


# Carbon performance assessment of electricity utilities: note on methodology

May 2018



Simon Dietz, Dan Gardiner,  
William Irwin and Bruno Rauis



Transition  
Pathway  
Initiative

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	3
2. The basis for TPI’s carbon performance assessment: the Sectoral Decarbonization Approach.....	4
3. How TPI is applying the SDA .....	6
3.1. Deriving the benchmark paths.....	6
3.2. Calculating company emissions intensities .....	9
3.3. Emissions reporting boundaries .....	10
3.4. Data sources and validation .....	10
3.5. Responding to companies .....	11
3.6. Presentation of assessment on TPI website .....	12
4. Specific considerations in the assessment of electricity utilities .....	13
4.1. Measure of emissions intensity .....	13
4.2. Coverage of target .....	13
4.3. Worked examples .....	14
5. Discussion .....	17
5.1. General issues.....	17
5.2. Issues specific to electricity utilities .....	17
6. Disclaimer .....	19
7. Bibliography.....	20

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to provide an overview of the methodology followed by the Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI) in its assessment of the carbon performance of electricity utilities.

TPI was established in January 2017. It is a global initiative led by asset owners and supported by asset managers. Collectively these investors represent over s£6/\$8 trillion of assets under management. TPI aims to evaluate what the transition to a low-carbon economy looks like for companies with a high impact on climate change, such as electricity utilities and oil and gas producers. It also aims to assess how well-prepared these companies are for the low-carbon transition. Companies are analysed in two ways:

1. *Management Quality*: TPI evaluates and tracks the quality of companies' governance/management of their greenhouse gas emissions and of risks and opportunities related to the low-carbon transition.
2. *Carbon Performance*: TPI also evaluates how companies' carbon emissions compare with the international targets and national pledges made as part of the UN Paris Agreement. It does this by comparing companies in high-emitting sectors against each other and against sector-specific benchmarks, which establish the performance of an average company that is aligned with international emissions targets.

TPI publishes the results of its analysis through an open online tool hosted by the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment at the London School of Economics (LSE):

<http://www.transitionpathwayinitiative.org>.

TPI encourages investors to use the data, indicators and online tool to inform their investment research, decision making, engagement with companies, proxy voting and dialogue with fund managers and policy makers, bearing in mind the Disclaimer that can be found in Section 6.

## 2. THE BASIS FOR TPI'S CARBON PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT: THE SECTORAL DECARBONIZATION APPROACH

TPI's Carbon Performance assessment is based on the Sectoral Decarbonization Approach (SDA).[1] The SDA translates greenhouse gas emissions targets made at the international level (e.g. under the Paris Agreement to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change) into appropriate benchmarks, against which the performance of individual companies can be compared.<sup>1</sup>

The SDA is built on the principle of recognising that different sectors of the economy (e.g. oil and gas production, electricity generation and automobile manufacturing) face different challenges arising from the low-carbon transition, including where emissions are concentrated in the value chain, and how costly it is to reduce emissions. Other approaches to translating international emissions targets into company benchmarks have applied the same decarbonization pathway to all sectors, regardless of these differences.[2]

Therefore the SDA takes a sector-by-sector approach, comparing companies within each sector against each other and against sector-specific benchmarks, which establish the performance of an average company that is aligned with international emissions targets.

Applying the SDA can be broken down into the following steps:

- A global carbon budget is established, which is consistent with international emissions targets, for example keeping global warming below 2°C. To do this rigorously, some input from a climate model is required.
- The global carbon budget is allocated across time and to different regions and industrial sectors. This typically requires an integrated economy-energy model, and these models usually allocate emissions reductions by region and by sector according to where it is cheapest to reduce emissions and when (i.e. the allocation is cost-effective). Cost-effectiveness is, however, subject to some constraints, such as political and public preferences, and the availability of capital. This step is therefore driven primarily by economic and engineering considerations, but with some awareness of political and social factors.
- In order to compare companies of different sizes, sectoral emissions are normalised by a relevant measure of sectoral activity (e.g. physical production, economic activity). This results in a benchmark pathway for emissions intensity in each sector:

$$\text{Emissions intensity} = \frac{\text{Emissions}}{\text{Activity}}$$

---

<sup>1</sup> Another initiative that is also using the SDA is the Science Based Targets Initiative (<http://sciencebasedtargets.org/>).

Assumptions about sectoral activity need to be consistent with the emissions modelled and therefore should be taken from the same economy-energy modelling, where possible.

