

DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

Catalyzing Value Chain Decarbonization

Corporate Survey Results FEBRUARY 2023

Context



- Value-chain decarbonization is one of the most significant opportunities to catalyze system-scale transformation towards a net-zero economy.
- On average, scope 3 emissions represent **70% of corporate greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories** and are part of 96% of validated science-based targets.
- Given the scale and importance of scope 3 target-setting, and an increasing urgency for action, the SBTi has launched a **process to review and update scope 3 target-setting guidance, methods, and criteria** with the aim of ensuring the framework effectively catalyzes value-chain decarbonization while being cognisant of barriers corporates face.
- As a first step, a survey was conducted to **understand the challenges faced with scope 3 target setting.**
- This presentation outlines the **results of the survey** which will be used to inform the future development of scope 3 guidance updates. This report does not seek to provide clarifications on existing guidance or criteria.
- This comprehensive survey was carried out by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) and Boston Consulting Group (BCG) in September 2022.

The end goal is clear, to reach a net-zero economy we need full value chain action



DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

To reach a net-zero economy, the business model of companies need to evolve to continue to create value to society without causing the accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

A net-zero value chain implies that each and every step involved in the provision of goods and services aligns to a level of emissions that is compatible with achieving climate stability.



Scope 3 represents 70% of corporate GHG footprints; targets on these emissions are critical to achieving system-wide decarbonization



DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

Scope 3 is significant across most sectors...



CDP Climate Change Questionnaire April 2022; BCG analysis

Scope 1-3 GHG emissions by sector

...and core to the SBTi's theory of change

- Achieving a net-zero economy requires a fundamental transformation of the economy, which can only be achieved by aligning incentives and eliminating barriers to GHG reduction.
- The SBTi believes in the importance of value chain action and builds on attributional accounting to make shared **cross-value chain responsibility** between actors explicit.
- By requiring economic actors to set targets not only on their direct emissions, but also on emissions in their value chain, the SBTi seeks to align all actors behind a common goal.



Science-based targets, 2022

Number of companies ('000)



96% of validated science-based targets include scope 3

Note, of validated targets; Source: SBTi companies taking action dataset 2022; SBTi Progress Report 2020; BCG analysis

However, barriers remain which may prevent effective translation of scope 3 ambition into value-chain decarbonization



DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

Baselining

Barriers to baselining scope 3 emissions

- Availability of value chain emissions data (reliance on average emissions factors).
- Consistent application of scope 3 baselining standards.

Target Setting

Barriers to setting scope 3 targets

- Confidence in ability to deliver scope 3 targets.
- Availability of scope 3 specific science-based target-setting methods.
- Mismatch of growth plans and decarbonization ambition.

Delivery

Barriers to delivering scope 3 targets

- Ability to influence suppliers and customers.
- Cost of decarbonization.
- Ability to track progress due to data challenges.
- Awareness of "what counts" as a decarbonization lever.

Objectives of the scope 3 guidance and criteria review

- Clarify the role and importance of scope
 3 targets in the delivery of 1.5°C pathways.
- 2. Evaluate scope 3 target boundary conditions and materiality thresholds.
- 3. Assess and refine existing scope 3 targetsetting methodologies.
- 4. Identify new target-setting methodologies.
- 5. Consider **accountability mechanisms** for delivery of scope 3 targets.

The SBTi is launching a process to review scope 3 guidance & criteria

-

and the second s



To inform the SBTi scope 3 review process, a stakeholder survey was launched to understand challenges faced when baselining, setting and delivering scope 3



DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

Objective Understand challenges companies face when setting and delivering scope 3 targets 230 respondents

>20 sectors

All major regions

85% with commitments or targets

>100 questions

Stakeholder engagement survey sampled a wide range of sectors and geographies



DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

Respondents represent a range of sectors...



...and geographies¹



Responses from all companies who completed a representative question; 1. One organization can cover multiple geographies, N=294; 2. N=237, ex. 46 respondents who did not complete this question; Source: SBTi Scope 3 Stakeholder Engagement Survey, September 2022; BCG analysis

Three categories of challenges were researched



DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

Α.	B.	C.
Challenges with baselining scope 3 emissions	Challenges with setting scope 3 science-based targets	Challenges with delivering progress towards a scope 3 science-based target

Baselining: Some companies are motivated to develop a baseline in order to set a target



A primary motivator for baselining scope 3 emissions is to enable setting an SBT

Q. What was/is your motivation for developing a scope 3 GHG baseline? Select one or many, % of respondents

84%
78%
79%

Regulation is not a motivator today, but is expected to be one in the future

Q. Are you currently subject to any regulatory disclosure on scope 3, or do you expect to be in the future?, % of respondents



Baselining Barrier #1: Data access

Supplier specific emissions factors only represent 6% of baseline calculations



DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

S3.1 Purchased goods and services S3.2 Capital Goods S3.3 Fuel and energy related activities S3.4 Upstream transportation and distribution S3.5 Waste generated in operations S3.6 Business travel S3.7 Employee commuting S3.8 Upstream leased assets S3.9 Downstream transport S3.10 Processingof sold products S3.11 Use of sold products S3.12 End of life treatment of sold products S3.13 Downstream leased assets S3.14 Franchises S3.15 Investments

Method used to estimate scope 3 emissions, % of respondents, N=175



1. A mix of spend, activity and supplier specific emissions factors. Source: SBTi Scope 3 Stakeholder Engagement Survey, September 2022; BCG analysis

Baselining Barrier #2: Comparability

50% of companies re-baseline emissions due to methodological changes

Differing interpretations of accounting guidance can limit **baseline comparability**

Due to....



