



House of Commons
Environmental Audit
Committee

**Greening Government
2003**

Thirteenth Report of Session 2002–03

*Report, together with evidence and formal
minutes*

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 5 November 2003*

HC 961

Published on Thursday 13 November 2003
by authority of the House of Commons
London: The Stationery Office Limited
£12.00

The Environmental Audit Committee

The Environmental Audit Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to consider to what extent the policies and programmes of government departments and non-departmental public bodies contribute to environmental protection and sustainable development; to audit their performance against such targets as may be set for them by Her Majesty's Ministers; and to report thereon to the House.

Current membership

Mr Peter Ainsworth MP (*Conservative, East Surrey*) (Chairman)
Mr Gregory Barker MP (*Conservative, Bexhill and Battle*)
Mr Harold Best MP (*Labour, Leeds North West*)
Mr Colin Challen MP (*Labour, Morley and Rothwell*)
Mr David Chaytor MP (*Labour, Bury North*)
Mrs Helen Clark MP (*Labour, Peterborough*)
Sue Doughty MP (*Liberal Democrat, Guildford*)
Mr Paul Flynn MP (*Labour, Newport West*)
Mr Mark Francois MP (*Conservative, Rayleigh*)
Mr John Horam MP (*Conservative, Orpington*)
Mr Jon Owen Jones MP (*Labour, Cardiff Central*)
Mr Elliot Morley MP (*Labour, Scunthorpe*)
Mr Malcolm Savidge MP (*Labour, Aberdeen North*)
Mr Simon Thomas MP (*Plaid Cymru, Ceredigion*)
Joan Walley MP (*Labour, Stoke-on-Trent North*)
Mr David Wright MP (*Labour, Telford*)

Powers

The constitution and powers are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally Standing Order No. 152A. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at: www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/environmental_audit_committee.cfm.

A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this volume.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are: Mike Hennessy (Clerk); Emma Downing (Committee Specialist); Eric Lewis (Committee Specialist); Anna O'Rourke (Committee Assistant); and Caroline McElwee (Secretary).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to The Clerk, Environmental Audit Committee, Committee Office, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general inquiries is: 020 7219 6150; the Committee's e-mail address is: eacom@parliament.uk

References

In the footnotes of this Report, references to oral evidence are indicated by 'Q' followed by the question number. References to written evidence are indicated by page number as in 'Ev12'.

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	3
Conclusions and recommendations	5
Background	10
Sustainable Development in Government: First Annual Report	11
Coverage of the report	12
Staff resources	13
Greening policy	15
Objectives and targets	15
Policy Appraisal	19
Awareness raising	22
Greening operations	22
Monitoring and reporting	24
Departmental reporting	24
The First Annual Report	26
The Framework	26
A better quality of life?	28
Audit and accountability	29
Spending Review 2002	29
The role of ENV	29
Audit	30
ANNEX	31
EAC analysis of departmental responses to the Sustainable Development in Government Questionnaire 2002	31
Formal minutes	62
Witnesses	63
List of written evidence	63
Past reports from the Environmental Audit Committee since 1997	64

Foreword

1. There are immense challenges ahead if the UK is to move towards a sustainable future in which we balance the need for economic and social progress against environmental limits and constraints. Central Government departments can play a key role here by placing the environment at the heart of policy making and helping to achieve such a shift. They are also major employers and estate managers, and to that extent should manage operations to reduce environmental impacts. “Greening Government” is therefore of enormous importance. It should constitute an over-arching framework within which all policy making and operational management are carried out.

2. For some years, the Government has itself produced an annual report on Greening Government. The latest in this series was renamed *Sustainable Development in Government: First Annual Report* partly to reflect the inclusion of social issues. It was largely based on detailed information which departments provided in response to an annual questionnaire, and these responses have been made available on the Government’s Sustainable Development web-site. Our main purpose in producing our own report is to review the progress being made by departments in the light of these detailed questionnaire responses, and we see this as an inherent part of our audit role. In view of the difficulty in evaluating these responses, we have also sought to increase transparency and accountability by including as an Annex not only the full questionnaire itself but our own commentary on the responses. We have drawn heavily on this analysis for our main report.

3. The key messages from our work are these:

- Most departments devote little in the way of staff resources to the Sustainable Development agenda, while the grade of the most senior staff working on these issues is relatively low. This reflects a lack of commitment by senior management and a failure to exploit the potential within many departments to mainstream sustainable development more radically.
- Objectives and targets agreed within Public Service Agreements act as key drivers for departments. Yet, with the exception of DEFRA, these agreements contain hardly any environmentally related targets—fuelling the impression that sustainable development is a relatively low priority. As we do not have access to the Sustainable Development Reports which departments submitted with their bids for Spending Review 2002, we cannot assess what impact this new requirement has had.

- Many departments are still unable to provide lists of new policies and the results of screening them for environmental impacts—some three years after the Government set this as an objective. Poor progress here partly reflects the lack of effective environmental management systems covering policy aspects. But it is also symptomatic of a lack of commitment and awareness at higher levels within departments.
- Many departments are still unable to report adequately on their operational performance—for example, in reducing waste or water consumption. This highlights the importance of developing environmental management systems. More generally, departments could do much more to report on their environmental impacts by publishing their own environmental or sustainable development reports.

4. The Government is due to publish the next annual report on Sustainable Development in Government shortly. We appreciate that it will not be able to take account in that report of our findings and comments. However, we trust that our work will be of use to ENV(G) by highlighting areas where more progress could be made and further targets set. In particular, we would strongly urge ENV(G) to take account of the many specific comments contained in the Annex to this report. We would also be happy to comment on the draft questionnaire which will form the basis for the Government's 2004 report.

5. More generally, the Government is now embarking on review of its Sustainable Development Strategy. This should examine the impact which the strategy has had on departments and assess to what extent it has achieved the mainstreaming of environmental objectives. There is indeed an impressive range of policy documents and guidance in place which relate to sustainable development. But our fear is that much of the work undertaken on this agenda occupies a limbo existence which has little impact on departments' real priorities. It is a fear which is compounded by the very concept of sustainable development which can all too easily be used to obfuscate as well as empower.

6. Our work on this report has also involved considerable analysis of data. We have taken this opportunity to highlight once again our need for audit support. We would welcome the assistance of the NAO in analysing future reports and enabling us to carry out our audit function in a timely and effective manner.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. The First Annual Report is based on a questionnaire sent out to departments. In response to an earlier recommendation we made, DEFRA have made available both the questionnaire and the complete departmental responses. We welcome the provision of this detailed information. It marks a significant step forward in terms of transparency and accountability, and has enabled us to carry out a significantly more extensive analysis than we could otherwise have done. (Paragraph 12)
2. We recommend that all departments should provide a printed copy of their responses to both the SDU and EAC. These should be signed by the senior officer who is responsible for sustainable development issues in order to ensure accountability at a sufficiently high level within each department. (Paragraph 14)

Staff Resources

3. The level of staff resources which most departments specifically devote to the sustainable development agenda is very small, reflecting the low priority accorded to it. The grade of staff working on these issues is also relatively low. We would particularly single out DCMS, DfES, DH, IR and ONS as departments within which we would have expected far greater commitment in terms of staff resources in view of the specific challenges which sustainable development poses for those departments. (Paragraph 19)
4. Seven departments have not set up an SDU or division, and these include DCMS, DfES, HMT, HO and IR. This is surprising and disappointing in view of the potentially important roles these departments should have in relation to sustainable development. (Paragraph 20)
5. In the case of both DH and DWP, the senior officer responsible for sustainable development is not located in the departments' central offices alongside the dedicated sustainable development staff. Such an arrangement hardly seems to us conducive to effective operational management on a day to day basis, nor indeed to the need to exert leverage on central policy divisions within the department. (Paragraph 22)
6. It is unclear what level of commitment and representation exists at a Management Board level as there is no information provided on this topic. Our analysis of staff resources does not inspire confidence that senior management is committed to implementing sustainable development. ENV(G) should probe this area in greater depth by including more searching questions in the 2004 questionnaire. (Paragraph 25)