- Companies' recent and current emissions intensity is calculated and their future emissions intensity can be estimated based on emissions targets they have set (i.e. this assumes companies exactly meet their targets).<sup>2</sup> Together these establish emissions intensity pathways for companies.
- Companies' emissions intensity pathways are compared with each other and with the relevant sectoral benchmark pathway.

While companies will have different initial emissions intensities – i.e. different starting points – a fundamental tenet of the SDA approach is that all companies in a sector are required to converge to the average emissions intensity in 2050. Not only does this correspond with a fair distribution of effort across companies, there are good reasons to expect companies' emissions intensities to converge over time, as techniques and technologies for reducing emissions diffuse from leaders to laggards. [3]

---

<sup>2</sup> Alternatively, future emissions intensity could be calculated based on other data provided by companies on their business strategy and capital expenditure plans.

### 3. HOW TPI IS APPLYING THE SDA

#### 3.1. Deriving the benchmark paths

The key inputs to calculating the benchmark pathways are:

- A time path for carbon emissions, which is consistent with the delivery of a particular climate target (e.g. limiting global warming to 2°C). Consistency requires that cumulative carbon emissions are within the associated carbon budget.
- A breakdown of this economy-wide emissions path into emissions from key sectors (the numerator of sectoral emissions intensity).
- Consistent estimates of the time path of physical production from, or economic activity in, these key sectors (the denominator of sectoral emissions intensity).

TPI obtains all three of these inputs from the International Energy Agency (IEA), via its *Energy Technology Perspectives* report.[4] The IEA has established expertise in modelling the cost of achieving international emissions targets. It also provides unprecedented access to the modelling inputs and outputs in a form suitable for applying the SDA.

The IEA's economy-energy model simulates the supply of energy and the path of emissions in different sectors burning fossil fuels, or consuming energy generated by burning fossil fuels, given assumptions about key inputs, such as economic and population growth.

In low-carbon scenarios, the IEA model minimises the cost of adhering to a carbon budget by always allocating emissions reductions to sectors where they can be made most cheaply, subject to some constraints as mentioned above. These scenarios are therefore cost-effective, within some limits of economic, political, social and technological feasibility.

The IEA's work can be used to derive three benchmark emissions pathways, against which companies are evaluated by TPI:


1. A *Paris Pledges scenario*. It has been established that the sum of the emissions reductions pledged by individual countries as part of their Nationally Determined Contributions (or NDCs) to the Paris Agreement is insufficient to put the world on a pathway to limit warming to 2°C, even if it will constitute a departure from a business-as-usual trend. Analysis by various groups suggests that, if the NDCs are fully implemented, then annual global greenhouse gas emissions in 2030 will be in the range 52-61 gigatonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (GtCO<sub>2</sub>e).[5]–[7] The IEA's Reference Technology Scenario (RTS) takes into account individual countries' NDCs, and is used in the TPI as the basis for the Paris Pledges scenario. It must be stressed that, while this scenario is representative of the *global sum* of emissions cuts pledged in NDCs, the emissions cuts pledged by individual countries in their NDCs do of course vary and will in most cases differ from the global average cuts.

2. A *2 Degrees scenario*, which is consistent with the overall aim of the Paris Agreement to hold “the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels”, albeit at the low end of the range of ambition.[8]
3. A *Well Below 2 Degrees scenario*, which is consistent with the midpoint in the range of ambition in the overall aim of the Paris Agreement. Compared with the 2 Degrees scenario, the IEA’s “Beyond 2°C Scenario” reflects more extensive use of energy efficiency measures, renewable energy sources, fuel switching and carbon capture and storage. This scenario achieves net zero CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 2060, and a temperature increase of 1.75°C by the year 2100.

For each scenario, IEA modelling output provides sector-specific emissions paths. It also provides associated estimates of production in each sector. Alternatively input assumptions on overall economic growth can be used as a measure of sectoral activity (under the assumption that the sector grows at the same rate as the overall economy). Emissions are then divided by activity to derive sectoral pathways for emissions intensity.

Figure 1 shows the benchmark emissions intensity pathways for the electricity utilities sector, while Table 1 provides the underlying data on emissions and electricity production. For example, under the Paris Pledges scenario in 2025, total global emissions from the power sector are projected by IEA to be 13,351 million metric tonnes or megatonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>. Under the same scenario in 2025, gross electricity generation is projected to be 30,415 terawatt hours. Therefore the average carbon intensity of a power generator aligned with the Paris Pledges pathway is  $13,351 / 30,415 = 0.439$  megatonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> per terawatt hour (equivalent to tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> per megawatt hour) of electricity produced.

