

#### **Travel & Aviation Working Group**

#### Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020, 3pm

#### **ECCI Boardroom**

#### AGENDA

1	<b>Minute</b> To <u>approve</u> the minute of the previous meeting on 18 December 2019	TAWG 10
2	<b>Consultation &amp; Communications Process</b> To <u>review</u> and <u>provide feedback</u> on four consultation and communication assets including:	TAWG 11
	<ul> <li>a consultation survey to be distributed to staff and students</li> <li>a consultation information document containing detailed information on the proposed changes</li> </ul>	TAWG 11.1 TAWG 11.2
	<ul> <li>a brief communications plan</li> <li>an all-staff &amp; student email to announce the consultation</li> </ul>	TAWG 11.3 TAWG 11.4
3	<b>How To Assess Equality and Diversity</b> To <u>discuss</u> options as a group	Verbal
4	<b>Outline Framework for Final Report</b> To <u>note</u> and <u>discuss</u> a paper from the SRS Projects Coordinator	TAWG 12
5	<b>Carbon Offsetting &amp; Interim Position</b> To <u>note</u> and <u>discuss</u> papers from the Director of SRS and SRS Projects Coordinator	TAWG 13 TAWG 14
6	<b>Processes &amp; Policies</b> To <u>review</u> and <u>comment</u> on an outline paper from the Deputy Director of Finance on how a potential levy would operate	TAWG 15
	To <u>discuss</u> expenses & Key Travel, including feedback to Finance on Expenses Policy	Verbal
	To <u>raise</u> any further innovative ideas on climate conscious travel in the policy space	Verbal
7	<b>Corporate Business Travel Reduction Initiatives</b> To <u>note</u> and <u>discuss</u> a paper from the SRS Projects Coordinator	TAWG 16
8	<b>Sustainability Fund</b> To <u>receive</u> an update from the Director of SRS and <u>discuss</u> governance and processes	Verbal
9	<b>UNA Europa Project and Mobility</b> To <u>receive</u> an update from the Vice-Principal International	Verbal
10	<b>Any Other Business</b> To <u>consider</u> any other matters from Group members	Verbal
11	<b>Summary &amp; Next Steps</b> To <u>note</u> a summary of the meeting and next steps from the Convener	Verbal
As	a member or attendee of University committee meetinas, we process and store your data in acc	cordance with

As a member or attendee of University committee meetings, we process and store your data in accordance with our privacy statement. Your involvement in a committee is public by default, but you may opt-out by contacting <u>SRS.Privacy@ed.ac.uk</u> or <u>Jane.Rooney@ed.ac.uk</u>

If you require this agenda or any of the papers in an alternative format please contact Jane Rooney on 0131 650 4375 or email jane.rooney@ed.ac.uk

#### UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

**MINUTE OF A MEETING** of the Travel & Aviation Working Group held in the Elder Room, Old College on Wednesday 18 December 2019.

Present: Sandy Tudhope (Convenor), University Lead on Climate Responsibility and Sustainability Richard Anderson, Senior Lecturer, Architecture and Landscape Architecture Kevin Ashley, Director, Digital Curation Centre Harry Campbell, Personal Chair of Genetic Epidemiology & Public Health Dave Gorman. Director of Social Responsibility and Sustainability Rachael Robertson, Deputy Director of Finance Rosheen Wallace, Students' Association VP Community In attendance: Philip Graham, Head of Internal Communications, for Gavin Donoghue Chris Litwiniuk, SRS Engagement Manager, for Siôn Pickering **Apologies:** Chris Cox, Executive Director Development and Alumni Gavin Donoghue, Deputy Director, Stakeholder Relations, Communications and Marketing Grant Ferguson, Director of Estates Operations Bruce Nelson, College Registrar, Science and Engineering Siôn Pickering, SRS Projects Coordinator

#### 1 Minute

The Convenor welcomed attendees to the second meeting of the Group.

James Smith, Vice Principal International

The minute of 6 November 2019 was approved as a correct record, subject to one amendment. Under item 6 - Discussions on Levy Options & Evaluation Criteria, the sentence "Overall, members tended to favour proximity of the pay point to the traveller" was removed.

#### 2 New Group Members

It was agreed that the Convenor and Director of SRS would take action to improve gender balance and representation from early career researchers on the Group.

<u>Action – ST & DG</u> to recruit two early career academics, one originating from outside the UK.

#### 3 Amended Remit

The Group noted that the last two bullet points (on international events and not displacing emissions, and future metrics and ways of reporting) had been amended, as previously discussed.

<u>Action – DG</u> to use track changes in future, to make edits to Group documents more apparent.

#### 4 Vision, Evaluation Criteria and Initial Options

Members recognised that a potential levy was just one option, and that other possible approaches would also need to be developed. TAWG would need to agree criteria in order to evaluate these options. These could include: impact on carbon emissions; impact on costs; effectiveness in encouraging behaviour change; consistency with other core objectives (teaching, research, business development

#### TAWG 04

#### TAWG 05

and globalisation); administrative simplicity; relevance and scalability to other Universities; impact on University reputation; opportunity to show leadership; and ability to fund carbon reduction projects via hypothecation. Measures scoring below a set point in certain criteria would be rejected. It was proposed that assessed measures be colour-coded rather than using an overall score.

The Group agreed the proposed vision for climate conscious travel by 2025, comprising six key areas: information; visible leadership; policies, levies and incentives; UK travel; partnerships and collaboration; and long-term change. While it might be possible to achieve the vision in a shorter time span, the 2025 target aligned with the Climate Strategy and other goals. The Group would assess how quickly the vision could be reached, and review the target on that basis. It was proposed that the first key area, information, be split into individual and organisational/management information. Travel within the UK as the initial leg of a journey to an international destination would not be included. Assumptions regarding air carriers used government methodology to reach a calculated average. Available information on the carbon performance of individual airlines could be shared with staff. Concerns were raised about taking the total hours spent on a plane as a pure cost to the organisation, as a lot of this was done in staff personal time.

The Group found the public policy 'toolkit' in section 4 very useful. Due to the administrative complexity, market based instruments would not be considered as an immediate step, but would be kept in mind as a potentially effective option later in the process.

Levy options tended to score highest, with flat rates being particularly attractive as they made it easier to tweak domestic, short- and long-haul rates. The 10% option gave more incentive for culture change within individual Schools and units. The 20% option, provided for context, was agreed to be too high. It would be important for buy-in to make clear the implications of the 10% rate during the consultation phase, as this could sound higher than the flat rates.

It would be useful for TAWG to know the relative proportion of business aviation that was grant-funded, as the Group was keen not to penalise staff and Schools who were successful in securing grant funding, as they would not be able to claim the levy from their funding body. The proportion would vary significantly in different Schools; CAHSS' income was largely from fees, whereas CMVM was predominantly externally funded. Part of the recent uptick in long-haul travel was a result of grants coming on-stream.

The graduated levy would allow for earlier implementation, allowing a year to shadow developments. It would take time to establish how best to accommodate early-career researchers, and the Group should not underestimate the timescale needed for Schools to fully work through the budget implications. A graduated approach may be necessary to best accommodate the change.

The Group would review what other large organisations, such as Historic Scotland, were doing in this space, to see what could be learned from them.

Members endorsed the range of options proposed and the idea of evaluation. Further discussion would be needed to reach a final version, through consensus and consultation. <u>Action – DG</u> to reword criterion 4 - Consistency with other core objectives, which could be difficult to score, to "avoid damaging other core objectives".

<u>Action – DG</u> to make explicit in criterion 4 that the measures proposed would not have a negative impact on the staff or student experience.

<u>Action – DG</u> to consider combining the criteria on reputation and leadership.

<u>Action – DG</u> to remove the quotation marks around climate conscious.

<u>Action – DG</u> to include a commitment to build on UoE's existing VC facilities.

Action – DG to mention Strategy 2030 in the communications section.

<u>Action – DG</u> to reference in the vision that the University would work with other large scale organisations.

#### 5 Outline Finance Model

The SRS Engagement Manager introduced this paper outlining a Carbon Levy Calculation model developed by Matthew Nelson in Finance. Since 2012 the overall number of business travel journeys had grown by around 12% p.a. Business travel was growing consistently despite fluctuations in staff and students numbers. This growth was modelled forward to 2025, including a scenario factoring in flight reduction through engagement, information and financial measures. Both scenarios (Business as Usual and BAU + intervention) saw costs and carbon emissions grow. Depending on the type of levy and number of intervention options, notional savings ranged from £750K to £1M in the first year and continued to grow year on year (this did not differentiate whether costs were externally funded).

Costing would need to factor in caveats around grant-funded travel, and staff travelling on university business in their own time, which would need to be made clear before sharing these ideas more widely. Further work would also be needed to establish if growth assumptions were realistic, where the limit to that growth lay, and to feed in the latest thinking to ensure the figures were nuanced. In the meantime, members found the model useful to inform the Group's thinking and as a future basis when reporting back to the wider University.

<u>Action – RR</u> to follow up with colleagues in Finance to try to approximate the number of flights that were externally funded.

#### 6 Current Policies and Rules

TAWG noted a copy of the expenses policy, currently due its annual review. Finance would welcome the Group's feedback on the travel content in the current policy. This review was an early opportunity to start to drive behaviour in the right direction, for example, by asking that UK travel by plane be pre-approved. Currently accountability was not on the individual but on the line manager or budget holder who approved the expense. Members were also asked to review comments around the use of taxis and personal vehicles. This could also be an opportunity to encourage increased use of Key Travel, moving away from the expenses system, though there were issues due to the lower costs and wider range of options available elsewhere.

