

CONSULTATION OUTCOMES

Summary					
	Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 3	Proposal 4	Proposal 5
Agreed	89%	89%	95%	72%	78%
Disagreed	6%	0%	0%	6%	6%
Didn't know/didn't answer	6%	11%	6%	22%	17%

Note: Decimals rounded so may not total 100

Responses were largely supportive of the amendments and so **no changes have been made to the draft legislation.**

Breakdown		
Total number of responses received:	18	
Local Authorities	9	
Other	3	
Did not state which public body (Several are commissioners responding individually)	5	
Government Departments (note: COG approval already obtained)	0	
Statutory Boards	1	
(Total number of public bodies under CC Act)	55	response rate 33.3%

Proposal 1: Remove the requirement to calculate emissions.					
Agree	16	Disagree	1	Not answered/Didn't know	1

Proposal 2: Enable reports to be submitted where information is unavailable, incomplete or has been estimated.					
Agree	16	Disagree	0	Not answered/Didn't know	2

Proposal 3: Avoid duplication of data and clarify that the baseline year may be the same as the first reporting period.					
Agree	17	Disagree	0	Not answered	1

Proposal 4: Significantly reduce reporting requirements for bodies with 15 staff or fewer.					
Agree	13	Disagree	1	Didn't know	4

Proposal 4 (supplementary question): Do you feel that 15 staff is the correct threshold for reduced reporting?							
Agree	6	Should be higher	2	Should be lower	3	Didn't know / Didn't answer	7

Proposal 5: Improve the way we ask for information about buildings.					
Agree	14	Disagree	1	Didn't know	3

Note – Dol response

Dol have been in contact with CCTT outside of the online survey. They have confirmed that they are content for the amendments to progress but indicated that they have a number of concerns around reporting generally, which they will be detailing in a letter - CCTT have committed to working closely with Dol to address these concerns, once the letter is received.

Dol's comments: The Department welcomes the proposals regarding Climate Change (Public Bodies Requirements) Regulations 2022, and supports the proposed amendments. In response to circulating the draft Regulations to Departmental officers, a number of comments were received. It is intended that these comments be discussed at officer level with the Climate Change Team, in the near future.

Summary of comments/themes

Positive response to amendments generally

Several comments were received in support of the amendments generally and, in particular, to evolving our approach based on public body feedback: *"Encouraging to see the 'reflective' approach being taken. These are 'uncharted waters' and a degree of pragmatism is appropriate"*

Misunderstanding of existing requirements

Some of the comments received, indicated a misunderstanding of the existing requirements.

For example, *"It is unclear how future reporting of scope 3 emissions will be captured using the consumption data defined by the proposed regulations."*

Scope 3 emissions (supply chain, contractors etc.) are **not reportable** – neither under the existing Regulations nor the amendments.

These comments highlight the need to for more engagement with public bodies, so that they understand the requirements. We will be responding directly to these comments.

Polarity of opinions

Responses to Proposal 4 and the number of staff threshold highlighted that some public bodies are looking for a very detailed, comprehensive approach while others assert that the reporting is already/still too onerous. Across a wide variety of organisations it is very challenging to find a comfortable compromise. Once the first annual reports have been undertaken, public bodies will have a much better understanding of what is involved and we can continue to refine our approach.

It is important to understand the purpose of public body reporting – it is not designed to be a granular, detailed emissions report but, rather, a high level set of indicators that will help to gauge progress. Some public bodies are already involved in calculating their emissions in more detail, including Scope 3, but it does not appear achievable at this time to enforce such action on all public bodies.

Issues around data

Despite the amendments having been prepared to accommodate concerns around missing or estimated data, this remains a point of concern. CCTT will need to work closely with public bodies, Dol in particular due to their provision of shared services for fleet and buildings, and particularly in relation to the first reports when the process is new to everyone.

Staff number as criterion for proportionality

Several comments highlighted the imperfection of staff numbers as the criterion for categorisation, eg: *"The assumption that fewer staff results in lower emissions is problematic. Perhaps the smaller public body has an unusually bad climate impact owing to the work it does. If you already know which public bodies have 15 or fewer staff then you must also already have an idea of their climate impact. Do they have lower emissions per employee compared with larger public bodies? I think all public bodies should be reporting, personally."*

We acknowledge that using the number of staff is a 'blunt tool'; however, until the first reports are submitted, we cannot categorise on emissions data.

Feedback from very small public bodies, throughout 2022, identified significant resource issues around reporting, with some having fewer than 1 full time member of staff.

This was reflected in the responses to Proposal 4's supplementary question, which asked about the staff threshold and yielded the least conclusive response overall:

- Agree 33%
- Should be higher 11%
- Should be lower 17%
- Didn't know / Didn't answer 39%

As neither 'should be higher' or 'should be lower' outweighed the number who agreed, we believe that best way forward is to implement the proposed 15 staff threshold and continue to monitor the situation, making changes to improve the approach if necessary.

Enhanced reporting from very small public bodies could be revisited in future; however, we believe that the current focus should be on the largest public bodies, which likely have the biggest influence on emissions.