





# Wessex Live Lab Carbon Baselining Overview

#### **INFORMATION PACK**











# Live Labs II – Project context

- UK-wide, ADEPT-funded £30m DfT programme
- Local authorities providing leadership & innovation on how to decarbonise local highways infrastructure and assets.
- Wessex Live Lab is one of 4 themes (corridor and place-based decarbonisation) and one of 7 projects across the UK.
- 9 corridors 3 in each LA (Cornwall, Hampshire, & Somerset).
- Working towards resilient Net Zero roads pioneering an approach to measuring and reducing maintenance-phase emissions.





# Carbon Baselining – why is it important?

- Full-service picture required to identify carbon hotspots & understand where we can make the greatest difference.
- All-encompassing every aspect of highways maintenance has a carbon contribution, not just material-based activities.
- Enables carbon figures to be assigned to each activity that occurs on the corridors, providing a benchmark to compare lowercarbon alternatives against.
- Builds in carbon linked to non-operational elements, such as buildings, and links them to service activities







# Carbon Baselining - Methodology





# Carbon Baselining – Data Sources

	Premises & Sites	Staff & Contractors		Vehicles & Plant			Products & Services
Where does the data come from?	Electricity & gas meter readings	Staff commute surveys	Business mileage claims	Pool vehicle mileages	Inspection vehicle mileages	Contracted plant & vehicle fuel usage	Invoices, POs, job codes, and/or BoMs
Who does the data come from?	Facilities Manager	All staff in highways dept.	HR	Fleet Engineering Manager	Inspection Manager	Plant & fleet managers	Purchasing staff
Which tiers does the data come from?	Local Authority, Tier 1 contractor	Local Authority, Tier 1 contractor		Local Authority		Tier 1 & 2 contractors	Local Authority, Tier 1 & 2 contractors





# Novel approaches

- Doughnut Economics principles & normalised scorecard to be integrated into Carbon Analyser.
- Development of Carbon Toolkit to guide & inform the carbon baselining process.
- Production of Staff Commute Survey as a resource for use across the Live Lab, tailored to the requirements of each organisation.







# Maintaining the highest standards of carbon analysis

#### **Best-practice approach**

- FHRG Carbon Analyser alignment with standards including EN 15978 and PAS 2080.
- Trialled and tested across local authorities.
- Calculation of 90-95% of carbon emissions at 80% confidence.

#### Consistency

Across all three local authorities:

- Same functions and time period used to define baseline boundaries.
- Same point of contact for data processing.
- Same carbon tool and CCAS protocols used.

#### Data quality

- Selecting verifiable data sources, e.g., mileage claims.
- Pursuing statistically significant sample sizes
- Ensuring accuracy of responses by following up on potential errors / inconsistencies.

#### **Rigour**

- Ongoing verification process to identify and rectify data gaps & inconsistencies.
- Weekly opportunity to report findings to the Core Team and request further actions.
- Assumptions are documented for auditability.



# Disseminating findings & data







- Data is validated before entry, and data gaps / inconsistencies are followed up.
- As part of the FHRG support package:
  - The baseline carbon footprint assessment will be independently assessed.
  - Veracity, accuracy, and completeness of experimental carbon profiles will be independently certified.







# Results & progress so far

Key statistics, observations and analysis





# **Progress so far -** iterative learning across the three authorities



	Premises & Sites	Staff & Contractors	Vehicles & Plant	Products & Services	
Somerset	Completed	<pre>'Staff' completed for survey respondents (extrapolation required to fill gaps); 'Contractors' in progress</pre>	'Vehicles' near completion; 'Plant' in progress	Data collection in progress	
Lessons					
Cornwall	Data collection in progress				
Hampshire	Data collection in progress				

Sector-wide transfer of knowledge & best practices



# Key Statistics – Somerset Council









## Key observations

#### **Data Collection Processes**

- Discovering more efficient ways to collect data:
- Depot meter readings obtained directly from the contractor, allowing both LA and Tier 1 data to be obtained simultaneously.
- Staff commute survey streamlined & changed from MS Word to Forms.
- Requesting full list of business mileage claims instead of relying on individual estimates.
- Moving from manual data entry to bulk data imports proforma template for consistency.

#### Challenges

- Complexity of coordinating data collection across multiple organisations and contracts.
- Survey low response rates and inconsistent responses. Highlights importance of promoting staff engagement and clarifying data requirements.
- Difficulty of obtaining mileages for entire vehicle fleet some vehicles do not appear to have mileages recorded against them (data gaps are currently under investigation).







### Key observations

#### **Surprises**

- 88% of Premises & Sites emissions came from just 3 sites (out of 7), and 94% came from gas consumption alone.
- Home working was more carbon-intensive on average than commuting (excluding SC vehicles).
- Inspections staff accounted for 2x more emissions than any other OU and more than the most carbon-intensive depot.

#### **Potential actions**

- Explore strategies (potentially through a 'Lean Carbon' review) to reduce inspection trips, such as combined inspections, remote monitoring, and/or a revised inspection schedule.
- Regular meetings across supply chain to coordinate Scope 3 data collection and share progress & learning.