Paragraph 5.13 stated that "carbon tax levies will be reimbursed".

<u>Action – RR</u> to look into this further and report back.

#### **TAWG 07**

**TAWG 06** 

4

The wording of paragraph 5.7 on UK mainland flights would need to be changed to make clear the preference for rail travel. The Group may recommend that the University pay the difference for rail travel where a domestic flight would be cheaper, however time to consult would be needed, so this change would have to wait until the 2021 update.

TAWG agreed to support development of the expenses policy. More work was needed to clarify the position on a carbon levy, and to strengthen the wording on UK travel to help drive behaviour change. Members agreed to be cautious and consider the practical implications of asking for increased authorisation of travel, e.g. from Heads of School, who could potentially be asked to sign off on thousands of travel requests. The Group would also ensure its recommendations would not put barriers in the way of justifiable travel options. Members recognised that certain groups within the University would continue to use business class flights.

<u>Action – All</u> to share any specific points with RR.

<u>Action – All</u> members aware of any other formal policies relevant to the discussion to email DG.

#### 7 Broader Package of Measures

The Convenor and Director of SRS would discuss timescales and send out a reminder asking for creative ideas for non-levy actions to be sent to <u>Chris Litwiniuk</u>.

#### 8 Consultation Plan

Links to <u>Strategy 2030</u> would be integrated throughout the consultation plan. It would be important to demonstrate that consideration had been given to the position of early career researchers, and staff and students with caring responsibilities. The proposed changes should be put in context, showcasing how they fed in to core objectives, and conveying through different forms of communication how everyone could play their part. The plan should indicate how those who gave their time to consult would receive feedback, and how the Group would act on outcomes from the consultation. Members would consider including an email to all staff and students, to reinforce the importance of the issue. It would be helpful if the consultation could be referenced in the Principal's New Year message.

TAWG recognised that timing the roll out of any interventions would be important, given internal and external developments, such as changes to the People and Money system for Finance and HR. The Group would liaise with Russell Bartlett in Communications & Marketing, and work with the Students' Association on joint messaging.

Issues around travel and aviation would be included in the existing January to March Town Hall meetings on Strategy 2030, Brexit, and industrial action. It would be important to allow enough time for people to become aware of the consultation, to feed back, and to issue a coordinated package of communications around it. Members agreed to tailor different forms of consultation to different stakeholder groups. An online consultation offered the best vehicle to elicit tailored, structured feedback. Heads of School and Directors of Professional Services should be targeted in particular, to establish if they felt the proposals were realistic.

#### **TAWG 08**

#### 9 How To Assess Equality and Diversity

It was proposed that the Group carry out an Equality Impact Assessment, as the policies it recommended would have E&D implications.

<u>Action – ST</u> to follow up with Sarah Cunningham in HR, potentially asking her to join TAWG.

As the data available could not be analysed at individual level, it would not be possible to fully assess the impact on particular groups (e.g. slow travel disadvantaging people with caring responsibilities). This would need to be acknowledged in the Group's output.

Action – All to email their thoughts on E&D to the Convenor.

#### 10 Carbon Offsetting and Interim Position

This item was carried forward to the next meeting on 27 February.

#### 11 UNA Europa Project and Mobility

This item was carried forward to the next meeting on 27 February.

#### 12 Any Other Business

The Director of SRS would work with the Head of Internal Communications to draft an outline version of a possible online consultation document, as a starting point for discussions and to give members an idea of how it could look.

In order to maintain momentum between meetings, members would share work and ideas via email.

#### 13 Summary & Next Steps

Highlights of the second meeting included further discussions exploring group membership, strong endorsement of the proposed vision and approaches outlined in TAWG 05, and recognition that a numerical score may not be the best method of evaluation. There was an awareness of the sensitivity of the projections and approaches to a range of assumptions. There had also been strong endorsement of the consultation plan which would be taken forward in a way that balanced quality engagement and speed. The Group would explore the space further, and refine its ideas into a package of recommendations that would be submitted to University Executive. **TAWG 09** 



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

# TAWG 11

#### **Travel & Aviation Working Group**

#### 27.02.2020

#### **Consultation & Communications Process**

#### **Description of paper**

- 1. This paper provides drafts of four separate consultation & communications assets requested at the previous meeting (TAWG 8, 19.12.19):
  - a consultation survey to be distributed to staff and students
  - a consultation information document containing detailed information on the proposed changes
  - a brief communications plan
  - an all-staff & student email to announce the consultation

#### Action requested / recommendation

2. Committee members are asked to <u>review</u> these assets and provide feedback to improve them.

#### **Background and context**

3. Presented as options at previous committee (TAWG 8, 19.12.19).

#### Discussion

4. See documents that follow.

The consultation information document contains detailed information that the majority of the audience may not read, so it is advised that the most important information is extracted and summarised as a webpage to make it more accessible and quicker to read for those who simply want an overview.

#### **Resource implications**

5. Following feedback on these assets, the Communication Manager in the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability will make final changes and create a wiki webpage to host the information, and work with Market Insight and CAM's Internal Communications to launch the consultation.

#### **Risk Management**

6. Risks discussed in previous committee papers include:

- Unclear communications
- Negative feedback on proposals
- Low consultation response rate
- Limited time for responses
- Student survey dependent on Ethics Committee approval

#### Equality & Diversity

7. Equality, diversity and inclusion questions asked within survey.

#### Next steps/implications

8. One finalised, the Communication Manager in SRS will work with CAM's Internal Communications Team and the Market Insight Team to distribute the survey and related communications.

#### **Further information**

9. <u>Author: Sarah Ford-Hutchinson</u> Communication Manager Department for Social Responsibility & Sustainability

<u>Author & presenter: Dave Gorman</u> Director Department for Social Responsibility & Sustainability

19 February 2020

#### Freedom of Information

10. This is an open paper.



**TAWG** 11.1

#### **Travel & Aviation Working Group**

#### Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020

#### TAWG Consultation – Staff and Students. Market Insight version, Feb 2020.

\_\_\_\_\_

#### **SECTION 1 Vision / Proposed Interventions**

"By 2025, all travel undertaken by University staff and students will be made in a 'climate conscious' manner and consistent with the University's overall climate change strategy."

#### Q1. Do you agree with this vision?

Yes, completely Yes, mostly Not sure No, not really No, not at all

#### Q2. Why do you say that? (open ended)

------

# In order to achieve this vision, the University have recommended a series of possible interventions:

- Information provision and awareness raising: e.g. providing data and information to students and staff on the carbon emissions related to various forms of travel and available alternatives in the hope of informing and driving behaviours change
- Regulation / bans: e.g. ban domestic flights in most circumstances
- Levies: e.g. the University imposes a charge to individual schools and department on flights proportion of the cost of each flight, with levy funds used on an agreed list of climate-conscious related travel and carbon sequestration options
- Subsidies: e.g. for train travel and / or additional accommodation
- **Infrastructure provision:** e.g. better provision of videoconferencing and virtual collaboration tools

# Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of these proposed interventions:

(agree completely, agree slightly, disagree slightly, disagree completely)

- Information
- Regulation
- Levies
- Subsidies
- Infrastructure

# Q4. Which, if any, of the proposed interventions do you think are controversial, and why? (open ended)

- Information
- Regulation
- Levies
- Subsidies
- Infrastructure

We will now look at each of the interventions in a little more detail:

#### **SECTION 2 - information**

# In order to achieve this vision, the University believe that all decisions need to be fully informed.

In particular:

- For individuals: Staff and students, administrators and managers will have the right information at the point of planning and booking to ensure they are fully aware of the climate consequences of their travel, and that the alternatives open to them are clear, effective and manageable.
- Organisational / management information: Managers and leaders will have sufficient management information on the drivers, costs and carbon impacts of travel to track progress in delivering the vision.

# Q3. Do you have the information you need to help you make climate conscious travel decisions for work?

Yes, completely Yes, mostly Not sure No, not really No, not at all

#### Q4. If no, what further information do you need? (open ended)


#### **SECTION 3 Regulation**

The university are proposing to introduce regulation around climate conscious travel.

#### Q How amenable are you to the following:

(Very amenable, quite amenable, quite resistant, very resistant)

- A ban on UK domestic flights (where practical)
- A 'climate conscious' approach to travel outside of the UK (attending virtually or travelling by train as preferred options to flying)

#### \_\_\_\_\_

#### **SECTION 4 – Levies**

The university are interested in implementing a levy – an extra change – on top of flights both to fund carbon sequestration activities, such as tree planting, and to send a price signal that the University is prioritising climate conscious travel methods.

#### Q5 – In general, do you agree with the principle of introducing a levy?

Yes, completely Yes, mostly No, not really No, not at all

There are 5 levy options being considered, with some similarities across them all and some points of difference:

Across all levies;

- To be introduced in 20/21
- Exemptions apply e.g. some early career researchers, certain funding requirements, equality and diversity issues
- Monies to be spent on agreed list of climate conscious related travel (e.g. tree planting)

Levy 1	Levy 2	Levy 3	Levy 4	Levy 5
10% levy	20% levy	10% levy	10% levy	Flat fee:
				£25 domestic,
				£35 short haul,
				£50 long
Locally funded	Locally funded	Centrally funded	Locally funded	Locally funded
		(initially)		
No	No	No	Some	No
differentiation	differentiation	differentiation	differentiation	differentiation
			(e.g. first x	
			flights free)	

Q6 – Please rank the levy options according to your preference: #1 #2 #3 #4 #5

Q7 – please explain your ranking of the levy options (open ended)

\_\_\_\_\_

**SECTON 5: Subsidies** 

**Q** To support the change to carbon conscious travel, the University are considering a series of incentives. How attractive are the following proposals: Very attractive Quite attractive

Quite unattractive Very unattractive

- financial support for travellers to choose low-carbon travel
- time off in lieu for travelling by alternative means
- upgraded tickets

#### Q Are there any other incentives you would find attractive? (open ended)

- 1. -----
- 2. -----
- 3. -----

\_\_\_\_\_

#### **SECTION 6: Infrastructure**

The easiest and most efficient way to reduce emissions from business travel is by collaborating digitally- but these need to work easily, consistently and be available to all parties taking part.

