account factual evidence from his investigation report. The evidence was ignored as a conscious decision to strengthen the rebuttal to allegations attributed to Campbell in an article published by UpstreamOnline. Stausholm accepted that this had the secondary effect of punishing Campbell.
- In the same taped conversation, Stausholm disassociated himself and his colleague, Richard Sykes, the EP Group Environmental Advisor, from the formation of the wording in the press release and EP internal communiqué.
- Missing files: Campbell says that files held in the Internal Audit department in Aberdeen and at the EPS-HE library in The Hague relating to the PSMR disappeared. Related records of interviews with senior Brent Bravo management when important admittances were made had also conveniently disappeared. The same applied to logbooks, maintenance records, statements by inspectors etc.

· That contrary to Shell press statements no audit was carried out on Brent Bravo in 2000.

· **Jeroen van der Veer has sent a Letter of Censure to Brinded.** It concluded that Brinded was wrong to dismiss Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Brinded was also required to apologise personally to PSMR team members. A note to be issued by Brinded to EP staff and audit professionals was drafted. The tone implied that Brinded was on first name terms with "Bill". In fact they had not spoken for a decade.

· Kieron McFayden admitted at a meeting with Campbell in the presence of a witness, David Richmond (a retired Shell platform manager), that when he learned about the "touch fuck all" policy, he was "**thoroughly ashamed**".

· Campbell says: *"I have been thoroughly sickened by the whole process that a Company with such published principles and standards can lie, cheat, falsify and corrupt and defame the character of a respected employee who has been commended various times throughout his long career."*

Campbell has continued to publicly campaign about the alleged disregard for safety out of concern that unless past wrongdoing is exposed and culprits punished, another major accident is inevitable and that more preventable deaths will be the outcome.

Since we have not even received the courtesy of an acknowledgement, it seems reasonable to conclude that Shell is not interested in the offer. Consequently, unless we hear from you by 2pm UK time today we will assume that Shell does not wish to take up the offer and will not bother Shell further on the matter.

While writing, I would also like to draw your attention to the following article.

ShellNews.net: Update on lawsuits against Royal Dutch Shell  
<<http://royaldutchshellplc.com/2007/02/20/shellnewsnet-update-on-lawsuits-against-royal-dutch-shell/>>

No doubt Shell will let us know if it disputes what we say in this article.

Regards

ds



John Donovan

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 10:46  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Brent Bravo Scandal  
**Importance:** High

[REDACTED]

I attach a further email received from Mr Donovan. As it appears that this material has been provided to him by [REDACTED] I would ask you to consider urgently with your client whether publication of this material on the Donovan website in this manner is really in the best interests of furthering [REDACTED] case with Shell and of helping continue the constructive dialogue which we have been undertaking in good faith with him.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:john@shellnews.net]  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 10:17  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Ruddock

Re: My email dated 19 February 2007.

We had wanted Shell to have the opportunity to comment on a draft article based on information from documents in our possession and were prepared to take into account in a final draft, any comments made by Shell, particularly in relation to factual accuracy.

To give you some idea of the content, the following are extracts from the current comprehensive draft which contains devastating allegations and commentary about Shell and its senior management: -

[REDACTED]

90

- Campbell says that Shell's Chief Internal Auditor, Jakob Stausholm, admitted to him in a taped telephone conversation that the allegations made by Shell against Campbell in the releases were known by him (Stausholm) to be *"false and misleading"*.

- Stausholm also clearly stated in the recorded conversation from June 2004 that the EP internal communiqué did not take into account factual evidence from his investigation report. The evidence was ignored as a conscious decision to strengthen the rebuttal to allegations attributed to Campbell in an article published by UpstreamOnline. Stausholm accepted that this had the secondary effect of punishing Campbell.

- In the same taped conversation, Stausholm disassociated himself and his colleague, Richard Sykes, the EP Group Environmental Advisor, from the formation of the wording in the press release and EP internal communiqué.

- Missing files: Campbell says that files held in the Internal Audit department in Aberdeen and at the EPS-HE library in The Hague relating to the PSMR disappeared. Related records of interviews with senior Brent Bravo management when important admittances were made had also conveniently disappeared. The same applied to logbooks, maintenance records, statements by inspectors etc.

- That contrary to Shell press statements no audit was carried out on Brent Bravo in 2000.

- **Jeroen van der Veer has sent a Letter of Censure to Brinded.** It concluded that Brinded was wrong to dismiss Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Brinded was also required to apologise personally to PSMR team members. A note to be issued by Brinded to EP staff and audit professionals was drafted. The tone implied that Brinded was on first name terms with "Bill". In fact they had not spoken for a decade.

- Kieron McFayden admitted at a meeting with Campbell in the presence of a witness, David Richmond (a retired Shell platform manager), that when he learned about the "touch fuck all" policy, he was **"thoroughly ashamed"**.

- Campbell says: *"I have been thoroughly sickened by the whole process that a Company with such published principles and standards can lie, cheat, falsify and corrupt and defame the character of a respected employee who has been commended various times throughout his long career."*

Campbell has continued to publicly campaign about the alleged disregard for safety out of concern that unless past wrongdoing is exposed and culprits punished, another major accident is

inevitable and that more preventable deaths will be the outcome.

Since we have not even received the courtesy of an acknowledgement, it seems reasonable to conclude that Shell is not interested in the offer. Consequently, unless we hear from you by 2pm UK time today we will assume that Shell does not wish to take up the offer and will not bother Shell further on the matter.