Greening Policy

7. While we recognise that target setting is not something to be pursued for its own sake, the almost universal failure by departments to set new environmental objectives and targets cannot but reflect insufficient commitment, resources, and priorities in this area. (Paragraph 27)
8. We are astonished at the terse and unhelpful response provided by the Inland Revenue when asked about the compilation of its Sustainable Development Report. Given the lack of dedicated staff resources within the department, it only serves to reinforce the impression that it is little interested in the sustainable development agenda. (Paragraph 29)
9. We find it deplorable that both DCMS and ONS should place so little weight on sustainable development and environmental objectives, as both departments in their respective spheres face significant challenges in this area. This contrasts with the far more positive approach adopted by some other departments, such as DTLR and DfES. (Paragraph 32)
10. Environmental sustainability should constitute an over-arching framework within which policy making is carried out. But departments have made little attempt to incorporate environmental objectives within their high level priorities, and this is reflected in the dearth of environmental targets in the most recent Public Service Agreements. This betrays a lack of commitment to this agenda which complements the lack of resources devoted to it. (Paragraph 34)
11. If departments are indeed carrying out integrated appraisals, it follows that they must be screening new policies for environmental impacts as part of that process. For the Government's commitment to sustainable development to be taken seriously, ENV(G) must restate and rigorously implement the requirement that departments should maintain and make publicly available a central list of new policies, together with the results of screening them for environmental impacts. (Paragraph 42)
12. There is a variety of overlapping requirements and guidance relating to appraisal. The Government must rationalise these and develop Integrated Policy Appraisal to become a comprehensive tool. In doing so it must set out how departments should resolve the apparent conflict between monetary and non-monetary approaches to appraising environmental impacts. (Paragraph 45)
13. It is impossible to ascertain whether most departments have formal awareness raising strategies in place. But it is clear that few departments—with the exception of the FCO—have any structured approach to monitoring the effectiveness of their strategies (Paragraph 46)

Greening Operations

14. Our overall findings on the progress departments are making towards greening operations demonstrate continuing weaknesses in data availability and huge variations in performance. (Paragraph 50)
15. Our conclusions and recommendations on some key aspects of operational performance are set out below. (Paragraph 51)
 - (a) With the exception of those departments which utilise the Whitehall District Heating Scheme, progress on CHP schemes remains poor. Renewable energy, however, presents a more varied picture with some departments well ahead of the 5% March 2003 target. (Paragraph 51.a)
 - (b) In terms of overall performance across the entire estate, the Government appears to have met in both 2000-01 and 2001-02 the new target set of a 1% per annum reduction in carbon emissions, with overall reductions of 3% and 7% respectively. However, some individual departments have conspicuously failed to meet the target, with carbon emissions increasing in one or both years against the baseline. (Paragraph 51.b)
 - (c) We have some concerns on the Government's plan to replace the interim 1% per annum carbon reduction target with targets based on benchmarking individual offices. We would urge the Government to ensure that all departments face targets which are at least as challenging as the current one. (Paragraph 51.c)
 - (d) Given the incentives which the Government has provided to encourage LPG since 1997, it is disappointing that only some 547 vehicles out of a total fleet of over 18,600 are LPG equipped. The performance of DWP is particularly creditable, while that of HO, IR and C&E is far less so. (Paragraph 51.d)
 - (e) Only 5 out of 19 departments have clearly met the March 2002 water consumption target, while only 6 met the main waste recovery target set in 1999 by Green Ministers. We regard this as an abysmal performance. (Paragraph 51.e)
 - (f) There are huge variations in departmental performance. The proportion of renewable energy purchased, for example, ranges from 0% to over 75%, while the proportion of paper purchased meeting the 80% post-consumer waste specification ranged from 0% to 100%. The Government should investigate the reasons for these variations as a matter of urgency and make publicly available the findings. (Paragraph 51.f)

Monitoring and reporting

16. It is disappointing that so few departments produce their own sustainable development or environmental reports. Departments must also not use the production of the Sustainable Development in Government report as an excuse for not reporting themselves (Paragraph 53)
17. We recommend that the Government places on departments a formal requirement to report separately on their environmental impacts and to include in these reports

coverage of not only the department itself and its agencies, but its associate bodies also. (Paragraph 55)

18. While we would in no way wish to downplay the importance of departmental initiatives, we would not wish to see the Sustainable Development in Government Annual Report become simply a presentational vehicle for highlighting good practice. In our view, it should constitute a rigorous analysis to enable ENV(G) to monitor progress effectively, adjusting priorities and setting targets as required. (Paragraph 58)
19. We recommend that DEFRA, in drafting the 2004 questionnaire, ensures that the questions it contains are sufficiently specific to elicit reliable and comparable data from departments. Departments should also be required to indicate clearly where they consider questions are not relevant. (Paragraph 59)
20. We welcome the Framework for Sustainable Development on the Government Estate as tangible evidence of progress towards a more systematic and comprehensive approach to cross-departmental target setting and monitoring. (Paragraph 60)
21. We are concerned about the slow rate of progress in implementing the Framework. Five of its nine constituent parts have still not been published—three months after the date by which it should have been complete. (Paragraph 62)
22. We recommend that, within 4 months of the announcement of each suite of targets, all departments should submit their delivery strategies to the Environmental Audit Committee or provide an explanation as to why they have not done so. The Sustainable Development in Government web-site should also include full provision for monitoring progress against targets. (Paragraph 63)
23. We urge the Government to develop a more systematic approach to environmental target setting in a policy context as a complement to the systematic approach it is now adopting for departmental operations and as a way of providing greater accountability to Parliament through the EAC for environmentally related policy targets. (Paragraph 64)
24. While the quality of environmental reporting by departments remains inadequate, it seems over-ambitious to try to encompass social reporting as well. Indeed, the Sustainable Development in Government report is very far from being comprehensive in this respect. (Paragraph 66)
25. We strongly feel that, the term ‘sustainable development’ should be defined in such a way as to include only those policies, objectives and targets in which environmental aspects form a major component. (Paragraph 67)
26. We recommend that the Government should include, as part of its review of the Sustainable Development Strategy, an evaluation of the impact of the strategy on departments and the extent to which it has been successful in mainstreaming environmental objectives. (Paragraph 68)

Audit and accountability

27. The lack of accountability which now exists in relation to departmental Sustainable Development Reports submitted as part of Spending Review 2002 is unacceptable. We will continue to demand greater transparency in this process and for departments to be required to publish—perhaps on a two-yearly basis as in Canada—their own sustainable development reports (Paragraph 70)
28. We find it surprising that the Government did not feel that ENV could oversee the sustainable energy strategy. If it has no role here, we question what effective role it can play in any sphere of Government activity, and indeed how its role can be clearly differentiated from that of ENV(G). (Paragraph 73)
29. Our work has involved considerable analysis which the NAO would be ideally placed to carry out. We would therefore welcome the NAO's assistance in analysing future reports and associated evidence, in the form of a management report and accompanying analyses submitted to this Committee on an annual basis. The publication of the next Sustainable Development in Government annual report, due very shortly, offers an opportunity to begin the process. (Paragraph 75)
30. Our annual review may well highlight specific areas which require further investigation. For this reason, we would also welcome the assistance of the NAO in carrying out detailed studies on specific aspects of departmental performance. Such assistance would materially help us carry out our audit function in a timely and effective manner. (Paragraph 76)

Background

1. The Environmental Audit Committee (EAC) coined the term “greening government” in one of the first reports it undertook following its creation in 1997.¹ The phrase refers not only to incorporating environmental objectives in operational aspects of departmental performance (eg by reducing energy and water consumption and recycling waste); but also—and in some senses more importantly—to greening the fundamental objectives of departments by ensuring that full weight is given to environmental impacts in policy appraisal and development.

2. The Greening Government initiative therefore represents an attempt to mainstream the environment across the entire work of Government, and one cannot overestimate its importance. It was reflected in the various initiatives which the Government embarked on in 1997—including the development of a new Sustainable Development Strategy, the creation of the Green Ministers Committee, and the creation of the Sustainable Development Unit within Government and EAC itself in Parliament to promote sustainable development and monitor progress. Above all it was reflected in the often quoted statement of the Prime Minister that the environment should be placed at the heart of Government.²

3. Greening Government has comprised a core aspect of the work of this Committee over the last six years. We produced several major reports on this topic in 1998, 1999, and 2000.³ It was as a result of EAC recommendations that the Green Ministers began to publish an annual report from 1999, and indeed EAC itself initiated the annual questionnaire to departments which formed the basis for these reports.⁴

4. There have been a number of developments in the Greening Government initiative in the last few years:

- the change in status of the Green Ministers Committee (which has now become a formal sub-committee of the Cabinet Committee ENV);
- the change in the title of the Government’s annual report on Greening Government (from the ‘Annual Report of the Green Ministers Committee’ to the ‘Sustainable Development in Government Annual Report’), reflecting not only the changed status of the Green Ministers Committee but also the broader focus of the report itself;

1 Second report from the EAC, *The Greening Government Initiative*, HC 517, 1997-98.

2 Address to the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Sustainable Development, June 1997. See also Labour Party election manifesto 1997.

3 Second Report from the EAC, *The Greening Government Initiative*, HC517, 1997-98; Sixth Report from the EAC, *Greening Government 1999*, HC 426, 1998-99; Fifth Report from the EAC, *The Greening Government Initiative: First Annual Report from the Green Ministers Committee*, HC 341, 1999-2000.

4 The 1998 and 1999 Greening Government reports from the EAC were based on questionnaire surveys it conducted of all ministerial departments and some major agencies.

