

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

MINUTE OF A MEETING of the Sustainability Operations Advisory Group held in Main Library Meeting Room 1.11 on Wednesday 27 May 2015.

Members: Hugh Edmiston, Director of Corporate Services
 David Barratt, Engineering Operations Manager
 Liz Beattie, Assistant Director, Accommodation Services
 Tasha Boardman, EUSA Vice President Services
 Michelle Brown, Head of SRS Programmes
 Dave Gorman, Director of Social Responsibility & Sustainability
 Sarah Gormley, Business Manager & Deputy Head of IS Planning
 Andrew Haddon, Head of Estates Finance
 David Jack, Energy Manager
 Andrew Kerr, Director of Edinburgh Centre on Carbon Innovation
 Matthew Lawson, SRS Programme Manager
 Phil McNaul, Director of Finance
 Brian McTeir, Roslin Campus Facilities & Services Manager
 Fleur Ruckley, Waste & Environment Manager
 George Sked, Assistant Director of Procurement
 Geoff Turnbull, Assistant Director, Estates Operations
 Elizabeth Vander Meer, Climate Policy Manager
 Dougie Williams, Energy Systems Manager

In attendance: Ian Macaulay, Assistant Director – Catering Services
 Andrew Arnott, Programmes Facilitator - Laboratories, for item 6
 Caro Overy, SRS Engagement Manager, for item 7
 Alan Peddie, SRS Projects Co-ordinator – Waste, for item 8

Apologies: Hugh Edmiston; David Barratt; Liz Beattie; Tasha Boardman; Andrew Haddon; Andrew Kerr; Matthew Lawson; Elizabeth Vander Meer

- 1** The minute of the meeting held on 28 January 2015 was approved as a correct record subject to amendment of item 3 ‘Climate Emissions Report’. Paragraph two to read: “Work was ongoing to establish the relative contribution of the top 40 buildings. A two-year target was in place to get consumption data to Heads of Colleges.” **A**

In the absence of the Convener, the Director of Social Responsibility & Sustainability chaired the meeting. SOAG welcomed new member Sarah Gormley, Business Manager & Deputy Head of IS Planning, replacing Lesley Ross.

2 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising not covered on the agenda or in post-meeting notes.

SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS

3 Waste and Energy Carbon Quarterly Report **B**

The Energy Manager presented a report on the core academic estate utilities consumption and associated emissions for the first, second and third quarters of 2014-15 (including some estimates). Data from Accommodation Services would be included as an update once available. Electricity and gas constituted the largest emissions and opportunity for the greatest savings.

The Waste & Environment Manager summarised data for the last three quarters for the main waste contract (excluding Accommodation Services). The weight of waste collected under the main contract continued to rise. The capture of recyclable glass had increased as every kitchen and laboratory should now have a glass waste caddy. The main contractor for the core estate had changed to Biffa Waste Services and as of January 2015 landfill diversion (from the main contract) was 100%.

The Energy Systems Manager presented a report on possible solutions to mitigate rising energy prices, highlighting the need to input into new builds at the design stage; install energy meters wisely; and investigate innovative technology. A pilot project on Demand Based Ventilation (DBV) was ongoing within the Main Library. Similar schemes could be applied to animal houses, with BRF areas running 24/7 at between 15 and 20 air changes per hour. Members welcomed the project and recommended that findings be contextualised and delivery expressed as a percentage relative to the total achievable target.

SOAG discussed the purpose and future format for quarterly reporting, which should tie in to annual objectives. Estates and SRS were expecting to be set a target of 10% energy savings across the University. Retaining properly contextualised quarterly reporting would help identify pathways to this and other future targets, assist with forward planning, and provide needed visibility on a quarterly basis.

Concerns were noted that reporting on quarterly targets diverted resource away from key functions and that efforts could be wasted in gathering too much data at too spurious a level of accuracy. It should suffice to secure sufficient data to make an impact on senior managers. The importance of presentation was stressed in getting the message across to the target audience.

As the practical operational group working on these issues, SOAG agreed to take this approach to reporting, producing data for the whole University estate, broken down into work streams. Discussions would continue outwith the meeting.

4 Climate Change Reporting under Public Bodies Duties

C

The Director of SRS introduced this response to the Scottish Government Climate Change (Duties of Public Bodies: Reporting Requirements) (Scotland) Order 2015 consultation, closing on 29 May 2015. The response had been reviewed and approved by the Director of Corporate Services.

The Scottish Government proposed to make an order under section 46 of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 requiring specified public bodies to prepare annual reports on compliance with climate change duties. The aim was to improve the quality and consistency of climate change information reported across the four main areas of the public sector in Scotland.

The UoE response expressed support for statutory reporting using comparable and consistent data. One point of dissidence was on the proposed unification of timelines which UoE found unnecessary and unacceptable - not aligned to the academic year, these new timelines would give universities two months to report where other public bodies would have six. The amount of information asked for was also considered excessive, particularly given the scale of University operations.

Action – JR to amend the response to question 14 to read “We don’t believe it will have any policy impact.”