Figure 1 Benchmark global carbon intensity pathways for the power sector (tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> per MWh electricity generation) consistent with limiting warming to well below 2°C, 2°C, and with the sum of the Paris Pledges





**Table 1 Projections of emissions and electricity production used to calculate intensity pathways (Source: IEA)**

	2014	2025	2030
Paris Pledges scenario			
Direct CO2 emissions from power (Mt)	13,625	13,351	13,662
Gross electricity generation (TWh)	23,819	30,415	33,999
Carbon intensity (tCO2 / MWh)	0.572	0.439	0.402
2 Degrees scenario			
Direct CO2 emissions from power (Mt)	13,625	10,433	7,710
Gross electricity generation (TWh)	23,819	28,913	31,441
Carbon intensity (tCO2 / MWh)	0.572	0.361	0.245
Well below 2 Degrees scenario			
Direct CO2 emissions from power (Mt)	13,625	9,369	7,083
Gross electricity generation (TWh)	23,819	28,377	30,959
Carbon intensity (tCO2 / MWh)	0.572	0.330	0.229

### 3.2. Calculating company emissions intensities

TPI is based on public disclosures by companies. In any given sector, disclosures that are useful to TPI’s carbon performance assessment tend to come in one of three forms:

1. Some companies disclose their recent and current emissions intensity and some companies have also set future emissions targets in intensity terms. Provided these are measured in a way that can be compared with the benchmark scenarios and with other companies (e.g. in terms of scope of emissions covered and measure of activity chosen), these disclosures can be used directly. In some cases, adjustments need to be made to obtain estimates of emissions intensity on a consistent basis. The necessary adjustments will generally involve sector-specific issues (see below).
2. Some companies disclose their recent and current emissions on an absolute (i.e. un-normalised) basis. Provided emissions are appropriately measured, and an accompanying disclosure of the company’s activity can be found that is also in the appropriate metric, recent and current emissions intensity can be calculated by TPI.
3. Some companies set future emissions targets in terms of absolute emissions. This raises the particular question of what to assume about those companies’ future activity levels. The approach taken in the TPI is

to assume company activity increases at the same rate as the sector as a whole (i.e. this amounts to an assumption of constant market share), using sectoral growth rates from the IEA in order to be consistent with the benchmark paths. While companies' market shares are unlikely to remain constant, there is no obvious alternative assumption that can be made, which treats all companies consistently. Sectoral growth rates from the Paris Pledges (IEA RTS) scenario are used. These lie in the middle of the range from the IEA's three scenarios, close to the average of them.

The length of companies' emissions intensity paths will vary depending on how much information companies provide on their emissions in the last three since 2013, as well as the time horizon for their emissions targets.

### **3.3. Emissions reporting boundaries**

Company emissions disclosures vary in terms of the organisation boundary that a company sets. There are two high-level approaches: the equity share approach and the control approach, and within the control approach there is a choice of financial or operational control. Companies are free to choose which organisation boundary to set in their voluntary disclosures and there is variation between companies assessed by TPI.

TPI accepts emissions reported using any of the above approaches to setting organisation boundaries, as long as:

1. The boundary that has been set appears to allow a representative assessment of the company's emissions intensity;
2. The same boundary is used for reporting company emissions and activity, so that a consistent estimate of emissions intensity is obtained.

At this point in time, limiting the assessment to one particular type of organisation boundary would severely restrict the breadth of companies TPI can assess.

When companies report historical emissions or emission intensity under *both* the equity share and control approaches, as is sometimes the case, TPI chooses the reporting boundary that seems most appropriate, based on the criteria of consistency with the reporting of activity, consistency with the target, and the length of the available time series of disclosures.

### **3.4. Data sources and validation**

All company data in TPI come from companies' own disclosures. The sources for the carbon performance assessment include responses to the annual CDP questionnaire, as well as companies' own reports, e.g. sustainability reports.

Given that TPI's carbon performance assessment is both comparative and quantitative, it is essential to understand exactly what the data in company disclosures refer to. Company reporting varies not only in terms of what is reported, but also in terms of the level of detail and explanation provided. The following cases can be distinguished:

- Some companies provide data in a suitable form and they provide enough detail on those data for analysts to be confident appropriate measures can be calculated or used.
- Some companies also provide enough detail, but from the detail it is clear that their disclosures are not in a suitable form for TPI's carbon performance assessment (e.g. they do not report the measure of company activity needed). These companies cannot be included in the assessment.
- Some companies do not provide enough detail on the data disclosed and these companies are also excluded from the assessment (e.g. the company reports an emissions intensity estimate, but does not explain precisely what it refers to).
- Some companies do not disclose their carbon emissions and/or activity.