- the development in the last two years of a two-fold approach to reporting—with an overview published report which picks out the main messages the Government wishes to emphasis, and a second ‘volume’ which is available only on the web and provides details of departmental responses to the Green Ministers’ questionnaire;
- the Government’s ‘Framework for Sustainable Development on the Government Estate’ initiative (and the accompanying web-site) which aims to provide a more comprehensive and transparent way of setting cross-departmental targets for Greening Government and monitoring progress.

5. Since its last report in July 2000, EAC has not reported specifically on the Greening Government initiative—though its other reports address many greening issues either within a functional or departmental context. But, in view of the changes which have occurred, we considered it worthwhile reviewing the latest report, now entitled the ‘Sustainable Development in Government: First Annual Report’. We have also taken the opportunity to comment on some more general issues in this context.

6. Our inquiry was based entirely on our own analysis of the Sustainable Development in Government report. We have had no access to departmental files to carry out an in-depth audit—an issue to which we will return later. Over the period in which we were conducting this analysis, we took evidence from the Home Office on the specific issue of sustainable timber. The written evidence they submitted is attached as an Appendix to this report.⁵

Sustainable Development in Government: First Annual Report

7. The ‘Sustainable Development in Government: First Annual Report’ was published in late November 2002. It supersedes the previous series of Green Ministers’ annual reports which were published in 1999, 2000, and 2001.⁶ The Development in Government report is based on a questionnaire which was agreed with departments earlier in 2002 and formally sent out in May 2002. Only a summary report (Part 1) was published. Part 2, containing the departmental questionnaire responses was published only on a DEFRA web-site in the form of a database one could query by individual department or subject area.

8. In examining this report, we set out to:

- establish whether the available information in Part 2 is complete, in terms of both the questions which were asked of departments and the results which the latter provided;
- assess whether the questionnaire itself is adequate;

5 Ev 24. See also HC 961-i, 2002-03, for oral evidence from the Home Office.

6 These reports can be found on the Sustainable Development in Government website at: <http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/sdig/reports/index.htm>

- identify how accurately the published summary report reflects the results of the departmental responses;
- highlight our concerns, in terms of either the performance of individual departments or more general themes which emerged from the analysis.

9. The Annex to this report contains the original questionnaire which the Sustainable Development Unit (SDU) within DEFRA sent out to all departments, together with our own detailed commentary on departmental responses to this questionnaire. We have not commented in detail on every question. In particular, we have not analysed the section on social reporting—though we will follow with interest future developments in this area.

10. In the following sections, we highlight from our analysis of departmental responses various issues which, in our view, receive insufficient coverage in the published Part 1 of the report. In particular, we note that the latter included little quantified information of any kind on policy aspects of Greening Government—an area we consider particularly important. By contrast, operational issues are covered far better, and we have therefore devoted less attention to them.

Coverage of the report

11. The questionnaire to departments which underpins Part 1 of the Sustainable Development in Government report has been reproduced accurately and completely by DEFRA on its website. Part 2 of the report also appears to include all departmental responses.

12. The First Annual Report is based on a questionnaire sent out to departments. In response to an earlier recommendation we made, DEFRA have made available both the questionnaire and the complete departmental responses. We welcome the provision of this detailed information. It marks a significant step forward in terms of transparency and accountability, and has enabled us to carry out a significantly more extensive analysis than we could otherwise have done.

13. However, there were occasional gaps or errors in the data. For example, the MoD failed to answer questions 1.4 and 1.5 requesting information on MoD staff resources specifically dedicated to sustainable development. Where there were gaps, it was not possible for us to be certain whether departments had failed to respond to certain questions, not responded because they considered the question irrelevant, simply provided a nil response, or provided a response which has not been made available on the web-site. There were also a few cases where clerical mistakes had been made in inputting data onto the website.

14. We note that departments were asked to complete the questionnaire on-line through secure access to a common server, and that the SDU subsequently drafted Part 1 of the report on the basis of these responses. Where there are gaps or errors in departmental information, we cannot at present be certain as to the cause. **We recommend that all departments should provide a printed copy of their responses to both the SDU and EAC. These should be signed by the senior officer who is responsible for sustainable**

development issues in order to ensure accountability at a sufficiently high level within each department.

Staff resources

15. Part 1 of the departmental questionnaire contains various questions on the size and nature of the department, and the resources specifically devoted to the sustainable development agenda. Our analysis in the table below highlights wide differences between departments, both in absolute and percentage terms.

Dept	Number of staff			Highest grade of SD staff	
	Total Staff (including agencies)	Central SD staff (WTE)	Percentage of total staff	Grade of most senior SD staff	Percentage of his / her time
CO	6,044	2.0	0.03	HEO/SEO	100
C&E	22,286	2.0	0.01	SEO	100
DCMS	702	0.9	0.13	G7	10
DEFRA	14,252	12.9	0.09	G5	20
DfES	4,282	2.8	0.07	G6	2
DfID	1,385	32.2	2.32	SCS	100
DH	4,098	2.4	0.06	G6	5
DTLR	19,500	8.6	0.04	SCS	20
DTI	8,762	[no data]		G6	
DWP	129,909	10.2	0.01	G7	20
ECGD	420	2.0	0.48	G7	100
FCO	3,560	48.2	1.35	SCS	303
HMT	2,796	2.0	0.07	G6	5
HO	65,040	7.2	0.01	G7	33
IR	68,467	1.1	0.00	SCS	5
LCD	12,559	0.9	0.01	SEO	50
LOD	8,317	1.4	0.02	SCS	10
MoD					
ONS	3,800	0.3	0.01	5	1
Total	376,179	137	0.04		

Notes

1. WTE refers to Whole Time Equivalent.
2. Traditional Civil Service grades range from G1 (the highest) to G7, SEO, HEO, EO and below.
3. The term SCS has been used by some departments to refer to a member of the Senior Civil Service (ie Grade 5 and up). In such cases, the department has not disclosed the specific grade of the staff member.
4. The highest grade of SD staff refers to the highest graded individual(s) who is included in the Central SD staff (WTE) figure. In the case of the FCO, as there are 3 Grade 5s, each of whom devotes 100% of their time to this agenda, and a fourth Grade 5, who devotes only 3% of his/her time to it, the overall percentage figure is 303%. This is unusual, and for most departments there would only be one highest-graded member of staff who devotes only a part of his/her time to this agenda.

16. The amount of staff resources which departments specifically devote to sustainable development ranges widely from 0.0% to 2.3%. As one might expect, DFID leads with over 31 staff, 30 of whom are within its Environmental Policy Department. The FCO has also invested impressive resources in this area with the creation of its own Environment Policy Department, with a staff of 27. A further 21 staff in other parts of the FCO deal with a range of related issues.

17. At the other end of the scale, it is disappointing that the Inland Revenue, with some 68,000 staff, do not even register in percentage terms with only 1.1 WTE staff. Similarly, we are amazed that the ONS appears to have only 0.3 WTE staff devoted to this agenda, despite its involvement in developing the environmental accounts and resource productivity indicators.

18. We also note that the grading of staff involved is relatively low. In the case of seven departments, the highest grade of staff disclosed in this table is grade 7 or lower. In addition, the percentage of time of the most senior grade of staff is limited. For example, the DCMS grade 7 devotes only 10% of his/her time to the sustainable development agenda. In the case of DfES, the percentages for the three highest graded staff (6, 7, and SEO) are 2%, 5% and 10% respectively. Such figures hardly suggest commitment on the part of these departments.

19. The level of staff resources which most departments specifically devote to the sustainable development agenda is very small, reflecting the low priority accorded to it. The grade of staff working on these issues is also relatively low. We would particularly single out DCMS, DfES, DH, IR and ONS as departments within which we would have expected far greater commitment in terms of staff resources in view of the specific challenges which sustainable development poses for those departments.

20. Nine departments state that their sustainable development staff form a separate Sustainable Development Unit or division. (Curiously, DfID and FCO respond negatively to the SDU question even though they have set up dedicated environmental protection divisions.) **Seven departments have not set up an SDU or division, and these include DCMS, DfES, HMT, HO and IR. This is surprising and disappointing in view of the potentially important roles these departments should have in relation to sustainable development.**

21. Departments were also asked to give details of the senior official responsible for sustainable development issues. We examined the relationship between these staff and the dedicated Sustainable Development teams, and—while the information is extremely limited—it does suggest some anomalies:

- in the case of the ONS, the senior official is a grade 6, whereas table 1-4 suggests that a grade 5 is equally as involved. (Note that both these members of staff only devote 1% of their time to this agenda).
- in the case of the Department of Health, while the sustainable development staff are centrally located, the senior official responsible is a Regional Director of Public Health and is located in Bristol in the Government Office for the South West.
- In the case of DWP, there appears to be a mismatch between the dedicated Sustainable Development staff who are centrally located, and the senior official who is located in Leeds. It would also be interesting to know how these staff relate to the 'Sustainable Development Steering Group' which is referred to in the department's response to a later question.

