

Date: Tuesday 15th February

Attendees: James Cadman (Action Sustainability), Imogen Player (Action Sustainability), Chris Matthew (Flannery Plant Hire), John Leader (Ide Systems), Aaron Davis (Keltbray), Alana Paterson (Nationwide Platforms), Alex McFie-Hyland (Sunbelt Rentals), Alistair Donaghey (Wilmott Dixon), Michael Bandy (Kier), Ben Richardson (Sulnox Group), David Mallon (MHM), Amer Essa (National Highways), Toni Holloway (Environment Agency), Ian Watt (Scottish Water), Chris Gill (L Lynch), Wayne Bond (National Highways), Jim Field (Sunbelt Rentals), John Daulton (Pro Rail Services), Joshua Taylor (Selwood), Marty Dobbin (Costain), Daniel Ezzatvar (GGR Group), Paul Taylor (NOCN), Peter Brown (CPA), Alex Pinnington (Barratt Developments), Ross Walker (Costain), Tom Hitchener (Welfare Hire Nationwide), Amelia Woodley (Speedy Services), Ravithas Maruthapiran (Amery), James Hahessy (JLG), Stephen Jarvis (BAM Nuttall), Maria Jarosz (Network Rail), Mark Lawton (Skanska), Lara Young (Costain), Amanda Maloney (Pro Rail Services).

Summary of Actions and Notes from the Plant Category Group Meeting

Plant Category Group – Introductions and outstanding actions		
No	Action/Notes	Owner
1	Welcome and Intros	
2	<p>Updates</p> <p>The School is looking to partner with NOCN to endorse courses that contain a pre-determined criteria of sustainability content. For example, this would include idling and telematics. The School will continue to work with NOCN to deliver on this and will bring in advisors and subject matter experts from the plant group when required.</p> <p>At the last meeting, it was suggested that the School connect with Achilles to discuss the possibility of simplifying the PQQ process by including the plant charter status as a way to demonstrate organisations’ sustainability intentions. The School have since held an initial conversation with Achilles on this. The group now need to determine the level of ambition to do this, so that the concept can be established and revisited if desired.</p> <p>The School is currently developing a short e-learning module looking at low-carbon efficient construction sites. The content will cover more than just plant and equipment and will look at operative and other stakeholder behaviour too. It will be developed in the next couple of months and as such we will be asking for volunteers to review it. It was also suggested that the link between procurement and commercial is signposted in the e-learning, namely by recommending other resources that the School has already created on this.</p>	<p>Group: please let us know if you would like to be involved as a subject matter expert</p> <p>Group: please let us know if you would like to review the low-carbon efficient construction site resource</p>

The Minimum Standards & Charter

The Minimum Standards V2.0 are now live and are publicly available [here](#) - accessible through the [Plant Group Page](#). The Charter is also available [here](#). The process for reporting against the charter was explained again, with the full detailed information available in the Minimum Standards V2.0.

The SCSS is currently reviewing all evidence information passed over by those organisations who wish to be signatories.

In order to become a signatory, the process is:

1. Decide you would like to be a Signatory to the Charter
2. Gather evidence against the 4 sections of the Charter for your organisation for the preceding 12 months: i) Engine standards ii) Engagement iii) Training and education 4) Innovation. You need something in each of the 4 sections to reach at least Bronze; you can't be a signatory to the Charter is Bronze is not achieved
3. Present evidence to the School for assessment. The School will ask for any additional information or clarifications.
4. Status awarded and communicated to the Signatory. External communications are discussed with Signatory.
5. On the anniversary of becoming a Signatory, Partner will provide updated information for preceding 12 months

As all partners collect information in different ways, evidence can be in any form – e.g., spreadsheets, PowerPoints, news publications, engagements, trial days.

The School will be sharing information on social media when it has been confirmed with the Signatory.

Badges shown – the group voted that they would like a choice of badges to choose from. The badges are to be used externally, for example you can use it on social media, within communications, with clients etc.

Activities for the Group

Presence at events

The group previously requested that the School has presence at events. Over the last few months, the School has attended a variety of events, with the next event on the agenda being the CEA TechWorx (30th – 31st March 2022).

White paper roadmap

As a future activity, the group will also develop a white paper roadmap. The aim will be to provide the reader with a roadmap for achieve reduced carbon and air quality emissions in line with the CLC's commitment to reduce diesel consumption by 78% by 2035, in comparison with 1990, as well as the wider 2050 net zero target.

The proposed high-level structure was discussed and agreed as:

1. Introduction
2. Right machine for the job, run efficiently – people and plant
3. Power Sources and necessary infrastructure, including logistics
4. Semi and full autonomy
5. Provision and use of digital data
6. Retrofit and end of life

The group's immediate priority is the interactive carbon calculator, and once that is complete the group will then focus on the roadmap.

Interactive carbon calculator

James and Imogen presented the first draft of an interactive carbon calculator for discussion. The aim is to provide the user with a calculator to understand the whole life approach when procuring and hiring equipment, including carbon and cost.