Once a company's preliminary performance assessment has been made based on the principles and procedures described above, it is subject to the following quality assurance:

- *Internal findings review*: the preliminary assessment is reviewed by analysts who were not originally involved in making it.
- *Company review*: once the initial findings review is complete, TPI writes to companies with their assessment and requests companies to review it and confirm the accuracy of the company disclosures being used. The company review includes all companies, i.e. it also includes those who provide unsuitable or insufficiently detailed disclosures.
- *Final assessment*: company assessments are reviewed and, if it is considered appropriate, revised.

### **3.5. Responding to companies**

Allowing companies the opportunity to review and, if necessary, correct their assessments is an integral part of TPI's quality assurance process. We send each company its draft TPI assessment and the data that underpin the assessment, offering them the opportunity to review and comment on the data and assessment. We also allow companies to contact us at any point to discuss their assessment.

If a company seeks to challenge its result/representation, our process is as follows:

- TPI reviews the information provided by the company. At this point, additional information may be requested.
- If it is concluded that the company's challenge has merit, the assessment is updated and the company is informed.
- If it is concluded that there are insufficient grounds to change the assessment, this decision is explained to the company.

- If a company chooses to further contest the assessment and reverts to legal means to do so, the company's assessment is withheld from the TPI website and the company is identified as having challenged its assessment.

### **3.6. Presentation of assessment on TPI website**

The results of the carbon performance assessment will be posted on the TPI website, within the TPI tool (<http://www.lse.ac.uk/GranthamInstitute/tpi/the-toolkit/>). On each company page, its emissions intensity path will be plotted on the same chart as the benchmark paths for the relevant sector. Different companies can also be compared on the toolkit main page, with the user free to choose which companies to include in the comparison.

## 4. SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS IN THE ASSESSMENT OF ELECTRICITY UTILITIES

### 4.1. Measure of emissions intensity

In the electricity utilities sector, the specific measure of emissions intensity is:

- Greenhouse gas emissions per unit of electricity produced, in units of (metric) tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per megawatt hour.

This specifically covers emissions from the electricity generation process. It is sometimes referred to as 'absolute emissions' from electricity production (e.g. in the CDP questionnaire). In most cases, these emissions constitute all or nearly all of the company's scope 1 emissions, but some companies have significant scope 1 emissions from other sources and these must be subtracted, or else a stand-alone figure for emissions from electricity generation must be provided.

There are three main reasons for the choice of measure. First, it is consistent with the data provided by the IEA for the benchmark paths, which comprise direct CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from electricity generation,<sup>3</sup> as well as the amount of electricity generated. Second, almost all power-sector emissions are from the generation process. Third, data are relatively widely available for the companies in the TPI sample.

Some companies are engaged in the generation of electricity and heat in combined heat and power (CHP) facilities. Because TPI focuses strictly on the emissions intensity of electricity generation (as do the IEA benchmarks), it is sometimes necessary for TPI to adjust such companies' disclosures. Where a company does not readily separate its disclosed emissions between electricity and heat, where possible TPI adjusts the company's emissions intensity by subtracting emissions due to the production of heat (or an estimate thereof) from the numerator, and the amount of heat produced from the denominator, so that the adjusted intensity reflects only the company's electricity generation activities.

### 4.2. Coverage of target

There are differences in the scope of companies' emissions targets. Some companies have set specific targets for emissions from electricity production, while others have set targets for total scope 1 emissions, or scope 1 and 2 emissions, etc.

Where a target covers a scope broader than just emissions from electricity production, it is assumed – in the absence of any other specific information – that the percentage reduction in emissions is uniform across scopes, so the target percentage (e.g. a 20% cut) can be directly applied to absolute emissions from electricity production.

---

<sup>3</sup> IEA only provides an estimate of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and does not include other greenhouse gases. However, these are typically a very small share of companies' emissions from electricity production (0-3%), so we allow a comparison of company emissions intensity, in terms of all greenhouse gases, with benchmark emissions intensity, in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> only.