#### **Q** Please rate the following tools

- Very effective, quite effective, quite ineffective, very ineffective
  - Skype for Business
  - Blackboard Collaborate
  - VScene
  - Video conferencing in pods and rooms
  - Microsoft Teams

Q Do you have any specific proposals on how the current mix of online and virtual collaboration tools could be improved? (open ended)

------

Travel is seen as an important element of academic excellence for a number of reasons, however, long and short haul flights made up 16 million kilograms of CO2 last year. In order to reduce this figure, the University propose that a programme of research is created to examine the relationship between flights and i) research excellence ii) the student experience, to be carried out in conjunction with other institutions worldwide.

#### Q Would you be willing to take part in this research?

Yes No

#### **SECTION 7 – Equality and Diversity**

The University wish to fully consider the impact of any proposal on equality, diversity and inclusion and will be undertaking an Equality Impact Assessment to ensure proposals do not discriminate against individuals.

Some potential concerns we are aware of include:

- How climate conscious travel options may impact on early career researchers, who are encouraged to travel widely to build networks and collaborate
- How climate conscious travel options might disproportionately affect individuals with a disability
- How climate conscious travel options might disproportionately affect individuals with caring responsibilities
- How a levy might interact with existing and future externally-funded research projects

# Q Do you have any comments or concerns relating to equality, diversion and inclusion for any of the proposals above? (open ended)

-----

================================

#### **SECTION 8 - Overall**

**Q. Overall, what do you think about the proposal?** Very good Good Poor Very Poor

#### Q. Why do you say that? (open ended)

-----

\_\_\_\_\_

#### **SECTION 9 - Demographics**

So we can see if opinion is different by type of staff or student, please provide some demographic details:

#### Q. Age

<21, 21-25, 26-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, 71+

#### Q. Gender

Female, Male, Non binary, Refuse

#### Q. Role

Postdoc, Academic (not Prof), Academic (Prof), Professional Staff (College), Professional Staff (schools), Professional Staff (central), UG Student, PGT student, PGR student

Q. School / Department

List

Q. Length of time here

0-2yrs, 3-5 yrs, 6-10 yrs, 11-20yrs, 21+yrs

#### Q. Number of paid-for trips in last year (roughly)

0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21+

#### Q. Booking travel (multi):

Book for myself, Book travel for others, Approve travel for others

\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you

Thank you for taking the time to read and respond to this consultation.

The University will collect and analyse responses to this consultation and also targeted consultation events in March and April 2020 in order to inform a recommendations report created by the University's Travel and Aviation Working Group and submitted to the University Executive in May 2020. The University Executive will agree actions to embed climate conscious travel at the University, with a view to implement improvements in 2020.

Consultation findings will be made available on the Aviation Consultation webpage and all respondents will be notified both when they are published and when a decision is made by the University Executive.

For any enquiries relating to the Aviation Consultation, please contact the University's Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability on 0131 651 3000 or aviationconsultation@ed.ac.uk.

MISSING / MOVED:

- Evaluation of criteria (4) NEEDED?
- creation of governance (4.1.1) NEEDED?
- Sequestration vs Offsetting (4.1.2) NEEDED?
- Information and awareness-raising (4.2.1) MOVED TO SECTION 2

\_\_\_\_\_



**TAWG 11.2** 

This is a draft detailed consultation paper prepared by the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability for the Travel and Aviation Working Group in February 2020.

#### **Travel & Aviation Working Group**

#### Thursday 27th February 2020

#### TAWG Consultation – Climate Conscious Travel – Consultation Information

# Climate conscious travel: aviation consultation

## Summary

To deliver on the University's Strategy 2030 vision to make the world a better place, the University will become carbon neutral by eliminating avoidable greenhouse gas emissions and sequestering any unavoidable emissions.

Air travel is an important tool for the University of Edinburgh: it allows our students and staff to travel to our campuses or to opportunities abroad; facilitates knowledge-sharing with partnerships across the globe; and provides a means for our teaching, research and innovation to reach a global audience.

While there are many benefits to air travel, there are also some downsides. Aircraft emit a range of greenhouse gases - such as carbon dioxide - which trap heat in the earth's atmosphere and cause the planet to warm. Flying has a large 'carbon footprint' and releases emissions at a high altitude, meaning it's one of the least environmentally-friendly ways to travel, particularly over short distances.

At the University, emissions from travel are the second-biggest and fastest growing area in the University's carbon footprint, behind energy usage (gas and electricity); flights are responsible for 94% of our travel emissions, and carbon emissions from flights grew by 37% between 2017-18 and 2018-19. As part of the University's commitment to reduce its emissions and become carbon neutral by 2040, it must work to understand how travel itself can be reduced, how emissions from travel can be reduced by using less carbon-intensive forms of transport, and how to 'sequester' any emissions that cannot be reduced. This approach is called 'climate conscious travel'.

Climate conscious travel is:

- being aware of the environmental impacts of travel and choosing a method of travel that reduces these (e.g. by train rather than plane for UK-based travel)
- ensuring unnecessary travel is not undertaken (e.g. sending the minimum number of individuals required to fulfil the purpose of travel)
- Choosing not to travel when virtual collaboration tools will adequately fulfil the purpose of travel (e.g. for meetings where a video link would suffice)

This consultation seeks view from the University community on what our vision of climate conscious travel should be, what actions the University should take to enable travel to be more climate-conscious, and what impact those actions might have on students and staff.

The University's Travel and Aviation Working Group is keen to hear a wide range of views during the consultation period to allow it to present informed recommendations to the <u>University Executive</u> on how to ensure travel at the University of Edinburgh is more climate-conscious, particularly in relation to air travel.

## How to answer the consultation

This paper outlines the context in which the University is consulting on air travel and presents a range of options the University is considering. Please read the information it contains and then respond to the consultation at XXX.

If you require the consultation in another format or would prefer to email your responses to each question, contact the University's Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability on 0131 651 3000 or <u>aviationconsultation@ed.ac.uk</u>.

## What happens next

The University will collect and analyse responses to the consultation in March and April 2020 in order to inform a recommendations report created by the University's Travel and Aviation Working Group and submitted to the <u>University Executive</u>. The University Executive will agree actions to embed climate conscious travel at the University, with a view to implement improvements in 2020.

Consultation findings will be made available on the Aviation Consultation webpage and all respondents will be notified both when they are published and when a decision is made by the University Executive.

For any enquiries relating to the Aviation Consultation, please contact the University's Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability on 0131 651 3000 or <a href="mailto:srs.department@ed.ac.uk">srs.department@ed.ac.uk</a>.

## 1. Context

## 1.1 Why is the University consulting on aviation?

In September 2019, the University launched its new Strategic Plan for the next 10 years - <u>Strategy</u> <u>2030</u> – which sets out the University's vision to make the world a better place. One of the strategic areas of focus is <u>Social & Civic Responsibility</u>, to ensure the University's actions and activities deliver positive change locally, regionally and globally. This includes a commitment to "reduce our climate impact", "tackle climate change" and contributing to The United Nations' <u>Sustainable</u> <u>Development Goals</u>. The University's Climate Strategy – <u>Zero by 2040</u> – sets out the actions the University will take to become a net zero carbon university by 2040 using a whole-institution approach.

In December 2019, the University established a Travel & Aviation Working Group, one of a range of next steps discussed by the University Executive in August 2019 on actions the University should take to continue responding to the climate emergency. The Working Group's role is to "*support the delivery of the University's ambition to be a net zero University by 2040 by undertaking a programme of work to secure a University-wide 'climate conscious' approach to travel including aviation.*"

Given the importance of flights to the University – such as for academic research, student course travel or for business purposes - the University wishes to consult its community on what climate conscious travel options will mean for them. This consultation will assist the Travel & Aviation Working Group in recommending the best approach to climate conscious travel at the University.

The purpose of consultation is:

- to explain the impact of aviation on the climate;
- to detail what proportion of the University's carbon emissions come from flights
- to set out the Working Group's ideas for a climate conscious approach to travel, and clear options the University could take to achieve this;
- to receive feedback on these options from University students and staff, particularly on potential concerns with implementing each of these options, such as equality, diversity and inclusion issues.

# 1.2 What are the issues with aviation and how do they affect the University?

Aircraft emit a range of greenhouse gases - such as carbon dioxide - which trap heat in the earth's atmosphere and contributes to global warming. Flying has a large 'carbon footprint' and releases emissions at a high altitude, meaning it's one of the least environmentally-friendly ways to travel, particularly over short distances such as within the UK (as fuel consumption is greater during take-off and landing).

The <u>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</u> (IPCC) released a <u>Special Report in October 2018</u> explaining the importance of limiting global warming to 1.5° C in order to slow global sea level rise and the diminishing of Arctic sea ice, and to reduce extreme weather events and habitat and biodiversity losses. In order to limit global warming to 1.5° C, global net human-caused emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) would need to fall by about 45 percent from 2010 levels by 2030, reaching

'net zero' around 2050. 'Net zero' means that any remaining emissions would have to be sequestered by activities that remove CO2 from the air, such as by growing trees.

