



In collaboration with:



Weekly #SportPositive Twitter Chat

Tuesday, 23 June

Sport Emissions and Reporting/Publishing

Please note we have just taken salient points that were added in the discussion and have not given attribution. This document is to give a flavour of the Twitter Chat, it is not a transcription. If you wish to see who wrote points that resonate with you, to pick up a discussion, search #SportPositive on Twitter and you will be able to see the original tweets.

.....

Q1: Do you think that sports organisations; clubs, leagues, federations etc should make their emissions publicly available? What benefits are there to this?

Transparency is a key principle in world of sustainability, so yes sports bodies should measure and publish their GHG emissions inventory (carbon footprint). Many benefits: shows commitment, establishes a benchmark, enable target setting, credibility. However, it's no good publishing emissions data in isolation. Needs to be part of a wider climate action plan to measure and minimise emissions, and then compensate residual impacts

Taking the time to measure emissions is the important part because "what gets measured gets managed." Benefits of reporting is leading by example and making this a public issue -- what if we all tracked and reported our emissions?

Absolutely. We're in the era of transparency/accountability. Fans will expect it.(per BBC Sport/[#sportpositive](#) poll last Nov)Partners will expect this, as they are doing it themselves. Selfishly, it will draw reduction solutions to them. Lastly, they'll inspire others to follow

Absolutely. I think it is expected and necessary at this point. Benefits: transparency and accountability. Drawbacks: standardization and control over the measurement. Have to ensure sport organizations play fair.

Is it not just a matter of time?

Absolutely. The only way to ensure competitive compliance is to mandate visibility

Q2: Which sports organisations do you know of that currently publish their emissions for the general public to see - either in an annual report, sustainability report or on their website?

The IOC and Olympic organising committees publicly report their GHG emissions inventories. Importantly, these days they are using same methodology:
https://stillmed.olympic.org/media/Document%20Library/OlympicOrg/IOC/What-We-Do/celebrate-olympic-games/Sustainability/IOC-Carbon-Footprint-Methodology.pdf#_ga=2.88934299.1480613073.1592837673-1751414454.1592837673...

We know that Forest Green Rovers publicise their footprint and progress:
<https://fgr.co.uk/our-ethos/greening-up-football...>

In the football world, VfL Wolfsburg does this with progress reports every two years, and articulates targets

NHL does. AEG Worldwide publishes an organization-wide report that includes its sports entities: <https://aegworldwide.com/about/aeg-1earth...>

-> Is this the most up to date version for @NHLGreen - <http://sustainability.nhl.com/report/#!/innovate/reducing-emissions...> Emissions calculation up to 2016?

—> It's my understanding that data were gathered later than this but not published - poss due to shifting internal priorities

Bundesliga doing a fair job <http://ow.ly/z2pK50AfE5W>

For @uefaeuro2016, we did a 1Year-To-Go LCA/Carbon Footprint and then a post-event. You can find main outcomes in the GRI G4 EOSS reports:
https://de.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/uefaorg/General/02/26/41/78/2264178_DOWNLOAD.pdf...
https://uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/uefaorg/General/02/42/47/58/2424758_DOWNLOAD.pdf... [detailed outcomes]

The @Eagles publish a report annually. More focused on other issues than emissions

From replies so far we can see there is still a long way to go for sport sector to be routinely reporting on sustainability. For those pioneers that do, there are still inconsistencies in scope and methodology

-> Yes, still a ways to go. Hopefully the Sports for Climate Action Framework movement will help

—> I hope it will, but that recent "Playing against the clock" report by @DavidGoldblatt for @RapidTransition highlights just how relatively little uptake there is among sports bodies. Lots to do.

—> It's that Giddens paradox idea, or the thought that technology will dig us out of a hole. The last ten weeks have shown how quickly we can be impacted by environmental impacts though.

Q3: What concerns do sports organisations have when deciding whether to openly publish their emissions?

Four concerns I see: 1) they don't know how, and 2) they lack various resources, 3) it's not a priority, and 4) they want to avoid greenwashing perceptions

-> Agree - I think 1, 2 and 3 would be easily overcome if 4 was cracked. Concerns I've heard - data being incorrect, out of date, missing something, a hugely in-depth data set being compared to a top-line one & being labelled as a big emitter etc.

—> That's an interesting perspective because my research (pending) suggests that it's more of an issue of cracking 1, and then the rest may be overcome

—> Just conjecture, I'd trust your empirical evidence :) It just seems that an organisation prioritising the support to understand how to measure/report is much more within their control

There's a worry about being labelled a 'greenwasher' if everything isn't 100% on the money. Media scrutiny, particularly for high profile clubs (especially those who use air travel regularly)

One of the big concerns we hear a lot is that there isn't enough understanding by the general public on what CO2e really mean, what is good, what is bad, how big improvements should be etc. Leading to concern on misunderstanding.