Companies often express targets relative to emissions in a base year (e.g. 2010), but they do not always report absolute emissions from electricity production in the base year, rather they sometimes report base-year emissions in a different scope (e.g. total scope 1 emissions in 2010). If a company does not report absolute emissions from electricity generation in the base year, these are estimated where necessary using the ratio of absolute emissions to emissions in the company's chosen scope since 2013 (cumulatively).<sup>4</sup>

Most companies report recent and current absolute emissions of all greenhouse gases (i.e. CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent), but some have set future targets that relate to CO<sub>2</sub> only. This disconnect is ignored due to the very small share of non-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gases in companies' absolute emissions from electricity production, as explained above and in footnote 4.

### 4.3. Worked examples<sup>5</sup>

#### *Company A: a simple case*


Company A reports its emissions intensity in the required metric, i.e. greenhouse gas emissions from electricity generation, per unit of electricity produced. For example, in 2017 it was 0.80 tCO<sub>2</sub>e / MWh. These figures are used directly without adjustment.

Company A has also set a target to reduce the emission intensity of its generation portfolio to 0.600 tCO<sub>2</sub>e / MWh by 2020, and 0.500 tCO<sub>2</sub>e / MWh by 2030. After verifying that the target emission intensities are expressed in a manner consistent with the historical emission intensity disclosures, the target figures are used without adjustment.

---

<sup>4</sup> Due to the occasional practice of companies re-basing their emissions, this adjustment is preferred to using disclosures of base-year absolute emissions from past years' reporting. Take for example 2010 as the base year for a company's target. It is often the case that the company's stated base-year (2010) emissions in their 2016 CDP response differ from the company's stated 2010 emissions in their 2011 CDP response.

<sup>5</sup> In the following examples various numbers are rounded for ease of presentation.



### Company B: an absolute emissions target


Company B reports its absolute greenhouse gas emissions from electricity generation per unit of electricity produced. For example, in 2017 it was 0.707 tCO<sub>2</sub>e / MWh. After verification, these figures are used directly without adjustment.

Company B also has a target to reduce its Scope 1 emissions by 30% below the 2005 level by the “early 2020s”, and 45% by 2030. TPI understands this target to cover all of the company’s Scope 1 emissions from electricity production. In order to translate this information into an estimate of emissions intensity between 2016 and 2030, the following steps are taken:

- “Early 2020s” is not further defined; however, it is necessary for TPI to assume a specific date to plot the charts. TPI assumes that “early 2020s” can be approximated by the year 2022.
- The 2005 emissions from electricity generation are 39.2 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e. The company’s target is understood to cover all such emissions. Hence, the target absolute emissions from electricity generation in 2022 and 2030 will be, respectively:  $39.2 \times (1 - 30\%) = 27.4$  MtCO<sub>2</sub>e, and  $39.2 \times (1 - 45\%) = 21.5$  MtCO<sub>2</sub>e.
- As the company does not provide an intensity target, its electricity production between 2017 and 2030 is assumed to grow at the same rate as regional electricity production according to the IEA scenarios. In particular, on the IEA RTS scenario electricity production in the US (where the company is located) grows (cumulatively) by 1.19% between

2017 and 2022, and 4.63% between 2017 and 2030 (both cumulatively). The company's electricity production in 2017 was 42,112,982 MWh, and its 2022 and 2030 production can be estimated at, respectively:  $42,112,982 \times (1 + 1.19\%) = 42,613,445$  MWh, and  $42,112,982 \times (1 + 4.63\%) = 44,062,059$  MWh.

- Dividing the company's estimated 2022 and 2030 emissions by these estimates of electricity production for the same years gives estimated intensities of  $27.4 / 42,613,445 = 0.644$  tCO<sub>2</sub>e / MWh for 2022, and  $21.5 / 44,062,059 = 0.489$  tCO<sub>2</sub>e / MWh for 2030.





## 5. DISCUSSION

This note has described the methodology followed by TPI in carrying out carbon performance assessment of companies, with a particular focus on electricity utilities.

TPI's carbon performance assessment is designed to be easy to understand and use, while robust. There are inevitably many nuances surrounding each company's individual performance, how it relates to the benchmarks and why. Investors may wish to dig deeper to understand these.

### 5.1. General issues

The assessment follows the Sectoral Decarbonization Approach (SDA), which involves comparing companies' emissions intensity with sector-specific benchmark emissions intensities that are consistent with international targets (i.e. limiting global warming to no more than 2°C, and the sum of the Paris Pledges).

