

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 10 April 2007 14:59  
**To:**  
**Subject:** FW: Donovan Brief

Thanks - a few comments:

- (1) It needs clearer structure.
- (2) Agree we should have a brief for the AGM, but it needs to be much shorter - say one page.
- (3) Agree we should get a clearer response re Alfred D and the defamation claim.
- (4) Did you get anything from - he was doing some work on the wider D relationship.

Cheers

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

**From:**  
**Sent:** 10 April 2007 14:24  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Donovan Brief

I've received input from Malaysia and updated the Donovan issue brief. Are you the focal point for approval?



Alfred Donovan.doc  
(Compressed...)

**Outstanding:**

I have asked Malaysia for clarity on the below accusation made on the Donovan site:

*Eight Royal Dutch Shell companies currently have an application before the High Court demanding that my father (Alfred), who will be 90 years old in a few weeks and resides in the UK, must travel to Malaysia to be cross examined in respect of*

*a defamation action relating to our websites.*

Question:

Do we want to script specific responses to questions that the Donovan's may raise if they attend the AGM i.e.

- What is your response to My (Donovan) claim that we have received confidential information from Shell insiders that we are prepared to use against Shell?
- What is your response that claims made on our website are slanderous to Shell. Why don't you take us to court?
- We offer Shell the opportunity to comment on stories before they are released but they do not accept. Why is this?

My view is that we should stick with the two key messages - but I would be happy to draft responses to specific questions that we might receive if you felt that this would be of use.

- We are familiar with the activities of Messrs Alfred and John Donovan, who are long-standing critics of Shell.
- Although Shell disagrees fundamentally with the factual basis and interpretation of much of the information on which the Donovan's base their various allegations, the company has always refrained from commenting on specific issues raised by the Donovan's and will continue to do so in this case.