



Home / FORECAST NL / Session 6: The Future of Oil & Gas: NL's Offshore Oil & Climate Change

Session 6: The Future of Oil & Gas: NL's Offshore Oil & Climate Change

05 Oct 2021

Check out our latest session, on NL's offshore oil and gas industry and climate change!

You can watch the video below, or [on YouTube](#).

We'll be posting some comments and questions here, as well, that we weren't able to get to live.

Let us know what you thought!

The Future of Oil: NL's Offshore Oil and Climate Change



Write a comment... You can use @ to tag somebody in the conversation

14 comments

Recently active | Posted first

▀ Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago

Audience Comment:

"Throughout the value chain we need to focus on recycling and reuse of plastics, and serious consideration needs to be given to the end-of-life of our products, as well as transitioning to non-fossil fuel alternatives to achieve a more circular plastic economy."

REPLY




▀ Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago

Audience Comment:

"We're seeing energy shortages in China and parts of Europe today, and as Max noted many economists have predicted that some oil will still be required to meet energy needs all the way to 2050 and beyond. There still seems to be a large gap between what scientists say we need and what governments - and populations generally - are willing to do. In that context, is there a benefit to global emissions by NL unilaterally choosing to wind down its oil sector?"

REPLY



▀ Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago 

Audience Comment:

"The issue is that all oil producers want to be the last one standing, but at the end of the day, price + emission intensity will define which sources will be favored. NL may be reasonably positioned from an emissions perspective, but price is not on our side, and certainly not for new, expensive projects that need to recoup their capital investment cost. It seems as a non starter to me; the just transition now seems a more profitable avenue."

REPLY



🚩 Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago

Audience Comment:

"There is another issue that we must be concerned with and that is oil is a non renewable resource. Should this also be an urgent reason to immediately pay attention to the development of alternative technologies (which will take time to develop). As Max noted we will still need to derive energy from oil in 2050, 2060 2070 plus to other non energy products."

REPLY




🚩 Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago

Audience Comment:

"All energy projects emit GHGs. The correct science needs to be done on a GLOBAL Basis To make sure which source is the best. The best is actually a conservation by humans to not use more but decrease our use. Not counting the downstream of gas and oil production is as bad as not ever considering in our total emissions for Canada the GHG emissions from mega hydro. That too is not currently considered. And it's huge."

REPLY



🚩 Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago 

Audience Comment:

"The pro-oil development argument always assumes at least maintenance, if not growth, in oil demand. According to the sixth IPCC report, such a future would be associated with catastrophic increases in temperature. I'd like the panelists to speak to the ethical implications of the ruling class continually trying to say that this future is inevitable. If oil majors and their politicians have decided that catastrophe is unavoidable, what do we tell our children? Wouldn't it make more sense to commit to an all-of-society effort to avoid that catastrophe?"

REPLY




🚩 Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago

Audience Comment:

"Why can't we do both? Be on the offensive for the green economy, encouraging R&D, and continue to be an O&G supplier, continuing to innovate on the side of reduced impact from extraction and refinement."

REPLY




🚩 Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago 

Audience Comment:

"It's a myth that we need oil. Scientists have developed models for 100% clean energy. Big oil keeps blocking the move to renewables."

REPLY



▀ Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago 

Audience Comment:

"It seems to me that the 'lower intensity upstream emissions' is a rather minor point. Much more important: IEA says, "no new oil fields". That means no need for exploration in NL (ongoing or new). No new fields opening in NL. None of that is equivalent to 'turning the taps off'. Existing fields keep producing for some time."

REPLY



▀ Mandy Rowsell, about 1 year ago

Audience Comment:

"Oil will be in demand for decades to come. That being the case, NL should get the economic and employment benefits and not other countries with lax development and regulatory rules."

REPLY



[Terms and Conditions](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Moderation Policy](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Technical Support](#)

[Cookie Policy](#)

[Site Map](#)

