

Amendments to SDiG publications 2004-05

The Sustainable Development in Government Report 2004-05 (SDiG) was published on the Sustainable Development Commission's (SDC) website on December 16th 2005 (see <http://www.sd-commission.org.uk/watchdog/>). SDC invited participating organisations to inform us of any inaccuracies in the way in which their data had been presented. Each representation was assessed and amendments proposed where appropriate. The table below lists all the representations made by departments and the proposed amendments.

Dept	Representation	SDC assessment	Amendment proposed ¹
Defra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 25 of the SDC Commentary states that no Defra Agencies were included in Defra's questionnaire submission. However all their responses actually relate to Defra & Executive Agencies (EAs). • SDC's Commentary (Annex A) lists three Defra Agencies as being not actively included/omitted from the Defra estate covered by this year's SDiG report. These were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State Veterinary Service (SVS) - came into being on 1/4/05 ○ Marine Fisheries Agency (MFA) - came into being on 1/10/05 ○ Government Decontamination Service (GDS) - came into being on 1/10/05 <p>However, these agencies were not established during the reporting period.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information received from PwC was incorrect. The raw data indicates that all eligible Defra agencies were included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Commentary: Annex A: Defra Agencies – SVS add “not included in 2004-05 as came into being in April 2005”, and for MFA add “came into being in October 2005”. Move all agencies from ‘omitted’ to ‘included’. In the ‘omitted’ section, insert “Buildings where minor occupier, below 50 staff or surplus/vacant. Plus Minister's flat”. • SDC Commentary: P. 22, 4.5.1 – Change from “In all, 12 Departments submitted data for all their Agencies. This means that of all the agencies covered by the Framework, only 54% were included in the analysis. Out of the seven Departments that failed to cover all their agencies, six did not mention at least one of their Agencies in the section on Estate Background in the questionnaire, and therefore did not include reasons for their omission.” To “In all, nine Departments submitted data for all of their Agencies. This means only 64% of eligible Agencies were included in the analysis. Six Departments failed to cover all of their agencies, out of which five did not fully account for these omissions as required.” • PwC Dept. Summaries: P.8, Defra – take out “None of its agencies were included in the questionnaire due to being minor occupiers of their buildings”.

¹ Text in italics refers to changes that were made before December 16th 2005

Amendments to SDiG publications 2004-05

			Add at the end of the next paragraph "Defra has excluded sites where it is a minor occupier from the 2004-05 SDiG process".
DfID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: Request for amendment to Appendix 4 – Notes to Energy Figures for Part E (supplied by BRE) page 144. Department Footnotes 2004-05. Change footnote to: "The DFID base year has been set to 2002/03. This is due to staff in London moving into new premises at the end of 2001 with very different building characteristics and energy consumption profiles. At this time work began to refurbish our office in East Kilbride and we also added an annex to the existing building. The refurbishment in East Kilbride, snagging tasks in our London office and an increase in staffing levels accounts for the increase in energy usage from 2002/2003 through to 2003/2004" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The footnote still stands. BRE confirmed that the information contained in the proposed changes was not included in their original submission and has not materially affected their analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No amendment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: EMS – DfID are quoted on page 6 as having a certified EMS when it was uncertified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed that this statement is incorrect. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: third bullet point on 'Performance Lows' (p.6) change from '...have implemented a certified EMS' to '...have implemented <u>an</u> EMS'
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: Waste target D5 (p.56 + 66) – Figure D5 (p.66) indicates that data were 'not known' for criteria 2 and 3 when it should state that 100% of new contracts were covered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC did not include this information which was submitted by DfID in the questionnaire. Reason unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: Figure D5 (p. 66) change 'not known' for criteria 2 and 3 to 100% for both.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: BRE footnote (p. 144) – extra information was submitted to Defra following an SD policy working group meeting when Defra offered Departments the opportunity to amend footnotes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BRE confirmed that they were not aware of this. Defra are no longer involved in the data collection process and did not pass this information on to BRE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No amendment

