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Cautionary statement

The companies in which Royal Dutch Shell plc directly and indirectly owns investments are separate entities. In this presentation “Shell”, “Shell group” and “Royal Dutch Shell” are sometimes used for convenience where references are made to Royal Dutch Shell plc and its subsidiaries in general. Likewise, the words “we”, “us” and “our” are also used to refer to subsidiaries in general or to those who work for them. These expressions are also used where no useful purpose is served by identifying the particular company or companies. “Subsidiaries”, “Shell subsidiaries” and “Shell companies” as used in this presentation refer to companies over which Royal Dutch Shell plc either directly or indirectly has control. Companies over which Shell has joint control are generally referred to “joint ventures” and companies over which Shell has significant influence but neither control nor joint control are referred to as “associates”. In this presentation, joint ventures and associates may also be referred to as “equity-accounted investments”. The term “Shell interest” is used for convenience to indicate the direct and/or indirect ownership interest held by Shell in a venture, partnership or company, after exclusion of all third-party interest.

This presentation contains forward-looking statements concerning the financial condition, results of operations and businesses of Royal Dutch Shell. All statements other than statements of historical fact are, or may be deemed to be, forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements are statements of future expectations that are based on management’s current expectations and assumptions and involve known and unknown risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results, performance or events to differ materially from those expressed or implied in these statements. Forward-looking statements include, among other things, statements concerning the potential exposure of Royal Dutch Shell to market risks and statements expressing management’s expectations, beliefs, estimates, forecasts, projections and assumptions. These forward-looking statements are identified by their use of terms and phrases such as “anticipate”, “believe”, “could”, “estimate”, “expect”, “goals”, “intend”, “may”, “objectives”, “outlook”, “plan”, “probably”, “project”, “risks”, “schedule”, “seek”, “should”, “target”, “will” and similar terms and phrases. There are a number of factors that could affect the future operations of Royal Dutch Shell and could cause those results to differ materially from those expressed in the forward-looking statements included in this presentation, including (without limitation): (a) price fluctuations in crude oil and natural gas; (b) changes in demand for Shell’s products; (c) currency fluctuations; (d) drilling and production results; (e) reserves estimates; (f) loss of market share and industry competition; (g) environmental and physical risks; (h) risks associated with the identification of suitable potential acquisition properties and targets, and successful negotiation and completion of such transactions; (i) the risk of doing business in developing countries and countries subject to international sanctions; (j) legislative, fiscal and regulatory developments including regulatory measures addressing climate change; (k) economic and financial market conditions in various countries and regions; (l) political risks, including the risks of expropriation and renegotiation of the terms of contracts with governmental entities, delays or advancements in the approval of projects and delays in the reimbursement for shared costs, and (m) changes in trading conditions. All forward-looking statements contained in this presentation are expressly qualified in their entirety by the cautionary statements contained or referred to in this section. Readers should not place undue reliance on forward-looking statements. Additional risk factors that may affect future results are contained in Royal Dutch Shell’s 20-F for the year ended December 31, 2013 (available at www.shell.com/investor and www.sec.gov). These risk factors also expressly qualify all forward looking statements contained in this presentation and should be considered by the reader. Each forward-looking statement speaks only as of the date of this presentation, 26 September 2016, Neither Royal Dutch Shell plc nor any of its subsidiaries undertake any obligation to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statement as a result of new information, future events or other information. In light of these risks, results could differ materially from those stated, implied or inferred from the forward-looking statements contained in this presentation.

We may have used certain terms, such as resources, in this presentation that United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) strictly prohibits us from including in our filings with the SEC. U.S. Investors are urged to consider closely the disclosure in our Form 20-F, File No 1-32575, available on the SEC website www.sec.gov. You can also obtain these forms from the SEC by calling 1-800-SEC-0330.
The Quest project

- CO2 capture from 3 hydrogen manufacturing units at the Scotford Upgrader, with an average expected rate of 3000 tonnes/day.
- CO2 compressed to about 10 MPa so that it is in dense phase throughout the system.
- Compressor includes dehydration to minimize the amount of water in the system.
- 65 km pipeline with 6 block valves (every 4-15 km).
- Currently injecting into two wells at less than 1 MPa above background reservoir pressure (third well provides contingency).
- Total injected volume through to today is more than 1,000,000 tonnes.
An Opening Thought

“Probability is not really about numbers; it is about the structure of reasoning”

Pearl, Shafer; 1983

“Perhaps the most important aspect is not the probability number, but the evidence and reasoning it summarizes”

North; 1995
Site Selection: Risk Elimination

Selection criteria, scores and rational -> targets risk reduction

- Eliminate or Isolation from key risks
- Favourable ranking of site “A” (lowering risk) choice over “B” or “C”, even at higher cost
- Better ability to engineer and control safeguards (MMV and site operations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Selection Rationale</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>Thickening seals updip</td>
<td>++  +  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy wells</td>
<td></td>
<td>++  +  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>BCS thickening E-NE</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectivity</td>
<td>BCS reservoir quality</td>
<td>++  +  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMV</td>
<td>Better access and less interference</td>
<td>++  +  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore Space Access</td>
<td>Freehold –vs-crown</td>
<td>++  - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Most proximal site</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>++  -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Screening Stage

1. Define screening basis
2. Develop screening plan
3. Review available data and identify potential sites
4. Estimate capacity and level of uncertainty
5. Identification and assessment of uncertainty and risks
6. Select site(s) for assessment. Produce Screening Report
**QUEST Site Selection**

