

Responses to Questions raised during Webinar: Potential Impact of Corporate Climate Action in India, 28-Nov-18

Question	Response
How many companies have taken SBT?	26 Indian companies have committed to taking up Science Based Targets
Why is business as usual reduction in GHG more than increased ambition by non-state actors?	Kindly note in the graph it is not reduction, but emissions. BAU there will be reduction of 2.84%, but based on companies target are more ambitious than 2.84% reduction every year. So state action will have lesser emission as compared to BAU scenario
What is the business as usual scenario then	BAU is scenario under which the companies will have GHG reduction in any case (without them declaring the target or any commitments) due to technology advancement, or other initiatives.
The graph you showed in BAU or non-state actor commitment was it million tonnes of co2 reduced or emitted? then it explains my answer	It is actual emissions and difference between non state action and BAU will be impact of non-state action.
In your assessment there is a huge possibility of double accounting (especially the overlap of Scope2 emissions for industry and Scope 1 emissions of Power sector companies)	Thank you for your question. Yes there is possibility of overlap. But if you see the analysis, we see that the Scope 1 in our study accounts for around 95% of emission, while only 2% is from scope 2. But in BAU we have assumed that grid mix impact will be addressed.
And what % age of emissions from these companies under assessment have as part of total industry emissions	If you see India's biennial report (2010) which is latest document by Government source. the Industrial emissions total is around 470 million tonnes so, we can say at least 28% of India's industrial is accounted by these companies. (142 million TCO2)
How you are seeing emissions from mining sector in south east Asia and in India	The emissions from South East Asia from mining operation will be particularly from coal mining (Fugitive emissions). The fugitive emissions (Methane) will happen during mining and also during transportation. For more details please refer IPCC guidelines for accounting emissions from mining (Open Cast, Underground), etc. However in this project it was not in our scope.
I understood that the analysis excluded energy use. Is it possible to include this? Does he have an estimate of how much additional potential could unfold?	Thank you for the question. Please note that the emissions accounted are of Scope 1 and Scope 2 type for the companies considered under the study. So at a company level energy use (fuel consumption for boilers, heating, etc.) is already accounted. But we have excluded energy generation from our analysis as it is accounted under energy sector and not in industry sector as per (IPCC).
Dalmia Cement has committed to carbon negative cement by 2040. How are they planning to achieve this? Use of offsets or just efficiency and biofuels usage?	To meet the scale of this challenge and achieve our ambitious goal of carbon negative by 2040, we are exploring a number of approaches, including: switching to 100% green fuels and green power generation; reducing our clinker factor in incremental stages, and optimising the clinker heat consumption; switching over to solar drying for relevant raw materials; developing a new range of low-carbon cements; carbon capture and utilisation technology; and carbon sequestration.