TPI uses the modelling of the International Energy Agency (IEA) to calculate the benchmark paths. The IEA modelling has a number of advantages, but it is also subject to limitations, like all other economy-energy modelling. In particular, model projections often turn out to be wrong. The comparison between companies and the benchmark paths might then be inaccurate. However, there is no way to escape the need to make a projection of the future in forward-looking exercises like this. IEA updates its modelling regularly with the aim of improving the accuracy of its projections and TPI plans to update its benchmark paths accordingly.

TPI uses companies' self-reported emissions and activity data to derive emissions intensity paths. Therefore companies' paths are only as accurate as the underlying disclosures.

Estimating the recent, current and especially the future emissions intensity of companies involves a number of assumptions. Therefore it is important to bear in mind that, in some cases, the emissions path drawn for each company is an estimate made by TPI, based on information disclosed by companies, rather than the companies' own estimate or target. In other cases, the information disclosed by companies is sufficient on its own to completely characterise the emissions intensity path.

### 5.2. Issues specific to electricity utilities

In the electricity utilities sector, the measure of carbon performance is absolute greenhouse gas emissions from electricity generation, per unit of electricity produced. While this covers almost all power-sector emissions, is consistent with the IEA benchmarks and can be calculated for most companies, it is a narrow measure of carbon performance for some companies in the sample. This particularly concerns companies that, as well as generating electricity, are significantly engaged in distributing or retailing electricity generated by other companies, or are significantly engaged in other activities such as gas distribution/retail (thus straddling multiple sectors of the

economy). These companies may have, respectively, a larger share of scope 2 emissions in total scope 1 and 2 emissions, and a larger share of scope 1 emissions coming from activities other than electricity generation.

## 6. DISCLAIMER

1. All information contained in this report and on the TPI website is derived from publicly available sources and is for general information use only. Information can change without notice and The Transition Pathway Initiative does not guarantee the accuracy of information in this report or on the TPI website, including information provided by third parties, at any particular time.
2. Neither this report nor the TPI website provides investment advice and nothing in the report or on the site should be construed as being personalised investment advice for your particular circumstances. Neither this report nor the TPI website takes account of individual investment objectives or the financial position or specific needs of individual users. You must not rely on this report or the TPI website to make a financial or investment decision. Before making any financial or investment decisions, we recommend you consult a financial planner to take into account your personal investment objectives, financial situation and individual needs.
3. This report and the TPI website contain information derived from publicly available third party websites. It is the responsibility of these respective third parties to ensure this information is reliable and accurate. The Transition Pathway Initiative does not warrant or represent that the data or other information provided in this report or on the TPI website is accurate, complete or up-to-date, and make no warranties and representations as to the quality or availability of this data or other information.
4. The Transition Pathway Initiative is not obliged to update or keep up-to-date the information that is made available in this report or on its website.
5. If you are a company referenced in this report or on the TPI website and would like further information about the methodology used in our publications, or have any concerns about published information, then please [contact us](#). An overview of the [methodology](#) used is available on our website.
6. Please read the [Terms and Conditions](#) which apply to use of the website.

## 7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] O. Krabbe, G. Linthorst, K. Blok, W. Crijns-Graus, D. P. van Vuuren, N. Hoehne, P. Faria, N. Aden, and A. Carrillo Pineda, "Aligning corporate greenhouse-gas emissions targets with climate goals," *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, vol. 5, pp. 1057–1060, 2015.
- [2] J. Randers, "Greenhouse gas emissions per unit of value added ('GEVA'): a corporate guide to voluntary climate action," *Energy Policy*, vol. 48, pp. 46–55, 2012.
- [3] Science Based Targets, "Sectoral Decarbonization Approach (SDA): a Method for Setting Corporate Emission Reduction Targets in line with Climate Science," 2015.
- [4] International Energy Agency, *Energy Technology Perspectives 2017*. International Energy Agency, 2017.
- [5] United Nations, "Adoption of the Paris Agreement," 2015.
- [6] UNEP, "The Emissions Gap Report 2015: A UNEP Synthesis Report," Nairobi, 2015.
- [7] R. Boyd, J. Cranston Turner, and B. Ward, "Intended nationally determined contributions: what are the implications for greenhouse gas emissions in 2030?," London, 2015.
- [8] UNFCCC, "Paris Agreement," 2015.

## The Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI)

c/o UNPRI PRI Association  
5th Floor, 25 Camperdown St  
London, E1 8DZ, UK

T +44 (0)20 3714 3141

E [tpi@unpri.org](mailto:tpi@unpri.org)

[transitionpathwayinitiative.org](http://transitionpathwayinitiative.org)

[@tp\\_initiative](https://twitter.com/tp_initiative)