The University has pledged to reach net zero by 2040, 10 years earlier than the IPCC recommendations. At present, the University is on track to halve its carbon emissions – relative to its expenditure – by 2025, compared with 2007/8 levels. It is also reviewing and implementing other options to help meet the 2040 target, such as increasing renewable energy generation by developing a "solar farm" at the Easter Bush campus.

At the University, emissions from travel are the second-biggest and fastest growing area in the University's carbon footprint behind energy usage (gas and electricity); flights are responsible for 94% of our travel emissions, and carbon emissions from flights grew by 37% between 2017-18 and 2018-19. As part of the University's commitment to reduce its emissions and become carbon neutral by 2040, it must work to understand how emissions from travel can be reduced, how to sequester any emissions that cannot be reduced, and how to promote 'climate conscious travel' amongst students and staff.



Figure 1: Kilograms CO2e per Academic year



Figure 2: Cost in GBP (£) per academic year



Figure 3: No. of journeys per academic year

To help the University calculate and interpret its travel emissions, we developed a world-first interactive <u>Business Travel Report</u>.

The University is not alone in considering the carbon emissions, costs and rising reliance of aviation; most other Universities and large corporations worldwide are beginning to assess the impacts of travel for business and various options to make this travel more climate-friendly. For example, the Russel Group created an <u>Environmental Sustainability Network</u> to share best practice, and emissions from aviation is one of the topics the network discusses. UK Research and Innovation – a major funder of University projects - have also <u>committed</u> to ensuring that

sustainability is in everything they do. The University works with these groups to identify best practice and share expertise.

For example, the University of Edinburgh leads a <u>network</u> of over 85 global institutions in a bid to address the growing emissions from business travel within higher education. This collaborative approach supports the sharing of ideas, establishes the scale of business travel emissions within the sector, and offers a platform for open discussion on this challenging topic.

Our data is better than many others but there are areas we need to improve- the reasons why people are flying (research, conferences and symposia, representing the University etc) and also whether these are paid from University resources or as part of external research

## 1.1 What am I being asked to do?

This paper outlines the University's vision for climate conscious travel and a range of actions the University can take to enable students and staff to travel in a more climate-conscious way. You can use the information provided to help inform your answers to the questions asked in the consultation at XXX. The consultation asks students and staff to give their views on the vision and actions, and in particular to consider what impact these actions might have on them, particularly in relation to equality, diversity and inclusion.

## 3. The University's vision for climate conscious travel

The Travel and Aviation Working Group propose the following vision for climate conscious travel to the year 2025:

#### Feature box: Vision for climate conscious travel

"By 2025, all travel undertaken by University staff and students will be made in a 'climate conscious' manner and consistent with the University's overall climate change strategy."

#### Information:

- For individuals: Staff and students, administrators and managers will have the right information at the point of planning and booking to ensure they are fully aware of the climate consequences of their travel, and that the alternatives open to them are clear, effective and manageable.
- Organisational / management information: Managers and leaders will have sufficient management information on the drivers, costs and carbon impacts of travel to track progress in delivering the vision.

*Visible leadership*: The University will provide clear and transparent leadership on managing the impacts of air travel. Senior leaders will lead from the top by exploring alternatives and encouraging behaviour change across the University

**Policies, levies and incentives**: The University will design its policies to support low carbon climate conscious travel across all of its activities, includes the use of levies where appropriate to incentivise alternative, and subsidies for more climate friendly options. All travel that cannot be avoided will be sequestered by the University via high quality carbon sequestration.

**UK travel:** By 2025 the vast majority of UK travel will be by public transport, and air travel will not be used, with a presumption against flights, unless by exception using rules that are clear, fair and that respect equality and diversity. Travel within the UK as the initial leg of a journey to an international destination would not be included.

**Partnership and collaboration**: The University will work with its travel providers, fellow Universities, funders and travel companies to innovate in finding ways to reduce the carbon impact of travel, whilst maintaining the advantages that travel can provide for research, teaching, business development and global connectiveness.

**Long-term change:** By 2025 the University is committed to researching and publishing information on the links between academic excellence and travel, student experience and travel, and in exploring whether and how our internal processes can adapt to a carbon constrained world.

## 4. Possible interventions

The Travel and Aviation Working Group have considered a range of possible interventions to support climate conscious travel and criteria to evaluate those options, including:

- Information provision and awareness raising: e.g. providing data and information to students and staff on the carbon emissions related to various forms of travel and available alternatives in the hope of informing and driving behaviours change
- Regulation / bans: e.g. ban domestic flights in most circumstances
- Levies: e.g. the University imposes a charge to individual schools and department on flights proportion of the cost of each flight, with levy funds used on an agreed list of climate-conscious related travel and carbon sequestration options
- Subsidies: e.g. for train travel and / or additional accommodation
- **Infrastructure provision:** e.g. better provision of videoconferencing and virtual collaboration tools

Offsetting provided by airlines was also considered, but is not preferred; this is covered in section 4.1.2 below.



Figure 4: A hierarchy of business travel options, from least carbon intensive (electronic communication) to most carbon intensive (aeroplanes)

We will explain these possible interventions in more detail in the following section.

Possible evaluation criteria to compare these options could be:

- Criterion 1: Impact on carbon emissions
- Criterion 2: Impact on costs
- Criterion 3: Effectiveness in encouraging behaviour change
- Criterion 4: Avoid damaging other core objectives incl student and staff experience
- Criterion 5: Administrative simplicity
- Criterion 6: Relevance and scalability to other Universities
- Criterion 7: Impact on University reputation and opportunity to show leadership
- Criterion 8: Ability to fund carbon reduction projects via hypothecation

(Criteria scored on a 1-5 scale, 1= lowest, 5= highest)

### 4.1 Levy and levy options

The Working Group are interested in implementing a levy – an extra change – on top of flights both to fund carbon sequestration activities, such as tree planting, and to send a price signal that the University is prioritising climate conscious travel methods.

The use of taxes or levies is a commonly used and well-tested device in policy to draw attention to an area where an organisation wishes to see a change in behaviour, and as a means of funding development of alternatives. Such levies are in use in a number of UK and European Universities already. It is hoped that the introduction of the levy is a means by which users will pause to consider if the flight is necessary or could be avoided by means of virtual collaboration tools, or the use of lower carbon forms of transport such as rail travel.

The following options are offered for consideration. Each one assumes that the levy monies collected would be used to fund climate conscious travel related activity, such as carbon sequestration, or perhaps invested in solutions to improve our virtual connectivity.

#### Levy Option 1a '10%, schools funded'

- A levy is introduced on all University flights at a rate of on average 10% with the monies funded at individual school and unit level and collected via a central finance mechanism. Any funds collected are hypothecated to spend on an agreed list of climate conscious related travel, with carbon sequestration a key component of that.
- Exemptions may be introduced as required to manage any potential issues associated with externally funded research (the research is within scope but the individual researcher is 'refunded' by the school) and any early career researcher or equality and diversity issues identified.
- Levy is introduced from 2020-21; could raise c£0.7m-£1m p.a.

#### Levy Option 1b '20%, schools funded'

- A levy is introduced on all University flights at a rate of on average 10% in year 1, rising to 20% in year 2 with the monies funded at individual school and unit level and collected via a central finance mechanism. Any funds collected are hypothecated to spend on an agreed list of climate conscious related travel, with carbon sequestration a key component of that.
- Exemptions may be introduced as required to manage any potential issues associated with externally funded research (the research is within scope but the individual researcher is 'refunded' by the school) and any early career researcher or equality and diversity issues identified.
- Levy is introduced from 2020-21; could raise c£1.4-£2m by year 2

#### Levy Option 2 '10%, graduated'

- A levy is introduced on all University flights at a rate of 10%, with year 1 entirely funded from a central 'top slice' moving to 100% funded by schools over a period of 5-10 years.
- Exemptions may be introduced as required to manage any potential issues associated with externally funded research (the research is within scope but the individual researcher is

'refunded' by the school) and any early career researcher or equality and diversity issues identified.

- This does not affect the quantity of funds raised but does introduce the charge more gradually to schools and business units.
- Levy is introduced from 2020-21; could raise c£0.7m-£1m p.a.

#### Levy Option 3 - '10%, Differentiates'

- A levy is introduced on all University flights at a rate of on average 10% with the monies funded at individual school and unit level and collected via a central finance mechanism. Any funds collected are hypothecated to spend on an agreed list of climate conscious related travel, with carbon sequestration a key component of that.
- The levy attempts to differentiate in some way, either by allowing for some initial travel 'first flight is free' or by role 'first X flights free for early career researchers'.
- Exemptions may be introduced as required to manage any potential issues associated with externally funded research (the research is within scope but the individual researcher is 'refunded' by the school) and any early career researcher or equality and diversity issues identified.
- Levy is introduced from 2020-21; unclear how much it could raise.

#### Levy Option 4 - Flat Rates

- A flat rate based on haul flown is introduced on all University flights. Values proposed:
  - £25 domestic
  - £35 short haul (flights under 3700km)
  - £50 for long-haul travel (flights over 3700km)
- Monies would be funded at individual school and unit level and collected via a central finance mechanism or through travel management company. Any funds collected are hypothecated to spend on an agreed list of climate conscious related travel, with carbon sequestration a key component of that.
- Exemptions may be introduced as required to manage any potential issues associated with externally funded research (the research is within scope but the individual researcher is 'refunded' by the school) and any early career researcher or equality and diversity issues identified.
- Levy is introduced from 2020-21; could raise  $c \pm 1m \pm 1.3m$  p.a.