# **Detailed Results Discussion**











# Premises & Sites

Key statistics, observations and analysis











### Key Statistics









# Premises & Sites – Key observations

#### **Data Collection Process**

- A proforma template was sent to the Facilities Manager to input gas & electricity meter readings for each site however, returning raw/independently formatted data proved to be preferable.
- For depots, data was obtained directly from the contractor, allowing both LA and Tier 1 data to be obtained simultaneously & efficiently.

#### Challenges

 Determining the emissions share for County Hall – this was achieved by dividing the number of desks allocated to Highways staff by the total number of desks in Blocks A & B.

#### **Surprises**

 Whilst only 4 out of 7 sites reported gas usage, gas consumption accounted for 94% of the total CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions in this module.

#### **Potential actions**

 Focus on reducing demand for gas and transitioning to alternative heating sources, particularly in Glastonbury & Dunball depots.







### Premises & Sites – emissions by source











# Staff & Contractors

Key statistics, observations and analysis











### Key Statistics



Average annual carbon emissions per person (excluding travel in SC vehicles)







# Staff & Contractors – Key observations

#### **Data Collection Process**

- Survey distributed to staff to collect data on their home working, commuting, and business travel habits (see next slide).
- Estimations of business mileage were verified using mileage claims.
- Missing responses are to be accounted for by attributing the average values for each mode of transport to the remaining staff.

#### Challenges

- Initial survey response rates were low, necessitating further prompting and an extension of the return deadline.
- Surveys were returned with incomplete or conflicting information, and the questions did not account for more complex commutes. The survey was refined to resolve these issues (see next slide).

#### **Surprises**

On average, home working (based on assumed energy usage) was the largest source of CO2e emissions for this module (47%).

#### **Potential actions**

- Explore whether converting home working to office-based just shifts the CO2e emissions or increases/reduces them.
- Investigate why people may be reluctant to respond and how this links to beliefs, worries and behaviours around carbon.
- Engage with staff to explore the potential for increased car-sharing, active travel, and/or use of public transport.











# Response Rates by Organisational Unit







**Decarbonising Local Roads** 

### Primary Transport Modes













### Average Carbon Emissions Per Person\*





\*Preliminary figures prior to final data confirmation







# Vehicles & Plant

Key statistics, observations & analysis









### Vehicles & Plant – Key statistics









# Vehicles & Plant – Key observations

#### **Data Collection Process**

- Mileages were originally requested for each pool vehicle recorded by the survey respondents. However, requesting a full vehicle inventory with mileages assigned to each vehicle proved to be more efficient.
- Inspection vehicle mileages were provided separately by the Inspections manager.

#### Challenges

 It has proven difficult to obtain mileages for the whole fleet, as some vehicles do not appear to have mileages recorded against them. Data gaps are currently under investigation.

#### **Surprises**

 Inspection vehicles alone account for more CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions (48.8 tonnes) than the most carbon-intensive depot.

#### **Potential actions**

• Explore strategies (potentially through a 'Lean Carbon' review) to reduce inspection trips, such as combined inspections, remote monitoring, and/or a revised inspection schedule.









# Products & Services

Data collection is ongoing....







# **Products & Services** – ongoing - key observations so far

#### Data Collection Process (yet to be completed)

- Workshop with Tier 1 & 2 partners to establish data collection protocols.
- Coordination by central Carbon Analyst.
- Provision of a new proforma template to support consistent data formatting & collation.

#### Challenges

- Complexity of gathering data across multiple organisations and contracts.
- Ensuring consistency, e.g., definitions, baseline year.

#### **Surprises**

• Watch this space!

#### **Potential actions**

• Regular progress meetings across supply chain.









- Carbon isn't always where we think it is! Focus on solutions that will address the real carbon hotspots.
- It's complex and needs to be all-encompassing.
- Identifying and solving the challenges of carbon baselining is informing the Carbon Toolkit development.
- Carbon baselining underpins meaningful demonstrators by highlighting key areas to target.
- Aiming to bring innovation into what we do every day.





Future Highways Research Group



**Decision Equipped.** 

# proving ADEPT

Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning & Transport

#### Highways PARTOF TRANSPORT NETWORK

### Live Labs II: Carbon Assessment

**Future Highways Research Group** 

**Future Highways Research Group** 



Decision Equipped.

# Pecision Equipped. **ADEPT**

Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning & Transport



### Overview

Live Labs II

#### Live Labs II: Carbon Assessments





#### Live Labs II: Carbon Assessments





#### Live Labs II: Carbon Assessments





#### Live Labs II: Carbon Assessments Sector Impact Assessment





#### Live Labs II: Carbon Assessments Sector Impact Assessment

Future Highways Research Group



$\frown$	Carbon Footprint Statement	
	Benchmark Carbon Profiles (Activity-Level)	Sector Impact Assessments
	Experimental Carbon Profiles (Live Labs II Projects)	Extrapolations for FHRG, ADEPT and Supply Chains
	Doughnut Economic Profiles (Statutory Obligations, Social Imperatives &	

Economic Goals within Planetary Boundaries)

**Future Highways Research Group** 



Decision Equipped.

# Pecision Equipped. **ADEPT**

Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning & Transport



### Overview

Live Labs II



#### 42



#### Five Step Process

#### High Accuracy, Low Overhead

Future Highways Research Group