

For immediate release

NEW ANALYSIS REVEALS MISLEADING NARRATIVES USED BY INDUSTRY TO PROMOTE FOSSIL FUELS IN AUSTRALIA’S “FUTURE GAS STRATEGY”

Respondents from the fossil fuel value chain advocating to safeguard the place of fossil gas in the energy mix are relying on arguments that do not reflect the latest climate science

New analysis by InfluenceMap of the consultation responses to Australia’s Future Gas Strategy reveals that the fossil fuel industry is relying on several narratives that are shown to be misaligned with science-based policy guidance from authoritative sources such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and International Energy Agency (IEA).

Inaccurate and misleading claims from industry include the idea that continued fossil fuel expansion is aligned with global climate goals, that new fossil fuel supply is required to support the decarbonization of Australia’s trading partners, and that new fossil fuel supply is needed to protect future domestic energy security.

The Future Gas Strategy aims to guide fossil gas production, consumption, and substitution in Australia to 2035 and 2050. The Strategy asserts that “reducing gas demand will support decarbonization” and that only an “adequate” but not “excessive” supply of gas needs to be maintained – points that were frequently challenged by industry in their comments on the policy.

Examples covered in the analysis include:

- **Australian Energy Producers** claiming that fossil gas “is the foundation of energy security in the region and is central to our neighbors’ pathway to net-zero” - which directly contradicts IPCC and IEA guidance that increased reliance on fossil gas to achieve decarbonization is a limited and potentially dangerous strategy.
- **The Business Council of Australia** stressing the “urgent need” for upstream supply and for Australia to maintain its reputation as a “reliable trading partner” - in contradiction to recent UN Environment Program research which states that promoting gas as a transition fuel could hinder or delay the transition to renewable energy systems.
- **Chevron** recommending against the objective that fossil gas supply should not be in excess, and **BP** advocating for the removal of regulatory barriers that currently limit fossil gas development - both despite the fact that the IPCC is clear that additional supply beyond existing fossil fuel infrastructure would exceed the remaining carbon budget for 1.5°C.

InfluenceMap Energy Transition Program Manager Tom Holen said:

“This research reveals how the whole fossil fuel value chain is using the same narrative playbook to convince policymakers and justify their continued push for fossil fuels to be included in the energy mix.

These claims are clearly misaligned with the scientific consensus on what is needed to achieve global climate goals. This threatens not only Australia's net-zero pathway, but that of its trading partners too."

While the Future Gas Strategy has far-reaching implications for Australia's ability to meet its climate targets, 88% of the respondents to the consultation that InfluenceMap analyzed came from the fossil fuel-heavy energy, metals and mining, and utilities sectors. Companies from the financial, consumer staples, and transportation sectors did not engage on the proposal, despite many having endorsed Australia's climate ambition in other public communications.

A lack of positive advocacy points to a continuation of the trend identified in InfluenceMap's January 2024 [Australia analysis](#) that a significant majority of Australia's leading companies and industry associations are failing to follow through on their supportive top-line climate messaging with active advocacy for climate policy.

Of the 33 companies and industry associations included in the analysis, 26 (79%) advocated for positions that are misaligned with IPCC guidance on the global use of gas in 1.5°C decarbonization pathways.



Fossil fuel companies from Asia – particularly Japan – also engaged on the consultation, including the **Asian Natural Gas and Energy Association (ANGEA)**, **INPEX**, and **Senex Energy**, which is wholly-owned by **POSCO**. All these entities actively called for the strategy to support the expansion of fossil gas exports and encourage new gas supply, advocacy that is similarly misaligned with science-based policy.

Additionally, responses from **Woodside Energy**, **Origin Energy**, the **Australian Pipeline and Gas Association**, and the **Australian Energy Council** all explicitly advocated for fossil gas to be included in the Capacity Investment Scheme, an attempt to give fossil fuel companies access to finance intended to aid the development of renewables. **Australian Energy Producers** also engaged with this section of the strategy proposal, advocating for this policy to be ‘technology neutral’.

Jack Herring, Australia Country Manager at InfluenceMap said:

“The world’s scientists are clear: to avoid dangerous climate change we cannot keep expanding fossil fuels. Advocacy promoting continued investment and supply of fossil gas not only risks locking Australia into a fossil fuel dependent pathway, but also threatens to misdirect the clean energy investment needed to support Australia’s net-zero transition.”

Full report, graphics, and quotes at [this landing page](#).

For further information or to arrange interviews, please contact:

Kitty Hatchley, Press Officer, InfluenceMap (London)
T : +44 (0) 7522953393 / kitty.hatchley@influencemap.org

About InfluenceMap

InfluenceMap is a London-based think tank providing data driven analysis to investors, NGOs, corporations, and the media on issues related to energy and climate change. Our metrics for measuring corporate influence over climate policy are used by investors, including the global Climate Action 100+ investor engagement process.