While writing, I would also like to draw your attention to the following article.

ShellNews.net: Update on lawsuits against Royal Dutch Shell  
<<http://royaldutchshellplc.com/2007/02/20/shellnewsnet-update-on-lawsuits-against-royal-dutch-shell/>>

No doubt Shell will let us know if it disputes what we say in this article.

Regards

John Donovan

Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP

---

**From:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 13:31  
**To:** 'John Donovan'  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Donovan

We disagree fundamentally with the factual basis and interpretation of the material you have produced but believe that no useful purpose would be achieved by engaging in a detailed rebuttal. We continue to expressly reserve our position in respect of these matters.

Regards

Keith Ruddock

Keith Ruddock  
General Counsel Exploration and Production  
Shell International Exploration and Production B.V.  
The Hague, The Netherlands - Trade Register no. 27002688  
Address: Kessler Park 1, 2288 GS Rijswijk, The Netherlands  
Tel: +31 70 447 4323 Fax: 4380 Email: [Keith.Ruddock@shell.com](mailto:Keith.Ruddock@shell.com)  
Internet: <http://www.shell.com/>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:[john@shellnews.net](mailto:john@shellnews.net)]  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 10:17  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Ruddock

Re: My email dated 19 February 2007.

We had wanted Shell to have the opportunity to comment on a draft article based on information from documents in our possession and were prepared to take into account in a final draft, any comments made by Shell, particularly in relation to factual accuracy.

To give you some idea of the content, the following are extracts from the current comprehensive draft which contains devastating allegations and commentary about Shell and its senior management: -

Campbell says that Shell's Chief Internal Auditor, Jakob Stausholm, admitted to him in a

taped telephone conversation that the allegations made by Shell against Campbell in the releases were known by him (Stausholm) to be *"false and misleading"*.

- Stausholm also clearly stated in the recorded conversation from June 2004 that the EP internal communiqué did not take into account factual evidence from his investigation report. The evidence was ignored as a conscious decision to strengthen the rebuttal to allegations attributed to Campbell in an article published by UpstreamOnline. Stausholm accepted that this had the secondary effect of punishing Campbell.

- In the same taped conversation, Stausholm disassociated himself and his colleague, Richard Sykes, the EP Group Environmental Advisor, from the formation of the wording in the press release and EP internal communiqué.

- Missing files: Campbell says that files held in the Internal Audit department in Aberdeen and at the EPS-HE library in The Hague relating to the PSMR disappeared. Related records of interviews with senior Brent Bravo management when important admittances were made had also conveniently disappeared. The same applied to logbooks, maintenance records, statements by inspectors etc.

- That contrary to Shell press statements no audit was carried out on Brent Bravo in 2000.

- **Jeroen van der Veer has sent a Letter of Censure to Brinded.** It concluded that Brinded was wrong to dismiss Campbell as SIEP Lead Auditor. Brinded was also required to apologise personally to PSMR team members. A note to be issued by Brinded to EP staff and audit professionals was drafted. The tone implied that Brinded was on first name terms with "Bill". In fact they had not spoken for a decade.

- Kieron McFayden admitted at a meeting with Campbell in the presence of a witness, David Richmond (a retired Shell platform manager), that when he learned about the "touch fuck all" policy, he was **"thoroughly ashamed"**.

- **Campbell says: *"I have been thoroughly sickened by the whole process that a Company with such published principles and standards can lie, cheat, falsify and corrupt and defame the character of a respected employee who has been commended various times throughout his long career."***

Campbell has continued to publicly campaign about the alleged disregard for safety out of concern that unless past wrongdoing is exposed and culprits punished, another major accident is inevitable and that more preventable deaths will be the outcome.

Since we have not even received the courtesy of an acknowledgement, it seems reasonable to conclude that Shell is not interested in the offer. Consequently, unless we hear from you by 2pm UK time today we will assume that Shell does not wish to take up the offer and will not bother Shell further on the matter.

While writing, I would also like to draw your attention to the following article.

ShellNews.net: Update on lawsuits against Royal Dutch Shell  
<<http://royaldutchshellplc.com/2007/02/20/shellnewsnet-update-on-lawsuits-against-royal-dutch-shell/>>

No doubt Shell will let us know if it disputes what we say in this article.

Regards

John Donovan

95

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 13:31  
**To:** 'John Donovan'  
**Subject:** RE: Brent Bravo Scandal

Dear Mr Donovan

We disagree fundamentally with the factual basis and interpretation of the material you have produced but believe that no useful purpose would be achieved by engaging in a detailed rebuttal. We continue to expressly reserve our position in respect of these matters.

Regards

Keith Ruddock

Keith Ruddock  
General Counsel Exploration and Production  
Shell International Exploration and Production B.V.  
The Hague, The Netherlands - Trade Register no. 27002688  
Address: Kessler Park 1, 2288 GS Rijswijk, The Netherlands  
Tel: +31 70 447 4323 Fax: 4380 Email: [Keith.Ruddock@shell.com](mailto:Keith.Ruddock@shell.com)  
Internet: <http://www.shell.com/>

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Donovan [mailto:[john@shellnews.net](mailto:john@shellnews.net)]  
**Sent:** 20 February 2007 10:17  
**To:** Ruddock, Keith KA SI-LSEP  
**Cc:** van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB; Ollila, Jorma SI-RDS/CH; Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF  
**Subject:** Brent Bravo Scandal