#### Assessing the levy options according to the criteria outlined

The Working Group have made the following assessment of the levy options according to the criteria outlined previously:

(Criteria scored on a 1-5 scale, 1= lowest, 5= highest)

Criteria	Levy 1a: 10%	Levy 1b: 20%	<b>Levy 2:</b> 10%	<b>Levy 3:</b> 10%	Levy 4:
	schools	schools	graduate	differen	Flat
	funded	funded	d	tiates	rates
1. Impact on carbon emissions	5	5	5	5	5
2. Impact on costs	4	4	3	4	4
3. Effectiveness at encouraging	4	5	3	3	4
behaviour change					
4. Avoid damaging other core objectives	3	3	3	3	3
5. Administrative simplicity	3	3	2	2	3
6. Relevance and scalability to other	4	4	4	4	4
universities					
7. Impact on University reputation and	4	4	4	4	4
opportunity to show leadership					
8. Ability to fund carbon reduction	5	5	5	3	5
projects					
Total	32	32	29	26	32

#### 4.1.1 How should revenue from a levy be used?

Any funds raised from a levy on flights will be used to make a positive environmental impact. The majority of the fund will be used to fund sequestration of the carbon impact of flights – such as by planting trees - and a small proportion of it could be invested in other projects such as technology to improve our virtual collaborations or research into the relationship between travel and other objectives.

Options include:

- Invest in carbon sequestration, e.g. tree planting, peatland restoration
- Invest in better virtual collaboration tools, e.g. more video conferencing pods
- Invest in further research into encouraging climate conscious travel at the University, such as research into advanced videoconferencing technologies e.g. telepresence
- Incentivise lower carbon forms of travel to popular destinations, e.g. first class rail travel to London rather than a flight
- Invest in a central Sustainability Fund, which could then be used to fund a range of projects as required at any specific time

While introducing a levy will mean extra costs in the short term, we believe over time it could save money, as less travel occurs, as low-carbon travel options become cheaper relative to flights, and as the use of virtual collaboration tools increases. However the purpose of the levy is to change behaviour and deliver climate conscious travel, not to save money.

#### 4.1.2 Carbon sequestration vs carbon offsetting

Carbon offsetting is a market-based payment from a carbon emitter to an organisation that will promise to compensate for this by reducing carbon emissions. Offsetting the emissions from business activities - such as flying, or holding a conference - is becoming increasingly popular as organisations deepen their understanding of where their emissions come from and how they can

fund the removal of any emissions their activities released into the atmosphere. Some airlines now offer their own offsetting schemes which a booker can choose as an "add-on" during ticket purchase and the industry is launching a sector wide zero carbon plan to 2050.

While these have some merits, there is a lack of transparency over the actual carbon sequestration that takes place and a lack of assurance that these schemes will continue. Other concerns with airline's own offsetting schemes is the misalignment between what different companies offer, that they are not tailored to the organisation booking the flight, and – importantly – do not encourage the booker to consider other lower-carbon methods of travel, nor reduce instances of travel.

For these reasons, the University has decided to undertaken carbon sequestration that is under its direct control rather than market-based. This means any carbon sequestration will be done directly by the University, or that we will enter long-term partnerships of 50 years plus. This is a complex field but we summarise our position and reasoning here.

A significant benefit of this approach is that University-managed carbon sequestration activities – such as tree planting or peatland restoration – can serve the broader vision of the University when used as a research, teaching and outdoor education tool, as well as increasing natural and real capital and biodiversity for local communities.

#### Feature box: Carbon Sequestration

Carbon sequestration is the process of capturing and storing atmospheric carbon dioxide. It can take place via natural processes such as tree growth, via the application of technologies (e.g. direct air capture and storage (DACS)), or a combination of natural and technological processes (e.g. bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS)). Activities that increase the amount of carbon sequestration are also referred to as 'removal enhancements', such as peatland or restoration.

While the University plans to proceed with its own offsetting scheme via sequestration, it intends to also keep this approach under review as market-based offsetting schemes develop and mature.

#### Do you have any comments on the University's proposals for carbon sequestration?

Y/N

Please provide more detail.

[Freetext]

## 4.2 Broader options

#### 4.2.1 Information and awareness-raising of climate conscious travel options

For the University to truly achieve climate conscious travel, all students and staff must be made aware of what this means, and given advice on how to adapt their actions to include climate-conscious travel options.

The University plans to communicate this through awareness raising activities, and with the provision of both simplified and detailed information of what climate conscious travel is and what options exist at the University of Edinburgh.

Examples include:

• Provision of detailed information on carbon emissions associated with each flight, at the point of planning/purchase, potentially with an estimate of difference between flight and train for domestic travel.

• Provision of guidance explaining differences between modes and class of travel as well as tips on reducing impacts.

• Clear advice on assessing full journey cost vs ticket cost when booking domestic travel. Whilst rail tickets are occasionally more expensive, it might reduce costs associated with getting to and from airports.

• Information specifically aimed at the major travel bookers at the University – unit admins, PAs to frequent travellers, etc., providing updates on policies and information on environmental impacts of travel.

- Improving information provision for non-travel options.
- Providing management information to heads of schools and units.

#### 4.2.2 Incentives and bans

To support the change to carbon conscious travel, it is proposed that a number of incentives are provided to travellers. Incentives may include financial support for travellers to choose low-carbon travel, time off in lieu for travelling by alternative means, or upgraded tickets. The exact incentives, and mechanism for collecting these incentives, would need further exploration before being confirmed.

Within mainland Britain, many locations are accessible by train. Because of this, it is proposed that there will be a presumption against flights within mainland Britain. There would not be a presumption against flights for travel to Islands within Great Britain (e.g. Shetland, the Isle of Man), Northern Ireland, or where the flight is part of an onward journey (e.g. Edinburgh to Shanghai via London Heathrow).

There would be a small number of exceptions to this presumption, for example for reasons of disability, inclusion, or accessibility.

#### 4.2.3 Changes to the expenses policy

The current University expenses policy notes that, when booking travel, journeys should be booked only via the University's travel management company (Key Travel) and based predominantly on financial viability. It is proposed that the expenses policy is adapted to state that consideration for financial viability, staff productivity, and carbon emissions are made when booking a journey.

This is to say that there will be a presumption against flights or, where flights are unavoidable, the lowest carbon ticket is purchased and efforts are made by the traveller to increase the value of their journey (e.g. by reducing the number of travellers, linking in multiple events in a single trip, extending the trip to enable greater knowledge sharing).

The expenses policy would be based on a decision-making tree, an example of which is set out below:



Figure 5: An example decision-making tree to assist an individual in interpreting the expenses policy.

Implementing mandatory use of Key Travel reduces the University's travel costs overall, and assists the University in being able to track business travel, making it easier to calculate associated carbon emissions.

#### 4.3.4 Online and virtual collaboration tools

The easiest and most efficient way to reduce emissions from business travel is by collaborating digitally- but these need to work easily, consistently and be available to all parties taking part.

This decreases financial costs by avoiding payment for the journey, improving staff productivity and reducing environmental costs by minimising CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

If your journey can be avoided through a video conference, local computer video software, a telephone conference or a telephone call, then this may be the most efficient choice.

The University offers a range of online tools (e.g. Skype for Business, Blackboard Collaborate, and VScene) and dedicated physical spaces (e.g. video conferencing pods) to allow for virtual collaboration. These are suitable for 1-to-1 meetings all the way up to hosting presentations to 200 guests or meeting large groups (up to 20 participants) from one location.

The global FHE sector –including industry partners – are becoming more adept at facilitating collaboration via virtual tools.

Later in 2020 we will complete further work to consider other tools and assess the suitability of all proposed tools and the direction of travel of the sector in this area.

#### 4.3.5 Researching the relationship between flights and achieving academic success criteria

Travel is seen as an important element of academic excellence for a number of reasons, including:

- Research where the subject of research is abroad
- International collaboration with other research partners
- Gaining an international perspective on research matter to reduce cultural bias
- To communicate, teach or learn abroad
- To improve the diversity of one's experience, improving career prospects

One element of the University's climate conscious travel vision is:

**Long-term change:** By 2025 the University is committed to researching and publishing information on the links between academic excellence and travel, student experience and travel, and in exploring whether and how our internal processes can adapt to a carbon constrained world.

The Working Group propose that a programme of research is created to examine the relationship between flights and research excellence as well as the relationship between flights and the student experience, and carried out in conjunction with other institutions worldwide.

In addition, the Working Group recommends research to explore new modes and models for low carbon collaboration - including conferences, symposia and telepresence could be initiated.

## 5. Equality, Diversity and inclusion

We wish to fully consider the impact of any proposed levy on equality, diversity and inclusion and will be undertaking an Equality Impact Assessment to ensure proposals do not discriminate against individuals.

Some potential concerns we are aware of include:

- How climate conscious travel options may impact on early career researchers, who are encouraged to travel widely to build networks and collaborate
- How climate conscious travel options might disproportionately affect individuals with a disability
- How climate conscious travel options might disproportionately affect individuals with caring responsibilities
- How a levy might interact with existing and future externally-funded research projects

Please help us to understand these equality, diversity and inclusion concerns more fully – or any other related issues you can think of – in the next question.

## Thank you

Thank you for taking the time to read the information in this consultation document and respond to the consultation questions at XXX.

The University will collect and analyse responses to this consultation and also targeted consultation events in March and April 2020 in order to inform a recommendations report created by the University's Travel and Aviation Working Group and submitted to the <u>University Executive</u> in May 2020. The University Executive will agree actions to embed climate conscious travel at the University, with a view to implement improvements in 2020.

Consultation findings will be made available on the Aviation Consultation webpage and all respondents will be notified both when they are published and when a decision is made by the University Executive.