22. In the case of both DH and DWP, the senior officer responsible for sustainable development is not located in the departments' central offices alongside the dedicated

sustainable development staff. Such an arrangement hardly seems to us conducive to effective operational management on a day to day basis, nor indeed to the need to exert leverage on central policy divisions within the department.

23. More generally, many of the senior officials listed by departments do not appear to be included in the listing of staff resources, suggesting that either the latter is inaccurate or that the time devoted by these senior officials is too small to be measured. There is also no information on whether the senior official responsible for sustainable development is a member of each department's management board. In some cases this is unlikely given the gradings of the senior officials. Interestingly, this information was specifically sought in previous work by the Green Ministers Committee; and the EAC has itself frequently emphasised the need for departmental commitment at a high level.

24. Some departments may argue that sustainable development has been mainstreamed across other policy divisions, and that it is therefore unfair to take the figures they have provided on sustainable development staffing as representative of the priority accorded to this agenda. However, if this really were the case, initiatives such as the creation of EPD within FCO would be pointless and the question itself redundant. It would suggest that either the FCO have got it very wrong, or else that there is a role for a dedicated core of staff devoted to this agenda. We strongly endorse the latter viewpoint and are suspicious of claims that sustainable development has permeated the value structures and outlook of mainstream policy staff. Indeed, evidence elsewhere in this report on the extent of staff training and awareness demonstrates very little commitment to bringing about such a change.

25. It is unclear what level of commitment and representation exists at a Management Board level as there is no information provided on this topic. Our analysis of staff resources does not inspire confidence that senior management is committed to implementing sustainable development. ENV(G) should probe this area in greater depth by including more searching questions in the 2004 questionnaire.

Greening policy

Objectives and targets

26. The incorporation of environmental aims within departments' objectives and targets represents a key measure of the extent to which the environment is being mainstreamed. The Sustainable Development in Government report explores this area on the basis of a series of questions included in part 2 of the questionnaire. However, a number of these questions were open-ended and subject to a variety of interpretation by departments. There is relatively little 'hard' data, therefore, on which to base firm conclusions.⁷

27. Hardly any departments had set any new objectives or targets in the last year. We could only identify five which were not vacuously general, and of these only three were in any

⁷ See paragraphs 11 to 32 of the Annex to this report for our detailed commentary.

way ‘smart’. Many of the departments, in answering the question, referred to initiatives or processes which would more appropriately have been included in responses to other questions. We welcome by contrast the candour of the Home Office in admitting that it had set no new objectives. **While we recognise that target setting is not something to be pursued for its own sake, the almost universal failure by departments to set new environmental objectives and targets cannot but reflect insufficient commitment, resources, and priorities in this area.**

28. Departments were also asked specifically about Spending Review 2002—in particular, the processes which they had used to produce their Sustainable Development Reports (SDRs). Departmental responses to this question highlight a variety of approaches, and—given the lack of access to the SDRs themselves—it is difficult to assess their effectiveness. Some departments appear to have adopted a systematic and thorough approach. The DTLR, for example, subjected all individual bids to integrated appraisals which would highlight environmental and other impacts, and aggregated the results. Other departments, including the MoD and DEFRA, only applied integrated appraisals to a subset of its bids. We also noted that DEFRA appeared to be the only department to match its top priority spending proposals against the department’s objectives and draft PSA targets, and the sustainable development indicators.

29. By contrast, other departments give little or no real information, referring only to liaison and coordination, or to Cabinet Office and Treasury guidance. The response of the Inland Revenue is particularly terse: “*SD is included in the Department’s report.*” We find it astonishing that the department made so little attempt to provide an informative answer to the question. This is a matter of particular concern in view of the potential for exploring innovative approaches within the tax system in order to shift the burden of taxation from ‘goods’ to ‘bads’. **We are astonished at the terse and unhelpful response provided by the Inland Revenue when asked about the compilation of its Sustainable Development Report. Given the lack of dedicated staff resources within the department, it only serves to reinforce the impression that it is little interested in the sustainable development agenda.**

30. Little meaningful information was provided by departments on the extent to which sustainable development had been incorporated within PSA targets. Some departments interpreted sustainable development to encompass all their activities. The CO, DfES and DH responses, for example, focus on social and economic policies relating to human health and education. By contrast other departments such as the MoD and the DTI tried to limit their responses to more environmentally related issues.

31. In view of the wide-ranging nature of responses and their departmental specific focus, we have not attempted to analyse to them. However, we noted with interest some of the responses from individual departments on the extent to which sustainable development was included in their policy objectives:

- The DCMS stated that it was mainly concerned with indicators on poverty and social exclusion, and education; and that it had no specific sustainable development targets. Yet DCMS has a potentially key role in environmental education and awareness raising so as to bring about fundamental changes in values and behaviour.

- The DfES acknowledged the need to review how its aims and objectives related to sustainable development and to make these connexions much more specific.
- The ONS admitted that sustainable development was not covered in its Service Delivery Agreement, and that it has no plans for further developments to incorporate environmental concerns. As we have pointed out elsewhere in this report, the development of effective resource productivity indicators is a major task. Moreover, we would have thought that the ONS would be centrally involved in the review of the Sustainable Development Strategy and its indicators.

32. We find it deplorable that both DCMS and ONS should place so little weight on sustainable development and environmental objectives, as both departments in their respective spheres face significant challenges in this area. This contrasts with the far more positive approach adopted by some other departments, such as DTLR and DfES.

33. In its last Pre-Budget Report, EAC carried out its own analysis of the extent to which environmental objectives and targets had been incorporated within Public Service Agreements as part of Spending Review 2002.⁸ In view of the lack of 'hard' information on this score in the Sustainable Development in Government report, we reproduce the results in the following table and have taken the opportunity to make a couple of minor corrections. Excluding those targets which relate to DEFRA, we can only identify four which are primarily environmental out of some 160 targets in total. This is a dismal reflection on the extent to which the environment is being mainstreamed.

Spending Review 2002: analysis of objectives and targets

Department	Total number of objectives	Total number of Targets	Environmental objectives	Environmental targets
CO	5	6	0	0
C&E	2	4	0	0
DCMS	3	4	0	0
DEFRA	6	10	2 (note 1)	6 (note 2)
DFES	6	10	0	0
DFID	5	5	0 (note 3)	0 (note 3)
DfT	1	7	1 (note 4)	1 (note 4)
DH	2	12	0	0
DTI	5	12	0	1 (note 5)
DWP	5	10	0	0
FCO	6	12	0 (note 6)	1 (note 7)
HMT	10	10	1 (note 8)	0
HO	6	10	0	0
IR	1	5	0	0
LCD	3	7	0	0
LOD (CPS)	1	3	0	0
MoD	3	7	0	0
NIO	6	4	0	0
ODPM	3	7	1 (note 9)	1 (note 10)
Sure Start etc	0	1	0	0
Criminal Justice System	3	5	0	0
Action against illegal drugs	4	4	0	0
Local Government	0	15	0	0
TOTAL	86	170	5	10
TOTAL (non-DEFRA)	80	160	3	4 (note 11)

Notes:

1. Objectives I and V. These are overtly environmental. Not included here are objectives III and IV (which include the word 'sustainable' but primarily emphasise other objectives such as competitive markets⁰; and objective VI (which is primarily health related, though it has a strong environmental component).
2. Targets 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Targets 2, 3, 6, 8 are overtly environmental. Target 7 can be included because of the direct impact on energy demand. Target 5 refers to EU support for environmental conservation and rural development, though it also emphasises a customer focused and competitive farming system. Not included here are target 1 (which relates to promoting sustainable development as a whole), target 4 (productivity related), target 9 (animal health and public welfare) and target 10 (VFM).
3. The objectives and targets of DFID are focused on poverty reduction and health improvements. While these are important components of progress towards sustainable development, they are not per se environmental.
4. DfT has only 1 objective—"reliable, safe and secure transport which respects the environment". Target 6 is a joint target with DEFRA to improve air quality.
5. Target 4. This refers to improving the environment and the sustainable use of natural resources, including through the use of energy saving technologies, and specifically to the joint DTI/DEFRA carbon reduction and greenhouse gas targets. Note, however, that the target begins by citing a simple economic competitiveness target ("to ensure the UK ranks in the top three most competitive energy markets in the EU and G7...").
6. Objective III has not been included. It is to "increased prosperity and a better quality of life in the UK and worldwide, through effective economic and political governance."
7. Target 7. This refers to making globalisation work for sustainable development and also to promoting environmental governance, but is rather wider in scope as it encompasses political and economic objectives.
8. Objective X. The objective is to protect and improve the environment by using instruments that will deliver efficient and sustainable outcomes through evidence-based policies.
9. Objective III. The objective is to help raise the quality of life but the supporting targets are primarily social.
10. Target 5. The target refers to protecting the countryside and to the sustainability of existing towns and cities, though the main emphasis is on achieving a better balance between housing availability and the demand for housing.
11. Of these 4 targets, 2 are shared targets with DEFRA (notes 4&5 above), while the extent to which the remaining two can be classed as environmental is arguable (see notes 7 and 10).