Amendments to SDiG publications 2004-05

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: Estates Mgt Strategy, Target G1 (p.95/96) – DfID were not included in the list of Departments that were either reviewing their existing strategies or were in the process of producing strategies. DfID felt this gave the impression that they were in danger of not meeting the deadline when the strategy was in progress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In their data return DfID answered ‘no’ to whether they had drawn up an estates management strategy or reviewed that which is already in place. However, they also stated that their strategy was ‘under development’. The list of departments on page 95 only includes those that had already reviewed their existing strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: On pages 95-96 change the bold text from “Six Departments...have reviewed or are reviewing their existing Estates Management Strategy or are in the process of producing a new Estates Management Strategy in line with Part G of the Framework” To “Six Departments...have reviewed their existing Estates management Strategy in line with Part G of the Framework” On page 96, fourth paragraph, after “DfID reported that it has developed a delivery plan before its strategy” add “which is currently under development”
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: Biodiversity target H3 (p. 112/3) states that DfID was the only Dept not to meet the interim target. DfID claim that this is factually incorrect as they published their Biodiversity Action Plan in October 2005. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The questionnaire submission indicates that DfID had not developed the action plan by the end of the reporting year (March 2005). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: Clarifying amendment on page 108, third bullet, change from “...all but DfID have met the October 2005 target” To “...all but DfID have <u>already</u> met the October 2005 target”.
DWP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDC Commentary (p. 18): Incorrect statement that DWP reduced its carbon emissions by 15%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDC misquote 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDC Commentary: p.18 Change “DWP’s 15% absolute carbon reduction against the 1999-00 baseline was one of the best achieved this year (only equalled by HMT) and exceeded the 2010-11 target of 12.5 %. In addition, 20% of its car fleet is alternatively fuelled (c540).” To “DWP performed well on the Transport Targets; 20% of its car fleet is alternatively fuelled (c540) and it achieved a 30% reduction in CO2 emissions since the baseline year of 2002-03”.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: EMS Target A3 (p.26) – DWP were very close to meeting the target to have 100% of their offices covered by EMS (98%). DWP felt that the analysis was unfair. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target was not met. However, the narrative reflected DWP’s performance. DWP’s progress was put in context on page 26 of the PwC Report and was highlighted as a ‘considerable achievement’ on page 18 of the SDC Commentary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No amendment

Amendments to SDiG publications 2004-05

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: Figure E1 (p.75) indicates that DWP emissions increased by 19%. DWP claim that they decreased by 34% over the reporting year (if renewable energy and CHP are taken into account). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target E1 does not take renewables into account (see note on page 74 of the PwC Report). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No amendment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: Figure H5 (p. 115) indicates data were not known regarding biodiversity clauses in contracts. DWP claim that Land Securities Tillium do incorporate biodiversity into grounds maintenance and other contracts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DWP questionnaire submission states that data was not known. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No amendment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDC Commentary star rating (p. 16) – DWP claim they met 6 out of 11 applicable targets as opposed to 6 out of 14, which would change the score to 55% and the rating from 2 stars to 3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An analysis of targets met indicates that Targets D4 and E5 were still applicable to all Departments, despite no Departments meeting them. However, E6 should have been recorded as 'not applicable' to DWP, which changes the score from 43% to 46% but does not change the star rating or PwC/SDC commentaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDC Commentary and raw data: Target E6 to change from blank to 'not applicable' and the score to change appropriately. Reorder the ranking of Departments in the SDC Commentary (p. 16) to reflect DWP's increased score. DWP to swap with DCMS to achieve a new joint 12th place.
MoD (pre-pub)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMS: Figure A3 (2), p. 28 of PwC Report indicates that MoD failed to meet Target A3 to have 40% of a mixed/mainly non-office estate covered by an EMS by 31st March 2004. According to the MoD questionnaire submission, over 64% of their estate is covered by an EMS, therefore exceeding the target of 40%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The raw data indicates that 217 out of over 4000 UK sites have implemented an EMS or similar recognised standard. This represents just over 5% of their estate (in terms of number of sites). However, MoD's submission also states that 64% of its estate is covered by an EMS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment received from MoD, therefore no amendment will be made.

Amendments to SDiG publications 2004-05

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity: Figure H4, P. 114 of PwC Report indicates that data for MoD was 'not known/incomplete/not provided'. However, it was stated in the questionnaire that 78% England, 74% Scotland, 67% Wales, 66% Northern Ireland of SSSI's were in favourable/unfavourable-recovering status. This amounts to an average of 71%, therefore meeting the target of 68% by 2006. BUT due to different assessment methodologies of statutory conservation bodies in different countries, it was not possible to produce single figures for favourable and unfavourable-recovering status. • <i>It would be incorrect to categorise MoD as a 'Straggler' in this area</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed that MoD met Target H4 • <i>Based on this change to the PwC Report it would be incorrect to categorise MoD as a 'Straggler'</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PwC Report: p.114 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Merge the 'favourable' and 'recovering' boxes and insert 71% with a footnote stating, "Due to different assessment methodologies of statutory conservation bodies in different countries, it was not possible to produce single figures for favourable and unfavourable-recovering condition." ○ Change the grumpy face to a happy face in Figure H4 ○ Delete "MoD were unable to provide information on their 179 SSSIs, and" • Insert at the end of the first paragraph: "MoD has SSSIs across the UK. Due to different assessment methodologies of statutory conservation bodies in different countries, it was not possible to produce single figures for favourable and unfavourable-recovering status. However, they reported that 71% of their 179 SSSIs were in favourable/recovering condition." • SDC Commentary: p.16 change MoD's 'Extra Steps' score from 23% to 27% • SDC Commentary: <i>MoD removed as a 'Straggler' from the traffic light assessment pre-publication.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy: Figure A2, p.22 of PwC Report indicates that MoD did not publish an energy delivery plan. However, MoD's data return stated that plans had been published and the website link was provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoD did not meet Target A2 – the plan was published in May 2005 and the deadline was November 2005. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No amendment