For any enquiries relating to the Aviation Consultation, please contact the University's Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability on 0131 651 3000 or <u>aviationconsultation@ed.ac.uk</u>.



# **TAWG** 11.3

This is a draft detailed consultation paper prepared by the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability for the Travel and Aviation Working Group in February 2020.

#### **Travel & Aviation Working Group**

#### Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020

#### TAWG Consultation – Climate Conscious Travel – Communications Plan

## **Communications plan**

#### Climate conscious travel – aviation consultation 2020

#### Context

- Air travel is an important tool for the University of Edinburgh and facilitates many benefits, such as international research, collaboration and networking.
- However, flights are responsible for 94% of the University's emissions from travel, and are the second-biggest and fastest growing area in the University's carbon footprint, behind energy usage (gas and electricity).
- As part of the University's commitment to reduce its emissions and become carbon neutral by 2040, it must work to understand how travel itself can be reduced, how emissions from travel can be reduced by using less carbonintensive forms of transport, and how to 'offset' any emissions that cannot be reduced. This approach is called 'climate conscious travel', and a Travel and Aviation Working Group (TAWG) has been established to investigate this and make recommendations to the University Executive. It is an example of the "Social and Civic Responsibility" focus in Strategy 2030.
- The TAWG has proposed a number of actions the University could undertake such as levies on flights, or a ban on flying within GB and wishes to consult the University community on the likely impacts of these.
- This communications plan explains how the University community will be made aware of the consultation and encouraged to respond.

#### Audience

- All staff (primary)
- Students (secondary) excluding distance learners?

This is a draft communications paper prepared by the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability for the Travel and Aviation Working Group in February 2020.

#### Stakeholders

- The Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability
- CAM:
  - Internal Communications
  - o Market Insight
  - Stakeholder Relations
- TAWG members
- Heads of College
- Heads of School
- Edinburgh Global
- Finance
- Students' Association

#### Objectives

- Raise awareness of the consultation
- Provide stakeholders with the information they need to feel informed
- Encourage consultation responses
- Present the University's interest in climate conscious travel and the proposed options in a positive light. Make a clear link to "Social and Civic Responsibility" focus in Strategy 2030.
- Grow the University community's interest in climate conscious travel

#### Key messages

- As part of Strategy 2030, the Climate Strategy 2040, and the growing awareness of the global climate crisis, the University is going to take a more climate conscious approach to travel.
- The University has scoped ways to do this and has come up with a range of proposals.
- Students and staff are invited to read these proposals and give the University their views by responding to a consultation, to help inform the University's decision making process.
- The University is particularly interested in the equality, diversity and inclusion impacts of each of the proposals and would value individuals' responses to these.
- The University aims to begin implementing a climate conscious approach to travel from May 2020, and will ensure the University is fully informed in advanced.

This is a draft communications paper prepared by the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability for the Travel and Aviation Working Group in February 2020.

#### Timeline

Date	Activity
Feb 2020	Climate-conscious travel options and consultation paper created
27 Feb	Next TAWG meeting to approve information and consultation
March	<ul> <li>Consultation information uploaded to new webpages (unpublished)</li> <li>Market Insight to create consultation         <ul> <li>Ethics Committee approval</li> <li>User testing</li> </ul> </li> <li>Town-hall style meetings organised to communicate the consultation and provide background information</li> <li>Pre-inform University community of forthcoming consultation</li> </ul>
TBC	Consultation launched
March	<ul> <li>Webpages go live</li> <li>Consultation survey goes live</li> <li>All student and staff email</li> <li>Email to Heads of Schools asking them to disseminate</li> <li>Social media posts to raise awareness</li> </ul>
TBC April	Consultation closed
April	<ul> <li>Market Insight analyse responses</li> <li>TAWG review responses and agree recommendations</li> <li>TAWG provide University Executive with Recommendations</li> </ul>
May 2020	<ul> <li>University executive makes decision on which actions to implement</li> <li>TAWG decide on next steps</li> <li>Decision &amp; next steps communicated         <ul> <li>To all students and staff</li> <li>To all Heads of Schools</li> <li>To individual consultation respondents</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

#### **Questions/ considerations**

- What can we do to ensure the proposals are met with positivity?
- How can we prevent the main takeaway being "the University want to charge us more to fly"
- What information should be included in the 'next steps'?
- Is this something the press will pick up on (and spin)?
- What lessons can be learnt from the IS Sustainable IT policy consultation?

This is a draft communications paper prepared by the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability for the Travel and Aviation Working Group in February 2020.

#### **Risks and mitigation**

Risks	Mitigation
Existing negativity towards the University over travel cost or provision	Explain how climate conscious travel provides a way to resolve some of these
	issues (how?)
Lack of clarity on what the proposals	Clear diagrams and simplified
are	information; more detailed information
	available for those who want it
Confusion of how the proposals will	'How these proposals will affect you' text
affect staff and students	on webpages
Confusion over flights to and from the	Clearly explain these flights are out of
University to attend work / study	scope
Interest in the carbon sequestration	Have clear communications prepared
element of the proposals	
Lack of interest in responding to	Heads of School to encourage
consultations	those who fly to respond
	<ul> <li>Town-hall style meetings to</li> </ul>
	engage key stakeholders and
	frequent fliers
Confusion over how this effects current	Unsure – consultation itself will hopefully
and future research fund spending	clarify what the issues could be - more
	work needed

#### Evaluation

•

At the end of this consultation we will know if the communications plan has been successful if:

- There is clarity over what the consultation was about
  - Measured by questions at Town Hall discussions, enquiries to consultation email address and quality of responses from survey
- The consultation has been met with a general sense of positivity
   Measured in audience reaction to the consultation
  - There has been good engagement with the online consultation
    - This will be measured by comparing level of responses to the 2019 SRS Survey
- There has been good engagement at the Town Hall events
  - We will measure this by comparing attendance to the Strategy 2030 town halls
- There are clear preferences on policy interventions that receive broad support
  - We will measure this by having policy interventions that receive above 66% support from those completing the online consultation



**TAWG 11.4** 

This is a draft email prepared by the Department for Social Responsibility and Sustainability for the Travel and Aviation Working Group in February 2020.

#### **Travel & Aviation Working Group**

#### Thursday 27th February 2020

#### TAWG Consultation – Climate Conscious Travel – Consultation Email

# Climate conscious travel consultation: email

Email subject: Climate conscious travel consultation

To: All staff and students?

#### Email body:

Dear [colleague / student],

We are writing to seek your views on how the University will reduce its carbon emissions from business travel: the flights, trains, buses, cars and taxis that staff and students use to travel for University conferences, research trips and fieldwork.

#### **Becoming carbon neutral**

To deliver on the University's <u>Strategy 2030</u> vision to make the world a better place, and to respond to the climate crisis, the University will become <u>carbon neutral</u> by eliminating avoidable greenhouse gas emissions and sequestering any unavoidable emissions.

At the University, emissions from travel are the second-biggest and fastest growing area in the University's carbon footprint, behind energy usage. In 2018-19, flights alone are responsible for 94% of our travel emissions, and carbon emissions from flights grew by 37% between 2017-18 and 2018-19.

As part of the University's commitment to reduce its emissions and become carbon neutral by 2040, we must work to understand how travel itself can be reduced, how emissions from travel can be reduced by using less carbon-intensive forms of transport, and how to sequester any emissions that cannot be reduced, whilst still continuing to uphold excellence in research, learning and teaching. This approach is called 'climate conscious travel'.

#### Have your say on the University's approach to climate conscious travel

The University has developed a range of proposals that will reduce the carbon emissions created by University travel. They include:

- Levies on all flights, with the funds raised used to sequester carbon (e.g. by planting trees)
- Bans on the use of flights to mainland UK destinations
- Incentives and subsidies to encourage the use of less carbon intensive forms of travel (e.g. taking the train to mainland UK destinations rather than flying, with an incentive being subsidised first class rail tickets)
- More investment in online and virtual collaboration tools to reduce the need for travel
- More information on the carbon impacts of various travel options to assist individuals in choosing less carbon intensive forms of travel

To ensure the University chooses the best options to increase climate conscious travel, we wish to seek your views on each of the options we are proposing. At the following wiki link you will find more information on the proposals and a link to a consultation survey. Please read the information provided and respond with your views by [date in April?].

#### [Wiki: Climate conscious travel: consultation]

We are particularly interested in the impact of the proposals on equality, diversity and inclusion, and so would encourage anyone with a perspective on this to respond.

Some potential concerns we are aware of include:

- How climate conscious travel options may impact on early career researchers, who are encouraged to travel widely to build networks and collaborate
- How climate conscious travel options might disproportionately affect individuals with a disability
- How climate conscious travel options might disproportionately affect individuals with caring responsibilities
- How a levy might interact with existing and future externally-funded research projects

The University is also holding a number of town hall meetings for staff to find out more and have their say. Find out more and book a place at XXX.

If you require any more information please contact the University's <u>Department for Social</u> <u>Responsibility and Sustainability</u> on 0131 651 3000 or <u>aviationconsultation@ed.ac.uk</u>.

Finally, please forward this message to anyone in your respective area who many want to offer comments on the proposals.

We very much look forward to your feedback.