34. **Environmental sustainability should constitute an over-arching framework within which policy making is carried out. But departments have made little attempt to incorporate environmental objectives within their high level priorities, and this is reflected in the dearth of environmental targets in the most recent Public Service Agreements. This betrays a lack of commitment to this agenda which complements the lack of resources devoted to it.**

Policy Appraisal

35. Policy appraisal is a crucially important area on which EAC has frequently commented before. Two different issues are at stake here—the effectiveness of procedures to ensure that environmental screening and appraisals are carried out at all; and the manner in which environmental appraisals are evaluated. We are also concerned that appraisals should not be seen as a retrospective activity—to be carried out only when the preferred policy option is identified, but that they should be fundamentally incorporated in the initial process of drawing up policy options.

36. It is difficult to obtain objective evidence in this area and the questionnaire responses reflect this, with fairly vacuous answers to some of the questions which allow little scope for meaningful analysis.⁹ However, the 2000 Green Ministers Report introduced a requirement on all departments to screen all new policies or policy developments for their environmental effects, and carry out an environmental appraisal if necessary. Departments were also required to maintain a list of such screenings, though it was up to them whether to make these public.¹⁰ EAC regarded this as a significant achievement.

37. In the questionnaire, departments were specifically asked whether they were maintaining a record of screenings as required. In the following table, we have summarized the results, including the results from some other related questions.

9 See paragraphs 25 to 29 of the Annex to this report.

10 Second Annual Report of the Green Ministers Committee 2000, *Greening Government*, DEFRA, Nov 2000, page 29.

Dept	Do you maintain a central list of screening outcomes?	Number of environmental appraisals published	Does your Environmental Management System cover policy?
CO	No	None	No (central dept)
C&E	Yes [<i>confidential</i>]	None	Assume no
DCMS	[<i>no response</i>]	None	No
DEFRA	Yes	Unclear (move to IPA)	No
DfES	[<i>no response</i>]	None	No, but plan to include.
DfID	Assume no	None	No, but are other procedures.
DH	Unclear	None	No (central dept). Yes (PASA)
DTI	[<i>no response</i>]	Unclear	No
DTLR	No	None (part of wider appraisal)	No
DWP	Unclear	None	No
ECGD	Unclear	Yes, for some projects	Unclear
FCO	Unclear	None	No
HMT	No	None	No
HO	No	None	No
IR	Yes	Yes, as part of Budget	Yes
LCD	Yes	None	No
LOD	Not relevant	Not relevant	n/a
MoD	No (is planned)	None	Yes [<i>non-certified system</i>]
ONS	Not relevant	Not relevant	Unclear

38. Most departments are clearly flouting the requirement set by Green Ministers to maintain a list of screenings. Some have failed to answer the question (eg DCMS) or appear to have misunderstood it (eg DTLR). Others have provided rather anecdotal responses which makes it difficult to be certain even where the likelihood is that they are not (eg DH). The lack of any formal systems to maintain such a central record is reflected in the failure of most departmental EMS to encompass policy issues. As a result, with the exception of DETR and some project-specific appraisals carried out by ECGD, virtually no environmental appraisals were carried out during the previous year.

39. In considering this issue, the 2001 Green Ministers Report stated that “*it is somewhat disappointing that, despite promotion of environmental appraisal, inclusion in the Policy Makers Checklist and screening systems put in place by departments, relatively few departments beyond DETR have produced published environmental appraisals.*” It also stated that: “*It is possible that departments are making progress, and building environmental considerations into other appraisals, but the extent to which this is happening is not clear.*” It went on to make the following commitment: “*The reasons for the apparent lack of progress on environmental appraisal will be investigated as part of a review of progress with development of integrated appraisal systems in the next year.*”¹¹

40. Yet Part 1 of the Sustainable Development in Government report states only that “*there has been a recognition that environmental impacts need to be considered alongside economic and social impacts in the wider context of sustainable development. This year many departments—most notably DTLR and DEFRA—have reported that environmental appraisals are increasingly an intrinsic part of the wider decision making process and therefore keeping a log of appraisals is not a meaningful indicator of how well the department*

11 Third Annual Report 2001, *Greening Government*, DEFRA, November 2001, paragraphs 3.7 to 3.9.

considers environmental issues."¹² This is the only consideration given to this topic in the latest report.

41. The Government therefore appears to be arguing that the move towards integrated appraisal renders the screening requirement redundant, a view which was echoed in the questionnaire responses from some departments. We entirely disagree. EAC supports the move to integrated appraisals, but is concerned over the failure of departments to take environmental screening and appraisal seriously.

42. If departments are indeed carrying out integrated appraisals, it follows that they must be screening new policies for environmental impacts as part of that process. For the Government's commitment to sustainable development to be taken seriously, ENV(G) must restate and rigorously implement the requirement that departments should maintain and make publicly available a central list of new policies, together with the results of screening them for environmental impacts.

43. It is also worth noting that there are various overlapping requirements on departments in terms of different types of appraisal they are obliged to carry out. These include:

- individual methodologies developed within departments (eg DfT's New Approach to Appraisal)
- Regulatory Impact Assessments
- the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive
- Green Ministers' screening requirements
- Treasury policy guidance (eg 'Tax and the Environment')
- the Treasury 'Green Book'
- the Cabinet Office 'Policy makers checklist'.

44. DEFRA and some other departments have been developing a so-called "Integrated Appraisal Tool". But this tool is at present little more than a reminder to departmental staff that they must consider and, where relevant, carry out various other forms of appraisal. There are also some significant conceptual difficulties. In particular, EAC has recently highlighted a major tension between the increasing emphasis the Treasury is placing on evaluating environmental impacts in financial terms, and the non-monetary approaches used, for example, by the DfT in its NATA methodology.¹³

45. There is a variety of overlapping requirements and guidance relating to appraisal. The Government must rationalise these and develop Integrated Policy Appraisal to become a comprehensive tool. In doing so it must set out how departments should resolve the apparent conflict between monetary and non-monetary approaches to appraising environmental impacts.

¹² First Annual Report 2002, *Sustainable Development in Government*, DEFRA, November 2002, paragraph 2.1.

¹³ Fourth Report from the EAC, *Pre-Budget Report 2002*, HC 167, 2002-03.

Awareness raising

46. Departments are required to have strategies in place for raising awareness of sustainable development and environmental issues among their staff. Unfortunately, departmental questionnaire responses were not as informative as they might have been, partly due to ambiguities in some of the questions.¹⁴ There was not, for example, an explicit question asking departments whether or not they had awareness raising strategies in place. In a few cases, the answer to this question was clear. DCMS and DWP had no strategy—the latter excusable on the grounds that they were a new department—while the MoD and the FCO both explicitly confirmed that they did. Other departments cited a variety of promotional activities as if these, in themselves, amounted to a strategy. As a result, **it is impossible to ascertain whether most departments have formal awareness raising strategies in place. But it is clear that few departments—with the exception of the FCO—have any structured approach to monitoring the effectiveness of their strategies.**

47. We were also disappointed that only between 15 and 20 staff across all central departments attended external training courses on Sustainable Development in Government. One would not necessarily expect large numbers as such courses are primarily aimed at managers. However, the paucity of attendees is extraordinary when one considers that there are over 370,000 staff in civil departments and agencies alone. Similarly, there was little ‘hard’ evidence of the emphasis placed on sustainable development in internal training courses, and how widespread (in terms of numbers of staff and frequency) the coverage of these courses was. We would expect such issues to be covered in formal awareness raising strategies and subsequent monitoring reports.

Greening operations

48. To the extent that departments are major employers and estate manager, there is considerable scope for them to manage their activities to reduce environmental impacts. Many of these activities have traditionally been associated with estate management functions such as reducing water, waste and energy consumption. They also cover aspects of procurement, such as the purchase of renewable electricity, energy saving products, and recycled paper.

49. In the Annex to this report, we have commented at length on departmental responses to questions on greening operations, and would refer readers to those analyses for more detailed information.¹⁵ We have, however, included some key findings in the table below, though as will be immediately apparent a considerable number of departments were unable to provide comprehensive information in a number of areas.

¹⁴ See paragraphs 67 to 73 of the Annex to this report.

¹⁵ See paragraphs 30 to 66 of the Annex to this report.