SOAG endorsed the amended consultation response for submission to the Scottish Government Public Bodies Duties Team.

5 Utilities Savings, Practical Planning: Awareness and Promoting Positive Behaviour

D

The Head of SRS Programmes outlined the context for this pre-plan, designed to prompt discussion on utilities savings, clarify different work streams and linkages to the Climate Strategy Review, and decide responsibilities in terms of practical planning to deliver £2M saving to 2017.

The current cost of utilities was £20M per annum, plus carbon cost. A meeting chaired by the Assistant Director, Estates Operations had taken place on 29 April to consider potential work streams for practical planning on utilities savings (outlined in Table 1). Attendees had discussed issues around data, technical energy solutions, awareness raising, building buy-in and incentives; identified gaps; and agreed on the need for a joined-up strategic approach.

Members discussed funding opportunities for spend-to-save, the energy efficiency fund, and the proposed revolving sustainability fund for projects which did not fit into utilities savings (e.g. helium recycling). SOAG noted that staff at College level were not being adequately incentivised to save energy. Further communication was needed to convey the cost of energy, feeding in through the Resource Allocation Model (RAM) and the transparent accounting model, and to highlight where it was in the Colleges' interest to invest to cut energy use.

Work was ongoing with the Energy Office on awareness raising and to agree next steps. There would be further consultation on the 'Led by' column (Table 1), on the work streams, and to allocate action. The focus would be on identifying action-orientated mini-projects that could deliver measurable output by an agreed date. A practical plan would be developed quickly, prioritising data that would yield clear financial benefit.

6 Sustainable Laboratories Implementation Plan 2015

E

SOAG welcomed Andrew Arnott, Programmes Facilitator – Laboratories, noting major opportunities in this work area, given the high carbon intensity of lab space. The proposed Sustainable Laboratories Implementation Plan 2015, devised following consultation with academics, lab users, SRS and Estates staff, included priorities for action, how progress would be achieved, and where responsibility lay.

Utilities efficiency would be the target of work over the next year. To support recommendations on utilities an evidence base was needed, outlining potential savings, costs and impact on University operations. Case studies across the UK and North America were being reviewed to develop this evidence base.

The activities should increase knowledge and awareness of sustainability with a focus on lab users – looking at induction and exit procedures, workshops and events, and engagement as an extension of ongoing SRS activity. The Sustainability Awards were identified as a key route to engage with lab users and levels of participation were encouraging.

Members discussed potential funding streams, noting that the SFC, while broadly supportive, did not necessarily have the funds available at present. Involving other institutions could help secure funding, however securing funding was itself key in attracting interest from other universities.

Action – All to feed in their ideas on funding sources.

SOAG acknowledged that it was essential to have input at the design stage. The Programme Facilitator – Laboratories had been able to input into the Darwin redevelopment plans. The strong connections between SRS and Estate Development on the Darwin project were encouraging and would hopefully continue.

Following the first meeting in January it was agreed that the Sustainable Laboratories Steering Group was too large, with too broad a remit. The Group had

split into a core strategic group and a series of operationally-focused workshops. The first Labs Workshop, on waste and procurement, had taken place on 26 May. SLSG would endorse the Implementation Plan on 2 June and report back to SOAG on 16 September.

SOAG welcomed the Plan, noting that these activities would incur a cost and requesting indication of the benefit, quantified and in priority order (including financial, carbon and energy savings). Contextualising activities, sharpening up the narrative, and including long-term goals and indicators should facilitate identification of potential funding streams. This would need to be linked to the University Strategic Plan to ensure correlation and avoid duplication.

7 Edinburgh Sustainability Awards 2014-15

F

The Engagement Manager introduced this paper on outcomes, participation and evaluation. In 2014/15, 45 awards were given across office, lab, student society and special categories. There were 31 office teams, 16 of which were new to the scheme. Participants in the Labs Awards had particularly valued peer auditing, facilitating exchange of best practice – this could be trialled in the context of the office awards. The scheme as a whole gave students insight into practical sustainability on campus as well as auditing skills that are valuable in the job market.

Overall participants reported that the awards were valuable in changing attitudes and behaviours, building upon existing Health and Safety and Procurement guidelines, bringing agendas together, approaching improving sustainability in an organised way, yielding social benefit and team building.

Negative aspects included the time-intensive nature of the scheme, estimated at between 5 and 16 hours depending on the level and team size. Some participants felt that aspects of the bronze level award were simply box ticking. Others queried the inclusion of welfare and wellbeing under a holistic definition of SRS. The toolkit in its current form was not prioritised beyond division into Bronze, Silver and Gold levels. Thought would be given to further prioritisation and review of the toolkit to ensure the actions asked for were impactful. At present the scheme concentrated on grass-roots actions. In future it should be able to give recognition for leadership and for more strategic approaches to SRS.

Next steps included setting targets for wider participation, review of the process for continuous improvement, and development of additional resources. The time commitment involved would be reviewed as well as how to maintain the motivation of repeat Gold award winners.