Best wishes,

Dave Gorman

Director, Social Responsibility and Sustainability

Professor Sandy Tudhope

University Lead on Climate Responsibility and Sustainability

Page 2 of 2



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

**TAWG 12** 

#### Travel and Aviation Working Group

27.02.2019

#### Proposed Final Report Template

Section Number	Heading	Sub-heading	Where information gathered from
1	Executive Summ	ary	TAWG Final Report
		Broad Context	SRS documentation regarding climate change
		University ambitions	Strategy 2030
2	Introduction	University Climate Change Strategy	Zero by 2040
		Work of SRS to date	Business Travel Project Documents
		Movement to address travel in Higher Education	Business Travel Project Documents
		Remit and scope of the TAWG group	
3	Overview of TAWG	Membership of TAWG	TAWG papers and related
		TAWG meetings / process	
		TAWG vision	
	Financial model	Purpose	
4		Criteria & known limitations	TAWG papers related to the financial model
		Findings	
5	Equality and	Concerns raised	Focus groups & survey, Equality Impact Assessment
	Diversity	Steps taken to address concerns	Equality Impact Assessment
		Overview	Consultation documentation
6	Consultation	Methodology	Consultation documentation
		Results / outcomes	Consultation final report
		Link to six themes of TAWG vision	
7	Final Proposals	Carbon offsetting - Short term & Long Term	TAWG papers and related documentation
8	Next steps, implementation and further work		TAWG papers and related

#### Further information

<u>Author & Presenter</u> Siôn Pickering, SRS Project Coordinator

10 February, 2020

Freedom of Information

This is an open paper.



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Travel and Aviation Working Group

27 February 2020

Short Term Carbon Offsetting

#### **Description of paper**

This paper outlines a number of potential options for University wide carbon offsetting in the short term, until a high-quality carbon sequestration project can be delivered directly by the University.

#### **Background and context**

The Zero by 2040 Climate Strategy outlines ways to reduce carbon emissions at the University. Not all emissions can be avoided, and so the strategy also acknowledges that offsetting residual carbon will be required in order to achieve this target.

The University senior leadership have agreed, in principle, to support the RELCO project. RELCO sets out an ambitious process for carbon sequestration through reforestation and the restoration of native peatland. However, it is likely that a University-managed offsetting scheme will not begin until approximately 2023. This paper sets out options for the University to consider in the interim period.

#### Discussion

#### Overview

This is an important topic for discussion for two reasons. Primarily, requests to SRS for recommended offsetting schemes from colleagues across the University are becoming more frequent. This shows that carbon emissions are becoming a greater concern for staff at the University. Secondary, there is ambiguity within the current expenses policy as to whether offsetting is an allowable expense, which has led to some confusion amongst travellers.

By providing a recommended process for offsetting at a University level, this would mitigate these concerns. In addition, such action would show commitment by the University to achieve the Zero by 2040 climate strategy.

However, risks in selecting an offsetting scheme are:

- That emissions from travel increase as travellers feel that by offsetting, they can justify the travel.
- The possibility of reputational damage to the University should the chosen offsetting scheme not achieve the proposed outcomes over the lifetime of the project.
- By selecting an offsetting scheme, this raises the suggestion that the University sees offsetting is a viable long-term solution to carbon emissions
- Funding from different sources may not be eligible for offsetting charges to be applied, especially in regards to external grants. This may lead to inconsistencies across the University.

The alternative to selecting a short-term offsetting scheme is to take no action until the University scheme is realised. There are a number of resource savings should this option be chosen, both in financial terms as well as staff time to administer such schemes at a local and institutional level.

However, should it be decided that no action is taken in the short term, there is the distinct possibility of reputational damage to the University through perceived inaction. In addition, it is likely that there will be increasing individual level requests from across the University, which require resource in the form of staff time. It is difficult to predict the potential growth in these requests.

#### Scope of offsetting

Carbon offsetting in this instance would be used to offset carbon emissions from travel paid for by the University (in line with the current scope of our reported business travel).

It would also be possible to offset carbon from other sources, for example, purchasing additional offsetting credits could be considered instead of providing guests or delegates visiting the University with gifts – a concept recently noted by James Smith, Vice-Principal International, on a recent trip to the University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Option 1. 'Bank and Spend'- Collect offsetting funds and recycle this into Universityrun offsetting scheme. No additional short term approach adopted.

The proposals outlined in the RELCO final report note the aim to deliver "an ambitious project to develop renewable energy generation and land-based offsetting in order to address University of Edinburgh's residual emissions remaining after taking steps to reduce our emissions in the first place."

In Option 1, the University-run offsetting scheme becomes the sole recommended carbon offsetting scheme at the University for those looking to offset their carbon. Any funds collected in the short term would be hypothecated towards additional offsetting opportunities as and when RELCO is established.

In doing so, it may be possible to provide purchasers with a timescale for the emission reduction from their credits at the time of offsetting.

The benefits of Option 1 are that the University has already committed to delivering a world leading offsetting scheme which focuses on multiple benefits alongside carbon offsetting including increasing biodiversity, working in partnership with the local community, and increasing the opportunity for learning, teaching, and research through use of the scheme for these additional purposes. An internal scheme might be able to deliver more carbon sequestration as it would not have to cover overheads or deliver profit for an organisation.

The concerns with Option 1 are that, although RELCO has been approved in principle by the University Senior Leadership, the timescale to implementation is yet to be outlined fully. Should RELCO be delayed, this would impact on when these "preloaded" offset credits would deliver. Linked to this is the potential reputational damage that such a delay could cause. This option would also require resource to ensure that offsetting costs are tracked and ring-fenced within the University financial system. However, caution must be taken as it may not be currently possible to accurately calculate when this future offsetting may occur due to unforeseeable circumstances or additional delays in realising RELCO.

Option 2: 'Pay An Expert' University selects an 'approved' single 3rd party offsetting scheme

With this option, the University selects an expert 3<sup>rd</sup> party that meets defined standards and mandates all pre-RELCO offsetting is carried out via that party.

There are a diverse range of carbon offsetting schemes currently available locally, nationally, and internationally. Because of this range, a rigorous process would be required in order to establish the most relevant scheme for the University, ensuring the chosen scheme aligns with current strategies and the University's wider vision.

Within the University, the Department of Social Responsibility and Sustainability (SRS) are in the process of outlining a draft, non-exhaustive framework for comparing various offsetting schemes to offset their departmental carbon. A draft framework can be seen in Appendix 1.

Any final University-wide framework should include input from academic specialists and professional staff with knowledge of this sector.

The benefits of Option 2 are that, provided a framework is agreed, the process of offsetting could occur very quickly compared to other options. There would also be reduced administration time compared to the other options.

The concerns regarding Option 2 are focused on ensuring the framework encompasses a breadth of elements to ensure any risks to University's reputation are sufficiently managed. There may also be resistance to a single scheme across the University community. Consideration should also be given for any monitoring resources required by the University to ensure schemes are continued to the extent where carbon is successfully sequestered. There will also be risks associated with a scheme collapse, fraud or other non-compliance.

Option 3. Decision to offset carbon deferred to individual travellers.

A variation on Option 2, the University does not mandate the use of a single offsetting scheme, instead allowing individuals, teams, or schools / departments to choose a scheme that is in-line with their own views, choosing from several pre-selected schemes. As such, a framework (as noted in Option 2) would still be required to ensure the recommended schemes do not harm the University's reputation.

Benefits to Option 3 are that this offers individuals a greater choice of scheme to offset, potentially increasing their connection with the charge.

Concerns with Option 3 are that the University would need to track a greater number of selected schemes to ensure they continue to align with the framework. Resources would be required to track the quantity of carbon that is sequestered in this period so that this can be factored into carbon reporting. Doing so over multiple, varied, offsetting schemes would significantly increase complexity to successfully manage.

#### Criteria for selecting an offsetting scheme

Each of the options set out above should be considered on the following criteria:

- 1. **Time to Administer**: The staff resource required at traveller, school, and University level to ensure the procedure for the selected option is adhered to and reported on accurately.
- 2. **Time to deliver**: The speed in which, once a decision has been taken, the University can start to deliver offsetting through this channel.
- 3. **Range of offsetting schemes**: Considerations should be made as to whether the selected offsetting scheme is in-line with the University's vision.
- 4. Cost for sequestering carbon: The value of the carbon sequestered.
- 5. Flexibility with changes to University strategy or vision. In many instances, carbon offsetting requires a significant time investment before carbon is sequestered. As such it is advantageous for the chosen carbon offsetting schemes to allow for some changes to the vision or strategy of the University over this time.

The table below provides a comparison of the three options for each of these criteria, on a scale of 1 to 5.

Criteria	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Administration	Δ	2	1
(5 = least administrative work)	Т	۷.	
Time to deliver	1	1	3
(5 = quickest to deliver)	I	4	5
Range of Offsetting Schemes	1	Λ	5
(5 = biggest range)	I	4	5
Cost of Carbon	5	2	3
(5 = lowest cost)	5	5	5
Flexibility	5	2	2
(5= most flexible)	5	5	5
Total Score	16	16	15

#### Further information

Author and presenter Sion Pickering SRS 20/02/2020

#### Freedom of Information

This is an open paper.