Dept	Staff % covered by certified EMS	Electricity % from renewables sources	Met energy target in both years?	Met water target? (<11m ³)	Met 40% waste recovery target?	Proportion of paper purchased that met the 80% specification
CO	7	75%	✗			
C&E	4	26%	✓			
DCMS			✗		✓	100%
DEFRA	16		✗	✓	✓	25%
DfES	1	10%	✓	✗	✗	16%
DfID	n/a	10%	✗			2%
DH	8	100% ⁽¹⁾	✓	✓	✓	74%
DTI	44	33%	✓	✗	✓	38%
DTLR	45	0%	✓	✓	✓	95%
DWP	70	27%		✓	✓	1%
ECGD	0	5%				
FCO	47	0%	✗		✗	43%
HMT		0%	✓		✗	4%
HO	1		✗			3%
IR	13	0%	✗			2%
LCD	0		✓	✗	✗	0%
LOD		100% ⁽²⁾	✗			100%
MoD	1		✓			2%
ONS	75	10%	✓	✓	✗	100%

⁽¹⁾ covers 5 out of 6 London buildings. Overall figure not available.

⁽²⁾ covers 2 out of 4 London buildings, including the main HQ.

50. Our overall findings on the progress departments are making towards greening operations demonstrate continuing weaknesses in data availability and huge variations in performance. These partly reflect the absence of structured systems for monitoring and managing activities, and as long ago as 1999 the EAC recommended targets for implementing Environmental Management Systems (EMS). We note the statement in Part 1 of the Sustainable Development in Government report: “*The Government has agreed that to deliver challenging environmental targets for the Estate within this Parliament, a significant increase in the uptake of Environmental Management Systems is needed.*”¹⁶ And we welcome the cross-departmental targets for the take up of EMSs the Government has now set as part of the Framework initiative.¹⁷

51. Our conclusions and recommendations on some key aspects of operational performance are set out below.

- a) **With the exception of those departments which utilise the Whitehall District Heating Scheme, progress on CHP schemes remains poor. Renewable energy, however, presents a more varied picture with some departments well ahead of the 5% March 2003 target.**

16 First Annual Report, *Sustainable Development in Government*, DEFRA, November 2002, paragraph 3.17

17 Ibid.

- b) In terms of overall performance across the entire estate, the Government appears to have met in both 2000-01 and 2001-02 the new target set of a 1% per annum reduction in carbon emissions, with overall reductions of 3% and 7% respectively. However, some individual departments have conspicuously failed to meet the target, with carbon emissions increasing in one or both years against the baseline.
- c) We have some concerns on the Government's plan to replace the interim 1% per annum carbon reduction target with targets based on benchmarking individual offices. We would urge the Government to ensure that all departments face targets which are at least as challenging as the current one.
- d) Given the incentives which the Government has provided to encourage LPG since 1997, it is disappointing that only some 547 vehicles out of a total fleet of over 18,600 are LPG equipped. The performance of DWP is particularly creditable, while that of HO, IR and C&E is far less so.
- e) Only 5 out of 19 departments have clearly met the March 2002 water consumption target, while only 6 met the main waste recovery target set in 1999 by Green Ministers. We regard this as an abysmal performance.
- f) There are huge variations in departmental performance. The proportion of renewable energy purchased, for example, ranges from 0% to over 75%, while the proportion of paper purchased meeting the 80% post-consumer waste specification ranged from 0% to 100%. The Government should investigate the reasons for these variations as a matter of urgency and make publicly available the findings.

Monitoring and reporting

Departmental reporting

52. Departments were also asked how they reported on sustainable development and we have summarised their responses in the table below.¹⁸ We have also included additional information on whether departments have produced their own separate Sustainable Development or environmental reports, based on their responses and other available information.

¹⁸ See paragraphs xyz to xyz of the Annex to this report for our detailed commentary.

Dept	Method of reporting	Separate SD / Environmental report?
CO	Green Ministers Annual Report Departmental Report	No
C&E	Departmental Report	Yes
DCMS	Departmental Report	No
DEFRA	Annual operations report (planned) Annual review of SD strategy	Operations report planned
DfES	Departmental Report	No
DfID	Departmental Report	No
DH	Departmental Report	No
DTI	Departmental Report	No
DTLR	n/a	n/a
DWP	Annual Sustainable Development report	Yes
ECGD	Departmental Report	No
FCO	SR 2002 SDR	No
HMT	Departmental Report Chancellor's Sustainability Report	Yes (Chancellor's Sustainability Report, coordinated by C&E)
HO	Departmental Report Prison Service Annual Environmental report	No (department) Yes (Prison Service)
IR	Departmental Report	[See HMT above]
LCD	Departmental Report	No
LOD	Departmental Report	No
MoD	Departmental Report Annual Environment and Safety Report	SD report planned
ONS	None	No

53. Most departments point to their annual reports as being the vehicle for reporting on sustainable development. However, we have previously noted that the coverage of this topic in those reports is generally very poor. Indeed, the Government has argued that this is understandable in view of the competing pressures on departments to include other material in their reports. If that is the case, we would expect departments to take their responsibilities for environmental reporting more seriously and publish free-standing reports. **It is disappointing that so few departments produce their own sustainable development or environmental reports. Departments must also not use the production of the Sustainable Development in Government report as an excuse for not reporting themselves**

54. We are also concerned that the Sustainable Development in Government Report has so little to say on the subject of associate bodies – the wide range of NDPBs (both executive and advisory) and other organisations sponsored by departments. The 2000 Green Ministers Report included a requirement for departments to complete action plans for incorporating sustainable development into the work of their associate bodies. While the Sustainable Development in Government questionnaire did include some questions on this topic, the responses do not enable us to assess with any degree of objectivity progress in this area.

55. For all these reasons, we were interested in the commitment contained in Part 1 of the report, namely that *'departments will also develop plans for reporting their main sustainable development impacts at departmental level.'*¹⁹ It is not entirely clear what is envisaged here,

19 First Annual Report, *Sustainable Development in Government*, DEFRA, November 2002, paragraph 3.19.

but we would favour any move towards making departments more accountable for their performance in this area. **We recommend that the Government places on departments a formal requirement to report separately on their environmental impacts and to include in these reports coverage of not only the department itself and its agencies, but its associate bodies also.**

The First Annual Report

56. With regard to part 1 of the Sustainable Development in Government report—the only part of the report to be published—we did not find any obvious misrepresentation or errors in the way that departmental responses had been used. To this extent it appears to us accurate.

57. However, we were concerned that insufficient use was made of the information departments provided on resources available and policy making. In this respect the published report fails to reflect some of the ‘harder’ data in sections 1 and 2 of the questionnaire. We have ourselves attempted to rectify this weakness in our own analysis above. Moreover, some parts of the a report were somewhat anecdotal in nature because of the manner in which it highlighted a wide variety of initiatives by individual departments, without subjecting these to any form of critical analysis.

58. While we would in no way wish to downplay the importance of departmental initiatives, we would not wish to see the Sustainable Development in Government Annual Report become simply a presentational vehicle for highlighting good practice. In our view, it should constitute a rigorous analysis to enable ENV(G) to monitor progress effectively, adjusting priorities and setting targets as required.

59. In order to fulfil this function, the questionnaire which forms the basis of the Sustainable Development in Government report needs to be tightened up. In our analysis, we noted that many of the questions were too open-ended or potentially ambiguous to provide reliable and comparable data. It was also striking that, even where this was not the case, some departments pointedly failed to answer the questions posed. **We recommend that DEFRA, in drafting the 2004 questionnaire, ensures that the questions it contains are sufficiently specific to elicit reliable and comparable data from departments. Departments should also be required to indicate clearly where they consider questions are not relevant.**

The Framework

60. The Framework for Sustainable Development on the Government Estate was launched in July 2002. It supersedes the previous Model Framework for Greening Operations (dating from the 1990s) which provided guidance to departments. The new Framework, by contrast, represents a more comprehensive approach to setting targets across all departments and monitoring them in a systematic way. **We welcome the Framework for Sustainable Development on the Government Estate as tangible evidence of progress towards a more systematic and comprehensive approach to cross-departmental target setting and monitoring.**

61. The Framework actually consists of 9 parts:

- Part A: an overarching statement
- Part B: travel
- Part C: water
- Part D: waste
- Part E: energy
- Part F: procurement
- Part G: estates management
- Part H: biodiversity
- Part I: social impacts

62. Each of these parts was intended to include an introduction, detailed information on all the cross-departmental targets set, and a further section setting out progress in achieving targets. On its release, the first three parts were launched while the other six were to be published over the next year (ie by July 2003). However, as at the time of agreeing this report (November 2003), only Part H on biodiversity had in fact been published on the web site.²⁰ **We are concerned about the slow rate of progress in implementing the Framework. Five of its nine constituent parts have still not been published—three months after the date by which it should have been complete.**

