

Summary of discussion at October 2022 Outcomes Working Group

Operational Greenhouse gas (GHG)

- There was a mix of views on market based and location-based reporting.
- There was also a mix of views on the scopes that should be included with some considering that only scopes 1 and 2 should be included, while others considered elements of scope 3 should also be included. There should be alignment to the GHG protocol.
- Some considered it was important to keep up to date with this as an evolving area. Using the Carbon Accounting Workbook (CAW) and allowing reporting against different versions over time would allow this. Others thought that reporting against different versions of the CAW would add complexity.
- Clarity is very important and guidance needs to be right so everyone is consistent. Companies are at different stages in maturity of reporting and it needs to be possible for all to report. A number of the group thought that more detailed annual performance report (APR) guidance is required.
- Some attendees noted that they had not had time to consult experts within their organisations and were not experts themselves and so found it difficult to comment.

Biodiversity

- There was general agreement that all company owned land should not be surveyed with a detailed site-based survey every four years. Most considered that the PC should only require the surveying of a subset of sites.
- Some noted that companies were in different places, with some already managing much of their land for biodiversity and companies have different proportions of areas that were Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs).
- Some companies already have in-house ecologists carrying out surveys and these have specific knowledge that would be lost if only third parties could survey sites.

River Water Quality

- There was a mix of views with a few considering that basing the metric on consents would be simpler, but more suggesting that the PC should be based on measurement of phosphorus at treatment works.