Members stressed the need to factor in the varying conditions (e.g. fabric of building) that teams were working in. The inclusion of a special award focused on energy should help align the scheme with operational priorities. The scheme was envisaged as a celebration of success, reflecting what departments were already doing. If it was taking a lot of extra time then teams could be missing the point. A more freeform approach could be beneficial, potentially including interviews at the second stage. It was proposed that teams that had won a Gold Award three times be invited to take part in judging.

Action – All to share any further thoughts with the Secretary.

8 Waste Update – WARP-IT and external charitable partnerships

G

The Waste and Environment Manager presented this paper focused on reuse at UoE, which was doubling year on year and currently yielding a 25% saving on waste related emissions. The market was worth £3billion per annum. The main commodities involved were electrical appliances, textiles and furniture. Items donated were very valuable contributions to small third sector social enterprises. A

lot of informal reuse and repair had been going on within the University community, though tracking this had been a problem. These items now went through the WARPit resource reuse portal.

There was an inherent element of risk in reuse, and the main concern was ensuring the process was covered from a legal standpoint. The receiving organisation had to have the right paperwork and registration to ensure UoE received the data to enable it to demonstrate that it was meeting its legal requirements. The Director of Legal Services had highlighted issues that still needed to be investigated. Electrical appliances came with their own liabilities. Guidelines were being drafted to test out the robustness of the process and would be cross-checked. The main focus currently was on PCs, which offered major opportunities environmentally and socially, but had legal and reputational risks that needed to be identified and managed. Trying to capture the value often crystallised these risks.

The SRS Projects Co-ordinator demonstrated the WARPit dashboard. The tool cost £3,750 for the 18 months it had been in operation (not including staff time) and so far had saved £27K, 14,000kg of waste and 14,000kg CO_{2e}. The process of widening the scheme to include electronics had begun with those that held no data. Following discussions with IS, Records Management, Waste and SRS basic guidance was agreed and existing internal PC cascading lists were transferred to WARPit.

The pilot was rolled out initially to computer reps in CSG and USG, overseen by Myles Ewen. The scheme currently had 250 PCs, though storage was a serious issue both for WARPit and for the University as a whole. Talks were ongoing with IS on an automated wipe for PCs, to eliminate the need for storage by allowing direct transfer person to person.

In the last year the University sent three thousand PCs to CCL North. It was envisaged that in future 95% of these could be diverted to reuse companies. A robust SLA would be set up with these organisations to meet the University's legal requirements.

Members noted that the number of registered users was low relative to overall staff numbers. This was initially deliberate, to grow the scheme in a controlled and manageable way. Admin staff had been targeted, before rolling out to other groups (e.g. lab users). SOAG noted the business potential for students to get involved and offer solutions in this area.

ROUTINE ITEMS

9 Sustainable Procurement Update including Public Procurement Rules Consultation

H

The Assistant Director of Procurement shared an update on sustainable procurement activities over the last twelve months, including a briefing on the Procurement Reform Bill. The paper tied activities to the University's strategic themes.

Highlights included signing up to Electronics Watch, an EU-funded initiative bringing together public bodies across Europe to leverage against electronic goods producers. As universities buy through national contracts, institutions were lobbying APUC and the Scottish Government to include more workers' rights criteria in their tenders.

The updated Sustainable Procurement Prioritisation Tool (formerly Marrakech) was being piloted, initially in the area of ICT, and feedback issued to the Scottish

Government. Use of the tool would be mandatory once the new procurement laws came into effect.

Procurement, in partnership with ECCI, were rolling out a series of workshops for small to medium enterprises (SMEs) on how to improve their sustainability. The first workshop had been held with Estates suppliers in March and future events focused on ICT and laboratories were planned.

A paper on the progress of the Procurement Reform Bill had been submitted to CMG on 19 May and was included as appendix 1. Procurement had organised consultations on the new laws with various groups within the University. The new law had major implications included regulated procurement down to the £50K mark, more mandated requirements and resource and compliance implications. Further feedback was available on the Procurement [website](#). The new legislation would be enacted by April 2016 at the latest.

SOAG noted that Scope 3 reporting was an average weighting done on simple expenditure, not factoring in whether the institution was buying sustainable products or arranging for sustainable delivery. This had been raised as part of the consultation response and through Estates to feed back to HESA. While institutions normally only received data on their own performance, it was possible to request others' data for benchmarking purposes. This could be accessed through Paul Cruickshank in Estates.

10 Update on Sustainable Laboratories Activities

I

SOAG noted the minute of the SLSG meeting on 27 January.

11 Any Other Business

The University had been invited to join the Edinburgh Living Landscapes partnership, a coalition of different groups aiming to maximise the integrity and value of green space within the city.

The Director of SRS highlighted that the activity-based SRS Implementation Plan (shared with the Group in January) would be repeated again for the next academic year, moving toward a RAG report format.

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL/NOTING

12 Edinburgh Food for Life Partnership report

J

SOAG noted this report of the key achievements of the Edinburgh Food for Life Partnership, which was approaching completion. Members recognised the success of the scheme and commended Accommodation Services, which would continue with the Catering Mark certification.

Date of next meeting: 09:30-11:30, Wed 16 September 2015, Rm 1.07 Main Library