63. The Framework includes a commitment that all Departments should, within 4 months of announcing each suite of targets, make public a strategy showing how they plan to deliver those targets. In part 1 of the First Annual Report, the Government suggest that *'this approach responds, for the Estate, to the EAC's request that departments should provide explanatory memoranda when targets are published.'*²¹ However, these departmental strategies are not included or referenced in the Sustainable Development in Government web-site for the three specific sections of the Framework which have been completed, and indeed those sections of the Framework contain no provision for monitoring progress. We are therefore unable to assess whether departments have fulfilled the requirement to publish strategies showing how they plan to deliver targets. **We recommend that, within 4 months of the announcement of each suite of targets, all departments should submit their delivery strategies to the Environmental Audit Committee or provide an explanation as to why they have not done so. The Sustainable Development in Government web-site should also include full provision for monitoring progress against targets.**

64. Moreover, the main focus of the Framework remains on departmental operations: it will not encompass main policy-related objectives or targets—such as the UK waste reduction or renewable energy targets. It therefore represents only a partial response to the

20 The website is at: <http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/sdig/improving/index.htm> .

21 First Annual Report, *Sustainable Development in Government*, DEFRA, November 2002, paragraph 3.18.

EAC's request for the provision of explanatory memoranda when new targets are set. In our view, it should be relatively easy to incorporate, within the development of integrated appraisal systems, a formal requirement for an explanatory memorandum where departments are amending environmentally-related targets or setting new ones. **We urge the Government to develop a more systematic approach to environmental target setting in a policy context as a complement to the systematic approach it is now adopting for departmental operations and as a way of providing greater accountability to Parliament through the EAC for environmentally related policy targets.**

A better quality of life?

65. One of the reasons for the change in name of the Sustainable Development in Government report is that the Government wanted to broaden its title to reflect its wider focus and the move towards corporate social reporting. Accordingly, the questionnaire and the report itself included sections on social issues in relation to departmental operations—such as part-time working, home-working, and childcare. This reflects the broader focus to sustainable development which the Government has developed since 1997 in its Sustainable Development Strategy and indeed in the Government's Sustainable Development web-site.

66. We have not assessed the social aspects of this report, but will monitor with interest how the Government intends to take forward this agenda. We note that there is no generally agreed consensus about the framework within which to carry out sustainable development reporting. Indeed, the Sustainable Development in Government Report refers to corporate social reporting (CSR) but stops short of a commitment to triple bottom line reporting—within which economic, social and environmental impacts are clearly set against each other.²² We have serious concerns about the Government's attempt to broaden the scope of what was the annual report of the Green Ministers Committee. **While the quality of environmental reporting by departments remains inadequate, it seems over-ambitious to try to encompass social reporting as well. Indeed, the Sustainable Development in Government report is very far from being comprehensive in this respect.**

67. Moreover, sustainable development can mean all things to all men, and we have pointed out elsewhere that the Government's own view puts less weight on inter-generational aspects and inclines more to an economic interpretation.²³ We are critical of the tendency for departments to cite any policy initiative or objective—including economic or social initiatives—as counting towards sustainable development. Indeed, it is interesting to note that the Government's Sustainable Development web-site does not, in fact, attempt to encompass the entire breadth of this agenda, and presents a rather more eclectic view of what is relevant. In view of such considerations, **we strongly feel that the term 'sustainable development' should be defined in such a way as to include only those policies, objectives and targets in which environmental aspects form a major component.** Indeed, we note that the DEFRA sponsored Sustainable Development

²² op. cit, Chapter 5.

²³ EAC, Fourth report of 2002-03, *Pre-Budget Report 2002*, HC 167, para 59.

Research Network (SDRN) has adopted just such a definition as a means of defining eligible research.²⁴

68. In launching its Sustainable Development Strategy in 1999, the Government made a commitment to review it within five years, and DEFRA has recently carried out some work in this area. The performance of Government departments under the Strategy should comprise an important component of such a review. **We recommend that the Government should include, as part of its review of the Sustainable Development Strategy, an evaluation of the impact of the strategy on departments and the extent to which it has been successful in mainstreaming environmental objectives.**

Audit and accountability

Spending Review 2002

69. As part of Spending Review 2002, departments were required to complete Sustainable Development Reports (SDRs) and submit them with their bids. In our report on last year's Pre-Budget, we warmly welcomed this new requirement. We strongly recommended that these reports should be made available to us so that we could examine in detail to what extent departments had taken into account sustainable development objectives in compiling their bids.²⁵

70. In its response to our report, the Government made clear that these reports would continue to be kept secret as they are regarded as a confidential part of the bidding process. **The lack of accountability which now exists in relation to departmental Sustainable Development Reports submitted as part of Spending Review 2002 is unacceptable. We will continue to demand greater transparency in this process and for departments to be required to publish—perhaps on a two-yearly basis as in Canada—their own sustainable development reports.**

The role of ENV

71. Our earlier reports on Greening Government emphasised the need for leadership. In this context, two Cabinet Committees—ENV and ENV(G)—should play crucial roles. The membership of ENV consists of the Secretaries of State of all Ministerial Departments, and it is responsible for environmental policy at the highest level. ENV(G) was created in 2001. It is essentially the previous Green Ministers Committee (which had no formal status), but reconstituted as a formal sub-committee of ENV.

72. There are some benefits in the transformation of the Green Ministers Committee into a formal Cabinet sub-Committee. It carries more clout, in particular with regard to target setting where it is now able to set targets for all departments. By contrast the status of targets set by the former Green Ministers Committee was always somewhat unclear. The

²⁴ See <http://www.sd-research.org.uk/sdrguide/introduction.html>.

²⁵ EAC, Fourth Report of 2002-03, *Pre-Budget Report 2002*, HC 167.

downside of the transition is that the workings of ENV(G) are now covered by the Cabinet code of secrecy, and therefore nothing can be disclosed—not even the number of times it has met.

73. We also note that ENV and ENV(G) are not the only Cabinet Committees concerned with environmental matters. The Energy White Paper stated the Government's intention to set up an ad hoc Ministerial group to oversee its sustainable energy strategy.²⁶ **We find it surprising that the Government did not feel that ENV could oversee the sustainable energy strategy. If it has no role here, we question what effective role it can play in any sphere of Government activity, and indeed how its role can be clearly differentiated from that of ENV(G).**

Audit

74. The scope of the work we have undertaken in this report is considerable. Even so there is much more we could do. This raises not only issues about the resources available to us to fulfil our remit adequately, but also the question of access to departmental records. In principle, the Government has accepted our need for audit support. Indeed, the NAO has carried out work specifically in response to recommendations we have made—notably on energy statistics where audit access was of crucial importance in establishing the reliability of departmental data.

75. **Our work has involved considerable analysis which the NAO would be ideally placed to carry out. We would therefore welcome the NAO's assistance in analysing future reports and associated evidence, in the form of a management report and accompanying analyses submitted to this Committee on an annual basis. The publication of the next Sustainable Development in Government annual report, due very shortly, offers an opportunity to begin the process.**

76. **Our annual review may well highlight specific areas which require further investigation. For this reason, we would also welcome the assistance of the NAO in carrying out detailed studies on specific aspects of departmental performance. Such assistance would materially help us carry out our audit function in a timely and effective manner.**

26 The Energy White Paper, *Our energy future – creating a low carbon economy*, February 2002, Cm 5761.

ANNEX

EAC analysis of departmental responses to the Sustainable Development in Government Questionnaire 2002

1. The sections and questions of the DEFRA questionnaire are reproduced in *Italics* below. The commentary is non-italicised. Note also that the tables represent in almost all cases an analysis or summary of the information presented in DEFRA's web-site database, and therefore involve in some cases a degree of subjective judgement and interpretation. Where there appear to be errors in the data provided, figures have been reproduced without correction. Similarly, where departments have failed to provide any data, cells have been left blank or specifically highlighted. For ease of reference, the same order of departments has been retained in the tables as that given by the questionnaire responses database on the Sustainable Development in Government website.

Section 1: BACKGROUND

1.1 Please provide a description of your estate. This should be the parts of the estate and Executive Agencies on which you are reporting. Part (a) is the central department; Part (b) is all Executive Agencies included in the report; Part (c) is the total for the estate i.e. a + b.

2. The responses to this question are summarised by functional area in the tables below: Also included for reference is data from the 2001 Green Ministers Report.