Amendments to SDiG publications 2004-05

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> P. 77 of PwC Report: box entitled 'MoD – change in estate'. MoD question its inclusion because 1) estate rationalisation was not to be factored into the baseline figure, and 2) this was an old example. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BRE confirmed that example was used to illustrate how such changes can have an effect on overall results provided – hence BRE provide a series of notes from Departments to help explain their results. The MoD example was chosen because it remains the most extreme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No amendment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement: Figure F, p. 88 of PwC Report indicates that target F2 was not in progress. But it was stated in the MoD return that an Acquisition Safety Environment Mgt System (ASEMS) / Project Oriented EMS (POEMS) was developed and was in the process of being applied across all project areas. Also, sustainability appraisals were conducted for construction projects where appropriate, and environmental contract clauses were being developed. Figure F, p. 88 of PwC Report indicates that target F3 was not in progress. However, it was stated in the questionnaire that the matter was under review. <i>It would be incorrect to categorise MoD as a 'Straggler'.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target F2 – agreed to change assessment to 'In progress' Target F3 – will not be changed but a footnote will be added <i>With the above changes, MoD could not be categorised as a 'Straggler'</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PwC Report: Figure F, p. 88 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target F2: change 'No' for MoD to 'In progress' PwC Report: Figure F, p. 88 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target F3: add footnote stating, "MoD – this is under review" SDC Commentary: <i>MoD removed as 'Straggler' from traffic light assessment pre-publication</i>
ODPM (pre-pub)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>SDC 60 Second Overview: the SD Minister for ODPM is Baroness Andrews and not Yvette Cooper as originally listed.</i> SDC Commentary: traffic lights (p.7) Part A – ODPM categorised as a straggler for not implementing "an EMS". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed ODPM covered 67% of their main offices with EMS, but did not meet Target A3 to have implemented an EMS on all main offices by March 2004. Publishing error in SDC Commentary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SDC 60 Second Overview: <i>ODPM SD Minister changed from Yvette Cooper to Baroness Andrews pre-publication</i> SDC Commentary: correct wording on page 7 from 'have not implemented an EMS' to 'have not implemented an EMS <u>across all relevant sites</u>'

Amendments to SDiG publications 2004-05

SDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC 60 Second Overview: Question the SD Minister for ECGD • SDC 60 Second Overview: Question the SD Minister for ONS • SDC 60 Second Overview: Question the SD Minister for IR and HMCE • PwC Report: B2 - DCMS reported that 34 out of 40 cars were dual fuel, petrol and LPG without stating exact breakdown. PwC report assumed 34 alternatively fuelled vehicles equalling 85% of fleet. DfID's one dual fuelled vehicle was recorded as half petrol and half LPG. • PwC Report: p. 40, 1st paragraph – change FC figure from 12% to 14%. • Raw data: Target B2 - DCMS – split 34 petrol and LPG evenly between the two categories? • Raw data: Target B2 - FC – change 12% to 14% • Raw data: Target B2 - HMT – change 30% to 33% (appears accurately in the PwC Report, p.40) • Raw data: Target B3 - DCMS – change 1% and 8.8% to <1% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECGD SDiG contact confirmed that Malcolm Wicks is their SD Minister • ONS SDiG contact confirmed that John Healey has ministerial responsibility for ONS • HMT website states that Dawn Primarolo is the Departmental minister for HMRC (came into being in April 2005). However, she is not an SD Minister • Seeking clarification from DCMS about assumptions made in analysis • Transposition error • Seeking clarification from DCMS • Transposition error • Transposition error • Table had not been updated after clarification was received from DCMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC 60 Second Overview: ensure that Malcolm Wicks is SD Minister for ECGD on web document • SDC 60 Second Overview: add John Healey as SD Minister for ONS • SDC 60 Second Overview: add John Healey as SD Minister for HMRC • Seeking clarification from DCMS • PwC Report: p. 40, 1st paragraph – change FC figure from 12% to 14%. • Seeking clarification from DCMS • Raw data: Target B2 - FC – change 12% to 14% • Raw data: Target B2 - HMT – change 30% to 33% (appears accurately in the PwC Report, p.40) • Raw data: Target B3 - DCMS – change 1% and 8.8% to <1%
-----	--	--	---