

EMS Data discussion:

Issues:

- EMS data is not always submitted accurately by staff/Sustainability team
- Data is dated – out of date by time of publication
- Wales – EMS data from Hefce doesn't fit Hefcw data – different definitions which created real problems for Welsh institutions in Green League. Leaves P&P open to litigation from Welsh unis.
- Scope – eg. some unis not submitting data for all buildings – need improvements/much clearer guidance on scope
- Waste calculations - Whilst one year we may not have recovered or recycled more than the previous year (having not had so many recyclables available) we have overall reduced our waste total. Could this be factored into scoring rather than showing we have recycled less than the previous year which may (or may not) attract a lower score?

Potential solutions:

- Kingston Uni has set up an EMS group to bring together all the staff who submit different data and share best practice – good driver for getting correct EMS data
- Institutions suggested providing their own raw data to P&P
- P&P to lobby for improved scope of EMS data
- Welsh data from Hefcw?

Data Inconsistencies

- Can People & Planet run the Green League points allotted to each institution by them before publication?

Environmental Management Systems. How should P&P score/assess these?

Problems:

- GL2009 didn't recognise Green Dragon (welsh version of ISO14001)
- Need scaled scoring based on different stages in EMS process
- Need to include BS8555
- Green Dragon is a staged process with 5 stages, whereas ISO14001 only has one stage.
- Need to ensure EMS is valid for whole institution – ie scope of EMS
- There's crossover between points for EMS and points for policy
- Hefcw now stipulates all institutions must have an EMS

Solutions:

- check section 13 of UtC – they allow any EMS as long as externally verified and staged approach differentiation.
- Richard Meddings offered to help develop this criteria more thoroughly, based on format of Environmental Agency.

Carbon Reduction Commitment – how will the introduction of CRC impact on Green League – what's the crossover/implications?

Problems:

- CRC league tables will come online in a couple of years and potentially make large

parts of the Green League redundant/extraneous

- CRC won't cover all universities

Solutions:

- GL still has a role to play in showing improvements/change in performance
- Everyone will be cutting carbon (supposedly), so GL should look at improvement rather than absolute metrics
- Relative metrics better than absolute if you're increasing/decreasing in size all the time.
- Reduce points for things where data is not trustworthy (ie performance data).

If the GL retained just one measurement of carbon reduction, what should it be?

Change in footprint.

Other issues/problems from last year

- Uni of Greenwich has multiple student unions, and only one was counted which reduced points available for Sound Impact – should have got more.
- A number of other unis have multiple student unions – including UKC and UMSA – this needs to be factored into questions/point allocation for student engagement.

What should the focus of the Green League be beyond 2010?

- Biodiversity – this not measured elsewhere. Points for action planning and reporting/monitoring
- Transport policy – implementation
- Focus should be on fewer criteria not also captured or measured elsewhere (eg. CRC carbon reduction, EMS data)
- Curriculum – use UtC scope on ESD (GC <~~in Wales)
- Whatever the focus – P&P should be explicit about the focus and stage introduction of new criteria - (eg. for Fairtrade – why Fairtrade mark not Rainforest Alliance? - be explicit).
- Introduce staged criteria to push new areas of improvement – eg. monitor it one year without points, introduce 1 point next year, and full points in 3rd year.
- With new criteria like 10:10 vs carbon Trust Standard – talk to the experts before introducing and make very clear the merits of P&P's decision.