-> Yes, and I think the danger of that is a lot of greenwashing.

—> Any team that claims to be the first at being climate neutral needs to back it up in the details - scope 1, 2, 3 or a combination thereof?

The biggest issue is that in applying the GHG Protocol, the final number reflects a lot of different assumptions and decisions. Almost impossible to make an apples-apples comparison from one organization to another

Not sure this is as big a concern. It's important just to get the information out there. But after that, there will likely be a lot of "inside baseball" discussions with interested stakeholders because there's always a lot of nuance to explain

-> True but more needs to be explained beyond the assumption that seedlings will offset an entire seasons worth of emissions. Teams can't be coy with details despite lack of knowledge on the consumer's end

I'm hearing concerns about the scope to which they are expected to report, in terms of both ability/inputs to effectively measure that & discomfort being held responsible to that extent. Are used to limit liability within a 'fence' as they do w security

-> Do you mean scope as in Scope 1, 2, 3?

—> Yes - Scope 1,2,3

—> OK. Tracking Scopes 1 and 2 is essential and actually pretty easy to do. Not sure tracking Scope 3 makes a lot of sense for most organizations

Like all organisations venturing along the sustainability path, they will be afraid of being criticised, then under pressure to do more to reduce their emissions before being ready. Vital to have emissions reduction plan and be committed to implementing it. One unique thing about sport – especially events – is ability to calculate projected emissions ahead of time and use these as a way of informing reduction plans. This is a pro-active approach rather than just retrospective reporting

Q4: How can we work together as an industry to overcome these concerns?

The Sport for Climate Action initiative should be a good place to start. Another huge help would be to agree to use same methodology (see my A2). Also share knowhow on how to capture relevant data more easily. Common guidance on setting boundaries and a framework for emission reduction strategies would help organisations get started and have more confidence they are on right track and not alone

-> Agree re standards. Be very helpful if leagues or practitioners advanced sport/venue-specific tools to standardize a bit, give more confidence & provide ready to deploy tools. As [@Sandsi #Football4Climate](#) is doing e.g

—> Agreed. Definitely in the workstream for [@UNFCCC S4CA](#) Framework. A safety in numbers approach in terms of methodology and scope would help everyone.

The mandate for tracking and reporting should come from the leagues where it hasn't already

We could better articulate that there is no shame in having gaps in knowledge, and that stakeholders will appreciate honest, open dialogue if there is a genuine commitment to positive action

Q5: Do you think sports organisations should publish like-for-like data breakdowns across key metrics like CO2e from energy and transport, waste recycled/diverted, water usage, or across Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions etc.

I prefer like-for-like approach across key metrics that are meaningful to sport managers and would enable them to share knowhow and best practices. The Scope 1,2 3 approach is less intuitive, but perhaps important for showing context with other sectors. It's really just different ways of slicing and dicing the data. Should be possible to do both. Could have Scope 1,2,3 info in an appendix cross-referenced to main report like you'd do for a GRI report.

Yes, but it could take a while before we're at that stage - most sports entities will need a lot of support, education and reassurance to get there

I think the better approach - in the early going - is for them to publish where they are in the range for their peers and their annual progress on reduction (%) but to save the direct comparison details (for now) to learn from/work with peers. Once a solid comparative framework can be established, you might be able to see (publicly) more deeply into the data via a detailed 'Report Card' system from a 3rd party (not the league) as Richard Lapchick puts out re diversity.

This assumes a solid comparative framework can be established, in our experience that's not really possible. The point is for each organization to know their own footprint and address it. The situation is very different at each location

-> Yes, but we don't want a free-for-all either. Therefore some framework to provide consistency of methodology (not slavish uniformity) and boundary setting would be beneficial

—> Of course, but was thinking more of a footprint for baseball with 162 games would look quite different from a footprint for football with 17, ditto for a 18K seat arena vs a 70K seat stadium but there are massive geo & fan travel differences of course

Thank You!

If you contributed to the #SportPositive Twitter Chat this week, thank you for being a part of it! If you didn't, I hope you find this document useful, and mark your diaries now to join us next week, **Tuesday, June 30th at 4-5pm UTC.**

Claire

Claire Poole
Founder and CEO | Sport Positive Summit

T: +44 (0) 759 504 9938

E: claire.poole@sportpositivesummit.com

W: www.sportpositivesummit.com