Methodological choices e.g. spend vs. activity based emissions factors



Optional categories e.g. indirect use phase



Lack of sufficient sector specific accounting guidelines



Why has your baseline changed?

Methodological

Changes² ~50%

In addition, changing methodological decisions

Q: Has your baseline changed in the last 5 years, why?, N=198

often lead to **re-baselining**

No

30%

Yes

70%

Inorganic growth Changes in supplier factors Changes in emissions factors Calculation errors Changing to a different emissions factor database Changing the type of EF¹

(e.g., spend based to activity)

1. Emissions factor 2. Changes to a baseline not driven by methodological decisions rather than directly by real economy decarbonization Source: SBTi Scope 3 Stakeholder Engagement Survey, September 2022; BCG analysis



SCIENCE

BASED TARGETS



TIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

Target Setting

Almost all companies find setting a scope 3 science-based target challenging Q: How challenging do/did you find setting a scope 3 target?



Source: SBTi Scope 3 Stakeholder Engagement Survey, September 2022; BCG analysis

Source: SBTi Scope 3 Stakeholder Engagement Survey, September 2022; BCG analysis



Respondents are concerned about the consequences of failure...

Target Setting Barrier #1: Confidence

70% of respondents believe lack of confidence in delivery is a barrier to target setting

...and lack confidence because of unclear delivery roadmaps



Large implications to failing to deliver

Stakeholders will hold us to account

32%



We don't have a clear We delivery plan to

29%

r We don't know how to reduce emissions



12%

Economic

6%

SDA¹

Target Setting Barrier #2: Methods

Most respondents utilize absolute contraction as a scope 3 target-setting method

57% of companies use absolute contraction for scope 3 target setting...

...however, tailored sector specific guidance may help address perceived barriers

Scope 3 emissions originate from many different sources including some high emitting sectors.

For companies with scope 3 emissions in high emitting sectors, sector specific target-setting guidance may help create more nuanced targets compared to the absolute contraction method.

In addition, respondents commonly cite growth ambitions as a barrier to target setting.

Use of intensity-based target-setting methodologies may help to partially decouple planned growth from decarbonization ambition.

Contraction engagement intensity intensity

15%

Physical

19%

Supplier

57%

Absolute





Target Delivery

70% of scope 3 emissions concentrated in two categories



Q. Which scope 3 categories do you find the most challenging to decarbonize % of respondents, N=168

S3.1 Purchased goods and services S3.11 Use of sold products

> S3.10 Processing of sold products S3.12 End-of-life treatment S3.15 Investments S3.4 Upstream T&D S3.2 Capital Goods S3.9 Downstream Transport S3.7 Employee commuting S3.5 Waste in operations S3.6 Business travel S3.13 Downstream leased assets S3.14 Franchises S3.8 Upstream leased assets S3.3 Fuel and energy





...representing >70% of global scope 3

42%

29%



SCIENCE

BASED TARGETS

Delivery Barrier #1: Influence

81% of respondents believe limited influence over supply chains is a barrier to delivery





Source: SBTi Scope 3 Stakeholder Engagement Survey, September 2022; BCG analysis

Disagree: 12%

% respondents, N=180

Why is cost a challenge for delivering scope 3 targets? % respondents, N=117

Buying low carbon products and services will incur a green premium

Re-designing products will require **CAPEX** investment

Our competitors are slow to act, limiting pressure on us

Insufficient 20% business case

Delivery Barrier #2: Cost

Is cost a challenge to

61% of respondents are concerned that cost is a barrier to delivering a scope 3 target







Increased

CAPEX

30%

Delivery Barrier #3: Tracking progress

Access to measured supply chain data is a barrier to tracking the delivery of targets

Poor measured data availability

Supplier specific emissions factors not available (63%)

Tier 2 emissions factors are unknown (42%) Supplier emissions factors are often not robust or verified (61%)

Poor data

quality

Use of sold product emissions are at best rough estimates (24%)

Inability to track progress

Hard to recognize the impact of actions with average factors (58%)

Harder to identify and prioritize opportunities to act



Delivery Barrier #4: What counts

Some respondents are unclear on "what counts" as a valid scope 3 decarbonization lever

Q: How clear are you about which emission reduction activities can count towards delivery of a scope 3 science-based target? N=140

FLAG Interventions 69% 19% Non-FLAG 68% 16% Interventions Neutralization 42% 18% Changes to avg. 37% 14% **Emission factors** Switching supplier 27% 17% Unclear Neutral Clear

Source: SBTi Scope 3 Stakeholder Engagement Survey, September 2022; BCG analysis



Six high level solutions

Addressing barriers is critical to decarbonization - call to action for the entire ecosystem





Improved data collection & traceability Enhanced accounting frameworks

Target-setting guidance and methods Collective value chain action inanciers & regulators

Internal efforts

Six high level solutions

Addressing barriers is critical to decarbonization - call to action for the entire ecosystem



US CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