Sequestration Lease area = 3670 km²

Selection based on many factors:

Reservoir quality, seal placement, fractures/ faults, predicted pressure response, stakeholder concerns, legacy wells, ability to conduct MMV…
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## Subsurface Risks And Uncertainties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Key Uncertainty</th>
<th>Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>Loss of Containment Through Wells</td>
<td>Ability to drill &amp; cement gauge hole DTS (for leak detection) Integrity of Legacy Wells</td>
<td>3rd Well 3rd Well Study in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>LoC through the Subsurface</td>
<td>Structural interpretation Regional correlation of seals Geomechanics</td>
<td>HRAM, 2D,3D, VSP 2D, logs Core, logs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectivity</td>
<td>Non-commercial rates of injection</td>
<td>Permeability height (Kₜ) Skin Non-Darcy skin, relative permeability Connected volume CO₂ injectivity</td>
<td>H₂O inj. test H₂O inj. test No, SCAL (core) HRAM, 2D, 3D CO₂ inj. test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Low connected pore volume</td>
<td>Compartmentalisation Reservoir properties (h, N/G, phi &amp; cr)</td>
<td>HRAM, 3D, ext.H₂O inj. test 3rd well, core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMV</td>
<td>Conformance risk</td>
<td>Unexpected plume migration Differentiation CO₂ contamination Detectability</td>
<td>HRAM, 2D, 3D, 3rd well Water sampling ....... MDT, sampling, INSAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Managing Risk – The Bowtie Concept

What barriers and controls are there to prevent the event happening, or escalating?

UNWANTED EVENT

Prevention (proactive)
reduce likelihood of harmful event

Control and Recovery (reactive)
limit and mitigate consequence, re-instate

No escalation giving least potential impact

Full escalation giving largest potential impact
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# Systematic Evaluation of Passive Safeguards

- Evidence based using collective expert judgement (internal and external)
- Informed by appraisal data and site characterization studies
- Subject to independent expert review
- May steer further studies/ data gathering to reduce white space

## Threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Safeguard</th>
<th>Evidence For</th>
<th>Evidence Against</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>EA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Migration along a legacy well   | Injectors located away from legacy| 1. IHS database identifies legacy wells  
2. Shortest offset distance is 21km | 1. IHS database may not be complete  
2. IHS database may be inaccurate | 0.8 | 0.1 |
| Drilling mud forms impermeable plug | 1. Weighted drilling fluid used  
2. Settlement creates low K filtrate plug  
3. Plug forms at bottom hole over several | 1. Plug may not cover first seal | | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Lotsberg salt creep seals borehole | 1. Open-hole over Lotsberg salts  
2. Documented shrinkage in LPG caverns  
3. Small hole (<10 in) - long time (50 yr)  
4. Thick salt layers (55-127 m)  
5. Greater than 90% halite | 1. None | | 0.7 | 0 |
| Cement plugs                    | 1. Well abandonment and drilling reports  
2. Four wells with plugs inside BCS complex | 1. No positive pressure test results reported  
2. Cement may degrade over c. 50 years  
3. Darling lacks plugs in storage complex | | 0.3 | 0.4 |
MMV – Risk Analysis & Mitigation

- Establish Monitoring Requirements
- Select Monitoring Plans
- Establish Performance Targets
- Identify Contingency Monitoring
- Identify Control Measures
- Evaluate these Additional Safeguards
- Storage Risks Acceptable?

MMV Plan

- Identify Risks
- MMV Design
- Risks reduced to ALARP

Risks reduced to ALARP

- Risk-Based
  - Verify geological & engineered safeguards
  - Reduce containment risk to ALARP

- Site-Specific
  - Tailor-made monitoring
  - Informed by appraisal data

- Adaptive
  - Respond to observed performance
  - Contingency plans in place
Active Safeguards: Risk Profile

- Informed by appraisal data and feasibility studies
- Based on collective expert judgement

Diagram:
- Passive safeguards
- Active safeguards

Legend:
- Unacceptable
- Tolerable
- Broadly Acceptable
Performance & Closure

The Government or Regulators View Of Remaining Risk

Closure Plan Outline

- Intro
- Project Overview
- Storage Performance Tasks for Site Closure
  - CCS Targets from the Regulator
- Storage Performance Data
  - Well inventory
  - CO2 inventory
  - Containment Performance
  - Conformance Performance
- Operating Plan Updates
  - SDP changes
  - MMV changes
- Proposed Closure Activities
  - Storage site reclamations
  - Well decommissioning
- Site Closure Certification
  - Post-closure monitoring
  - Transfer of infrastructure
- Reporting & Documentation
Summary

Risk & Uncertainty needs to be addressed at every phase of the project:

- Site Selection – Elimination/ Isolation/ Reduction from risk
- Site Characterization – Reduction in uncertainty and remaining risk
- MMV/ Injection – Risk monitoring and mitigation
- Site Closure – Verification & Liability Transfer

Different stakeholders will focus on different risk elements

- Landowners – HSSE, Containment
- Government, Regulator – HSSE, Containment, Capacity and Long Term Liability
- Management – HSSE, Containment, Capacity, Long Term liability, Injectivity, Financially Sound

An Industrial Scale Integrated project needs to manage all risks to ALARP
A Final Thought

“Probability is not really about numbers; it is about the structure of reasoning”

………………Judea Pearl, Glen Shafer; 1983 - Defaults & Probabilities, Extensions & Coherence

“Perhaps the most important aspect is not the probability number, but the evidence and reasoning it summarizes”………Oliver North; 1995