### Appendix 1: Draft Framework for Selecting Carbon Offsetting Supplier

Theme	Description	How can this be checked?
Verifiability	There a robust, auditable trail.	Audit conducted by SRS of the chosen scheme before, during or after project completed.
Additionality	Ensuring the carbon savings are additional to what would have happened anyway	Does the project guarantee additionality? How can we hold them to account? When will we do this? <ul> <li>Investment Test</li> <li>Legal and Regulatory Additionality Test (Regulatory Surplus)</li> <li>Barriers Test</li> </ul>
Avoidance of "Leakage"	Ensuring the emissions are not just moved elsewhere	Due diligence of potential negative upstream or downstream impacts should the project be initiated
Avoidance of Impermanence	Ensuring the carbon savings sustained over time	What safeguards are in place to ensure the project continues to survive once completed.
Ensuring that "double-counting" does not occur	Ensuring the reductions are only claimed once	Check that project is not registered twice on same or different registry systems
Wider SRS benefits & potential negative effects of this project	<ul> <li>With consideration for:</li> <li>a. Community engagement</li> <li>b. What benefits are there to the local community</li> <li>c. How are the local community involved in this project</li> <li>d. Does this need to be Local to UoE?</li> </ul>	Negatives: See leakage (above) & consideration for other negative impacts of such a scheme.         Positives: Do Community Engagement have a framework?         Do we set a geographical limit to the location of projects?
Scheme Accreditation	Is this scheme accredited locally or globally?	Establish viable accreditations (local / national / international) – PAS 2060 Check individual projects within these accreditations.
Cost of Carbon	Is the cost of carbon reasonable?	What is considered reasonable? UK GOV (2018 actual) - £2.33 - £25.51 per tonne - but could be as high as £40 per tonne? (Burke et al, 2019)
Type of offsetting scheme	Is the scheme innovative? Is it purely carbon capture, or is there the opportunity for more?	Does the scheme align with the SRS vision?
Timescale of offsetting	When will this project take place, and when will the carbon be sequestered?	Provide a maximum timescale for the project sequestration (similar to with the SCF)



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

#### **Travel and Aviation Working Group**

#### 27th February, 2020

#### **Corporate Business Travel Reduction Initiatives**

#### **Description of paper**

This paper provides an overview of existing or past initiatives to reduce business travel emissions from organisations out with the Further and Higher Education sector.

#### Discussion

It has been challenging to establish what actions organisations are taking to reduce business travel emissions. The following report focuses on 12 separate organisations where some information was openly available via organisational websites. The organisations in question are from a range of sectors including finance, healthcare, consulting, and aviation, and include a mixture of Public Bodies (e.g. NHS Scotland and the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency - SEPA) and Private companies (e.g. PriceWaterhouseCooper, Possible). An overview of each of these organisations is provided in the table in Appendix A.

Research has consisted of online searches. From this research, it is apparent that a small number of organisations are attempting a range of actions to reduce business travel emissions. These actions are divided into the following categories:

- 1. Developing and enacting a travel hierarchy
- 2. Data and reporting
- 3. Carbon levy
- 4. Incentivising low-carbon travel
- 5. Carbon offsetting

A comparison of actions taken to reduce business travel emissions at these organisations is provided in Appendix B.

#### 1. Developing and enacting a travel hierarchy

Of the organisations reviewed, development of a travel hierarchy is the most frequent action put in place to reduce business travel emissions. An example travel hierarchy is provided in Figure 1.

All travel hierarchies noted follow a similar design, with the main aim being to raise awareness of existing traveller behaviours and to promote reduction and removal of journeys. This is primarily undertaken by promoting the use of Video Conferencing (VC). Where travel cannot be removed, low-carbon public transport – bus and rail - is promoted in favour of air travel. However, air travel is rarely completely banned within these organisations. The only exceptions to this are engineering firm *WSP*, where flights under 250 miles (402km) have been banned, and Standard Life Aberdeen where, in 2014, flights (except for those deemed "*business critical*") were banned for a week as part of an awareness raising exercise. No additional information is available on the outcomes of either action.

Considering the University's travel, a similar action to that of *WSP* would equate to 2,100 journeys in 2018-19, including from Edinburgh to Belfast and Birmingham as well as a number of short haul journeys within Europe (e.g. Lyon – Paris, Stockholm – Helsinki, Amsterdam – Paris).

To support uptake of the travel hierarchy, in particular to remove journeys overall, a number of companies are improving their video conferencing (VC) facilities. PriceWaterhouseCooper

(PWC) initiated a "*multi-phase campaign to boost use of online meetings by emphasising the benefits and features of such technology*", as well as by providing online training in the use of these technologies. CapGemini have taken a similar approach, investing in VC technologies across their workforce as part of their ConnectWell programme.



Figure 1. Example travel hierarchy as provided to NHS Scotland Staff.

These travel hierarchies are enacted through strict travel policies. The mechanisms vary across the organisations, however consist of one or multiple of the following elements:

- Senior management approval (e.g. PWC)
- Justification required before booking air travel (e.g. NHS Scotland)
- Capping number of attendees at global events (e.g. Lawson Conner)
- Prioritisation of digital communication and public transport options (e.g. SEPA)

Although mention of a travel hierarchy is noted by both Voya Financial and Zetteler, no further details are available on the mechanisms surrounding these travel policies.

#### 2. Data and reporting

A number of companies have started to collect more detailed data for their travel. Not only does this assist in increasing the understanding of travel patterns, some organisations are looking to directly influence the behaviours of staff. For example, CapGemini provide staff with monthly emissions reports at an individual level, while SEPA provide a detailed breakdown of the travel of their Chief Executive annually.

Of the recorded 57 flights:

- 10 were supporting enhanced regulation in remote or island communities;
- six were in relation to obligations in Northern Ireland, where Mr. A'Hearn was previously Chief Executive of the Northern Ireland Environment Agency, including legal obligations;
- 32 were in relation to engagement with European environment partners;
- nine were in relation to cross-frontier initiatives or working with international partners to support global programmes.

Figure 2. Extract from SEPA Report "Creating a sustainable SEPA: moving towards net zero", October 2019, detailing the flight behaviour of the SEPA Chief Executive.

#### 3. Carbon Levy

Only one organisation looks to have initiated a carbon levy - *WSP*. Initially set at £50 per journey, this levy looks to have increased to £200 per journey (return or one-way) in 2018. It has not been possible to establish further details on this levy, for example how this levy is collected, how the levy is spent, or how staff have reacted to the introduction / rise in this levy.

#### 4. Incentivising Low-Carbon travel

*Possible* provide staff with an additional two days per annum of annual leave should they decide to travel by low-carbon modes of transport (i.e. not flying). This is managed through a third party scheme - Climate Perks. This initiative appears to be focused on personal travel (e.g. for holidays) rather than for business travel.

#### 5. Carbon offsetting

A growing number of airlines offer a voluntary offset scheme for customers' (including Emirates, Delta, Qantas, and United Airlines). Of these, two airlines have recently announced an automatic offsetting of carbon emissions for certain journeys - British Airways (BA) and AirFrance.

A similar model is taken by both BA and AirFrance, to automatically offset their domestic flights (UK for BA and mainland France for AirFrance), while allowing customers the option to voluntarily offset their international flights. It is unclear whether these initiatives should be seen as companies offsetting their business emissions. BA have partnered with PureLeapFrog, and looks to put a cost of between £6 and £8 per tonne CO<sub>2</sub>e. Customers that volunteer to offset their international flights have a choice of three projects, all linked to conservation and sustainability in Cambodia, Sudan, or Peru. A more detailed look at the PureLeapFrog carbon calculations appear to show that Radiative Forcing (the impact of releasing emissions high in the atmosphere) is not taken into account by BA. Radiative Forcing equates to a 1.9x increase in emissions per flight. No further details are available for the AirFrance offsetting scheme at this time.

*Zetteler* have also committed to offsetting their travel carbon emissions, however no additional detail is provided by the company on how this will be undertaken.

#### **Further information**

<u>Author</u> Sion Pickering Project Coordinator, Department of Social Responsibility and Sustainability February 2020

#### **Freedom of Information**

This is an open paper.



Appendix A. Overview of organisations where actions to reduce business travel are known. Organisations presented in alphabetical order.

Company Sector		Main Location / Reach	Estimated Size of Company	Estimated Size of Travel
AirFrance	Airline	France, global	N/A	Estimated at 26,419 tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e per year (based on 450 domestic flights, average of 160kg CO <sub>2</sub> e / flight)
British Airways	Airline	UK, global	N/A	Estimated at 4,400 tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e per year (based on 75 UK flights, average of 160kg CO <sub>2</sub> e / flight)
CapGemini	Consulting, technology services, digital transformation	Multi-location, global	200,000 staff in over 40 countries	25,938 tonnes CO₂e in 2019
Lawson Conner (part of IQ-EQ)	provider of regulatory infrastructure & software	UK, global	2,450 staff in 23 countries	N/A
NHS Scotland	Health	Scotland, local	140,000 staff	N/A
Possible	digital marketing agency	Multi-location, global	20 locations worldwide	N/A
PricewaterhouseCoopers (PWC)	Professional services network	Multi-location, global	270,000 Staff in over 150 countries	71,711 tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e in 2019 (Scope 3 as a whole)
Scottish Environment Protection Agency	Environment	Scotland, local	1.300 staff	125.5 tonnes CO2e in 2018/19
Standard Life Aberdeen	Investment Company	Scotland, global	6,000 staff in 52 locations worldwide	22,482 tonnes CO2e in 2018
WSP	professional services firm	Multi-location, global	Approximately 49,500	Estimated at 28,833 tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e in 2018 for all Scope 3.
Voya Financial	Finances focusing on retirement	USA, local	6,000 staff	5,898 tonnes CO2e in 2018
Zetteler	PR agency specialising in art, design & other creative sectors	UK, global	<10	N/A



Appendix B. Overview of measures taken by organisations to reduce business travel. Organisations presented in alphabetical order.

Company / Organisation	Enacting Travel Hierarchy through travel policy	Improving Data and Carbon Reporting	Carbon Levy	Incentivising low- carbon travel	Carbon Offsetting
AirFrance					х
British Airways					Х
CapGemini	x	Х			
Lawson Conner (part of IQ-EQ)	x				
NHS Scotland	x	Х			
Possible				x	
PriceWaterhouseCooper	x				
Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	х	Х			
Standard Life Aberdeen	x				
WSP	x		х		
Voya Financial	X				
Zetteler	X				X