The group broke out into smaller groups to discuss the questions:

1. How do we need to get the balance between usability and meaningful outputs?
2. Which Plant do we use as the Base Cases – and can you provide data?
3. Is anything missing?

The groups then fed back and discussed their thoughts. The full outputs are in the appendix. The key discussion points included:

- It should be a generic framework that industry works towards;
- Manufacturers should take responsibility for providing the information, so that we know that the data is always up to date and reliable. The School will need members from the plant group to provide key contacts;
- Plant group should provide key top eco products, so that there is not too much information in the calculator that it becomes overwhelming to the user;
- The query was raised around dealing with commercial and sensitive information. The calculator will be built upon publicly available information, with the user entering any commercial information (such as cost) in themselves;
- Industry needs to move to whole-life assessments, but as an industry we're not ready at the moment so it would be more effective to start with the basics (carbon, cost – i.e. what's currently in the calculator). Embodied carbon will not be included within the calculator at this stage;
- A suggestion was raised to speak to SmartEquip about hosting the calculator;
- It was agreed that the calculator shouldn't be using hybrid fuels at this stage;
- A strong driver for the use of the calculator is the removal of the red diesel tax in April. Realistically in the industry, fuel savings will therefore

	<p>be the priority at the moment, and then carbon emissions will come secondary;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need the narrative around the calculator too – e.g., the importance of behaviour changes and training; and • Important to consider variable rates and workload within the calculator. Suggestion to include rates and workload at medium rates and workload (e.g., 60%). <p>The School will take away these discussion ideas and continue to develop these activities. Members of the group may be asked to provide additional input in between meetings, and the group will be involved with the proof of concept.</p>	
6	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No AOB was raised. 	
7	<p>Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday 26th February, 2-4pm, Action Sustainability Office, 2nd Floor, Albert House, 256-260 Old Street, London, EC1V 9DD, London. 	

Appendix

Interactive calculator group discussion outputs for all four groups

GROUP 1

How do we need to get the balance between usability and meaningful outputs?

possible approach could be logon as either - Owner or End user.

different level options - level 1 standard / level 2 detailed

Assume medium workload (e.g. 60%). Consider application (e.g. 30% capacity) in more detailed calculator approach?

rate of work query: high, medium and low - 1) how to actually know that info 2) how to capture that in the calculator. Advise: use medium workload

Different level options with the basic calculator.

User may only need to use basic calculator. Owner may need to use more detailed calculator

Which Plant do we use as the Base Cases – and can you provide data?

8T, 13T and 20T Excavators

Difficult one - i guess main market brands which reflect the standards

to include basics: age of plant, engine rating, size of machine (to ensure fair comparison), engine type

Measure top 100 items per supplier by revenue

Standards brand plants.

investigate hosted link to SmartEquip for source data

Is anything missing?

Consider additives, aftermarket treatments or retro-fits which may have a financial cost but a carbon saving

could it have a link to - examples / best practice / case studies

Generator loading calcs, kVa Vs requirements

Is there a need to explore different OEM information? i.e. to show what background thinking has gone into it

user behaviour - e.g. eco-training? How to understand scale of adoption.

GROUP 2

How do we need to get the balance between usability and meaningful outputs?

What is the terminology that could roll off the tongue. EG MPG for carbon.

Ease of finding information

How will frameworks and discount rate be addressed? A £40ph piece of plant may be £47ph to someone else.

Do not start with Hybrid measure consistent fuels. Pick up the worst case first.

Which Plant do we use as the Base Cases – and can you provide data?

What is the most deployed in every category. EG still saw model

Some plant comes inbuilt with telemetry data and that data could be scooped up to build a picture. EG heavy plant. ISO 15143-3

utilisation rates in each category

Is anything missing?

How long will this information be accurate? Is there a way to make this future proof?

GROUP 3

How do we need to get the balance between usability and meaningful outputs?

Verify / Validate data entered into the calculator

Possibly implement a level of self-certification with Supervision - helps to encourage confidence in the tool

General information - power rating, types of equipment and plant

focus on the purpose of the calculator - carbon savings

Which Plant do we use as the Base Cases – and can you provide data?

Flannerys, Lynch, Speedy, etc - most popular hires and used these - Top 20 list

Is anything missing?

Options for add ons

How does it get updated with new products, etc.?

Does it compliment other systems and carbon calculators?

GROUP 4

How do we need to get the balance between usability and meaningful outputs?

Provide a generic template to allow suppliers to input specific data for customers. Risk market average could be too generic

Manufacturers provide carbon emission data for products into database to ensure QA

Provide the ability to push out a carbon figure using generic factors but also the ability to add bespoke data to calculate more accurate footprint

Which Plant do we use as the Base Cases – and can you provide data?

Top 50/100 products across industry

Is anything missing?

How to maintain and monitor data in the system

Commercial sensitivity of cost information inputted - how is this info secured

Balance between modelling generic reductions vs reality of actual savings based on contract specifics. Modelling expectations vs reality.

Next phase - WLC (embodied carbon)