

World Business Council for Sustainable Development



The Greenhouse Gas Protocol

Scope 3 Accounting and Reporting Standard

Comment Template

We are providing this template to streamline public comment submissions. To use this template, please follow the instructions below:

- This Scope 3 draft is open for stakeholder comment from November 11, 2009 through December 21, 2009.
- To provide written comments, please use the comment template provided, instead of sending comments in a separate file or e-mail, in order to streamline the comment process.
- When using the comment template, please organize comments by chapter/section and reference page numbers and line numbers.
- If you have questions during the public comment process, please email Holly Lahd at <u>hlahd@wri.org</u>.
- Submit comments as an attached MS Word file by email to Holly Lahd at <u>hlahd@wri.org</u> no later than **Monday**, **December 21st**, **2009**. We appreciate any effort to submit written comments before the deadline.

Feedback from (name):_____Stefan Seum_____

Organization: ______Öko-Institut e.V., Berlin, Germany_____

Chapter/Section		Comments	
The outline and overall structure of the document		٠	
Part 1			
1. Introduct	ion	٠	
2. Accounti Principle	ng & Reporting s	•	
3. Business Inventory	s Goals & y Design	•	
4. Mapping Chain	the Value	٠	
5. Setting tl	he Boundary	•	







5.1 Prioritizing Relevant Emissions	•
5.2 Prioritizing Relevant Emissions Based on Size	•
5.3 Prioritizing Relevant Emissions Based on Other Criteria	•
6. Collecting Data	•
6.1. Prioritizing Activities	•
6.2. Assessing Data Sources	•
6.3. Collecting data	•
7. Allocating Emissions	•
12. Assurance	•
13. Reporting and Communication	•
Part 2	
 Purchased Goods and Services- Direct (Tier 1) Supplier Emissions 	•
2. Purchased Goods and Services – Cradle-to- Gate Emissions	•
3. Energy-Related Activities Not Included in scope 2	•
4. Capital Equipment	•
5. Transportation & Distribution (upstream/inbound)	 5.3.2.1: In container transport EFs often are reported in g/TEU-km. It is then important to take the real cargo load per TEU (not per container or lift) into account. Appr. 10.5 t/TEU average; 6 t/TEU light weight. 5.3.2.3: Real important to treat each mode of transport equal. Utilization should be averaged over return trip because imbalances in trades. 5.3.3: GHG tool is too US centric. In particular rail should be nation/region based. Marine EFs are only valid for bulk shipments and even for those too low (see Buhaug 2008 for IMO 2009). Other sources for EFs: www.ecotransit.org (a World version will be released spring 2010)
6. Business Travel	 Screening methodology and final methodology are essentially the same in the proposal. While the principle activity x EF is self explanatory, the crux are in the details, for which no guidance is provided. Activity: should be return trip distances. Guidance should be provided on important delineations (i.e. short
	2 WORLD





	 distance / long distance flights; vehicle sizes etc.) EFs: the list of EFs in the referenced WRI and EPA documents are US-
	 EFs: the list of EFs in the referenced WRI and EPA documents are US- centric. This is a deficiency that should be openly expressed.
	 EFs primary source should be company reporting of EFs (e.g. airlines);
	however, guidance should be provided, for example for considering
	utilization etc.
	EFs secondary source should be EF factors by credible sources: those
	include ICAO, Europe cars TREMOVE, Europe rail/air EcoPassenger; in
	particular electric rail is nationally significantly different.
	 Air travel: travel class should be recognized. Atmosfair calculates with factors 0.8 (economy), 1.5 (business) and 2.0 (first class).
	 Air travel: The use of a radiative forcing index should at least be offered
	optional as science is clear that the forcing effect is additional. This
	should be offered as a matter of fairness in case an RFI would become
	standard. A factor of 2 is today mostly agreed upon to be a minimum
	effect factor for longer distance flights. The emissions can easily
	expressed a) without and b) with RFI. This would be recommended.
	Units in table page 70 should be kg/p-km OWD factors from the 4 th UDCC Accessment report should be used.
7. Waste Generated in	 GWP factors from the 4th IPCC Assessment report should be used. Question of dealing with waste for recycling most important. Allocation,
Operations	• Question of dealing with waste for recycling most important. Allocation, benefits etc. This has not been addressed.
8. Franchises Not	
Included in Scope 1	•
and 2 (Upstream)	
9. Leased Assets Not	
Included in Scope 1	•
and 2 (Upstream) 10. Investments Not	
Included in Scope 1	
and 2	
11. Franchises	•
(Downstream)	•
12. Leased Assets	•
(Downstream) 13. Transportation &	
Distribution	
(Downstream/	• See 5.
Outbound)	
	• 14.2: biogenic carbon sources: a neutral calculation is only appropriate if
	sources are sustainably harvested. Otherwise land use change may be a
14. Use of Sold Products	significant source.
	 Table 14.1: Also 5 & 6 might be reported separately from Scopes 1, 2 & 3 because here as well a product influences another entity compared to a
	baseline. Baseline and use-phase assumptions shall be disclosed.
15. Disposal of Sold	
Products at the End of	 Question of dealing with waste for recycling most important. Allocation, benefits etc.
Life	
	EFs: the list of EFs in the referenced WRI and EPA documents are US- contribution. This is a definition of the table of the second se
16. Employee Commuting	 centric. This is a deficiency that should be openly expressed. EFs secondary source should be EF factors by credible sources: those
	 EFs secondary source should be EF factors by credible sources: those include Europe cars TREMOVE, Europe rail/air EcoPassenger; in
	particular electric rail is nationally significantly different.
Glossary	
Clossary	-





Any other general comments or feedback	•
---	---