Dept	Land owned (hectares)			GMR 2001 Total
	Central dept	Agencies	Total	
CO				n/k
C&E	n/a		n/a	n/k
DCMS	n/a	2,000	2,000	n/k
DTLR	n/a	n/a	196	n/k
DfES	5		5	n/k
DfID	4	n/a	4	n/k
DH	0	n/a	0	n/k
DWP				n/k
DTI	106		106	n/k
ECGD	0	n/a	0	n/k
FCO	40		40	40
HMT	0	30	30	2.5
HO		n/a	n/k	n/k
IR	0	0	0	35
LCD	0	0	0	n/k
LOD	0		0	n/k
DEFRA	28,250	188	28,437	32,182
MoD	240,000			240,000
ONS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/k
Total (civil depts)	268,406	2,217	30,818	
Total (all depts)			270,623	

Dept	Number of staff		Total	GMR 2001
	Central dept	Agencies		
CO	2,611	3,433	6,044	2,680
C&E	22,286		22,286	23,174
DCMS	475	227	702	419
DTLR	4,875	14,548	19,500	20,388
DfES	4,282	0	4,282	40,001
DfID	1,385	n/a	1,385	2,259
DH	3,240	858	4,098	4,472
DWP	11,139	118,283	129,909	96,889
DTI	4,427	4,335	8,762	9,800
ECGD	420	n/a	420	420
FCO	3,500	60	3,560	3,365
HMT	1,114	1,682	2,796	1,680
HO	14,400	50,640	65,040	57,150
IR	64,455	4,012	68,467	68,614
LCD	1,100	11,459	12,559	11,000
LOD	8,317		8,317	6,720
DEFRA	8,141	6,111	14,252	12,570
MoD	293,974			304,037
ONS	n/a	3,800	3,800	3,500
Total	450,141	219,448	376,179	669,138
Total (+MoD)			670,153	

Dept	Collective size (m2)		Total	GMR 2001
	Central dept	Agencies		
CO	70,875	74,746	145,621	86,143
C&E	358,616		358,616	388,024
DCMS	13,269	470	13,739	12,248
DTLR	62,732	2,802,757	2,865,488	404,021
DfES	102,913	0	102,913	802,809
DfID	25,843	n/a	25,843	23,647
DH	80,559	15,863	96,422	83,820
DWP			2,600,000	1,559,089
DTI	90,002	106,011	196,013	266,632
ECGD	11,590	n/a	11,590	11,590
FCO	125,000	2,326	127,326	94,406
HMT	33,823	53,416	87,239	45,868
HO	364,991	3,610,378	3,975,369	4,373,955
IR	1,123,592	90,322	1,213,914	1,582,551
LCD	34,594	823,470	858,064	830,000
LOD	146,327		146,327	130,000
DEFRA	195,945	136,814	332,759	480,540
MoD	62,813,483			62,813,483
ONS	n/a	80,359	80,359	80,359
Total	65,654,154	7,796,932	13,237,602	

Dept	Number of buildings occupied			GMR 2001
	Central dept	Agencies	Total	
CO	24	16	40	23
C&E	300		300	283
DCMS	4	8	12	6
DTLR	14	1161	1175	1208
DfES	8	0	8	1208
DfID	3	n/a	3	4
DH	6	8	14	11
DWP			1900	826
DTI	11	47	58	160
ECGD	3	n/a	3	3
FCO	5	1	55	37
HMT	2	36	38	5
HO	183	200	383	350
IR	537	85	642	622
LCD	13	427	440	421
LOD	101		101	100
DEFRA	165	73	203	238
MoD	> 45000			45000
ONS	n/a	7	7	7
Total	1379	2069	5382	

3. The data does not include the wide range of NDPBs and associate bodies for which departments are responsible. In the case of DH and DfES, for example, it does not include Health Trusts or the schools sector. Moreover, while it should include all Executive Agencies, responses to subsequent questions did not always seem to reflect this. There were a number of anomalies in relation to figures for the previous year, though in some cases this may be caused by departmental reorganisations. There were also some errors in the figures (eg in the case of IR and DEFRA where there were discrepancies in the total number of buildings the department managed).

1.2. Does your estate include any listed buildings, monuments or sites? If so please provide details. Please specify for each building whether it is owned, managed or leased by the department and whether it is open to the public.

4. This data is of some interest, but it is difficult to assess the extent to which departments could do more to increase access to listed buildings which they occupy. In the absence of more detailed information, no analysis has been attempted of this table.

1.3. What is the role/aim of your department (please highlight the sustainable development and aspects), this will form the departmental descriptions that are placed under the photograph of each Minister in the report. (75 words Max.)

5. Departmental responses to this question provide only general information about their role and objectives. This table has therefore not been analysed, though it does raise more general questions on the meaning of the term 'sustainable development' and the extent to which it is included in the objectives of all organisations (see questions 2.1 and 2.3 below).

1.4 What resources in the central department are assigned specifically to support the Sustainable Development agenda? [Please use the universal grade descriptions of AA, AO, EO, HEO, SEO, Grades 6 & 7 and SCS. Please include whole-time equivalent as well as full-time staff. For any other staff outside the normal admin system (such as scientists, lawyers or other professionally qualified staff) please give a description.]

6. The departmental responses are summarised below. In doing so, data has been used to calculate a total whole-time equivalent (WTE) for those staff specifically assigned to support the Sustainable Development agenda. The percentage has also been calculated of total departmental staff (including agency staff) which this represents, and the highest grade of sustainable development staff disclosed together with the percentage of his/her time assigned to this agenda.

Dept	Number of staff			Highest grade of SD staff	
	Total Staff (including agencies)	Central SD staff (WTE)	Percentage of total staff	Grade of most senior SD staff	Percentage of his / her time
CO	6,044	2.0	0.03	HEO/SEO	100
C&E	22,286	2.0	0.01	SEO	100
DCMS	702	0.9	0.13	G7	10
DTLR	19,500	8.6	0.04	SCS	20
DfES	4,282	2.8	0.07	G6	2
DfID	1,385	32.2	2.32	SCS	100
DH	4,098	2.4	0.06	G6	5
DWP	129,909	10.2	0.01	G7	20
DTI	8,762	[no data]		G6	
ECGD	420	2.0	0.48	G7	100
FCO	3,560	48.2	1.35	SCS	303
HMT	2,796	2.0	0.07	G6	5
HO	65,040	7.2	0.01	G7	33
IR	68,467	1.1	0.00	SCS	5
LCD	12,559	0.9	0.01	SEO	50
LOD	8,317	1.4	0.02	SCS	10
DEFRA	14,252	12.9	0.09	G5	20
MoD					
ONS	3,800	0.3	0.01	5	1
Total	376,179	137	0.04		

Notes

- (1) Traditional Civil Service grades range from G1 (the highest) to G7, SEO and HEO.
- (2) The term SCS has been used by some departments to refer to a member of the Senior Civil Service (ie Grade 5 and up). In such cases, the department has not disclosed the specific grade of the staff member.
- (3) The highest grade of SD staff refers to the highest graded individual(s) who is included in the Central SD staff (WTE) figure. In the case of the FCO, as there are 3 Grade 5s, each of whom devotes 100% of their time to this agenda, and a fourth Grade 5, who devotes only 3% of his/her time to it, the overall percentage figure is 303%. This is unusual, and for most departments there would only be one highest-graded member of staff who devotes only a part of his/her time to this agenda.

7. Detailed comments on this table are contained in paragraphs 17 to 19 of the Committee's report.

1.5. What is the scope of the activities of the team members specifically assigned to support the Sustainable Development Agenda? [Are staff centrally located? Do they form a separate SDU? What issues are they responsible for?]

8. The table below is a summary interpretation of departmental responses. No attempt has been made to summarise departmental comments on the issues these staff are responsible for, as the responses generally referred to both policy and operational advice and it was difficult to assess, on the limited information provided, the degree and nature of involvement—particularly in the policy area. Where these staff are located within the estates management function of a department has however been indicated, as this might limit their involvement in policy development. In some cases, it was also clear that operational and policy issues were managed by separate groups of staff (question 1.4 was also useful in this respect), but in others this was less clear.

Dept	Centrally located?	Separate SDU?	Functional location in department
CO	yes	yes	
C&E	yes	yes	Estates
DCMS	yes	no	
DTLR	yes	yes	
DfES	yes, mainly	no	
DfID	yes, mainly	division	
DH	yes	?	
DWP	yes	yes	Estates
DTI	yes	yes	
ECGD	yes	yes	
FCO	Yes	division	
HMT	Yes	no	
HO	Yes	no	
IR	Yes	no	
LCD	Yes	no	
LOD	Partly	no	Estates
DEFRA	Yes	yes	
MoD			
ONS	No	no	

9. The table shows that almost all staff involved specifically in SD are centrally located (ie in London), the one main exception being the ONS where the key player (0.33 WTE) is located in Newport. In three cases (C&E, DWP, LOD) they are located within the estates management function, rather than alongside central policy departments.

1.6. Please provide details of your senior official with responsibility for sustainable development.

Dept	Senior official (grade)	Location (if not London)
CO	5	
C&E	3	
DCMS	3	
DTLR	3	
DfES	3	
DfID	5	
DH	5	Bristol (Government Office for the SW)
DWP	5 or above	Leeds
DTI	3	
ECGD	5 or above	
FCO	5 or above	
HMT	3	
HO	5 or above	
IR	Deputy Chairman	
LCD	3	
LOD	6 or above	
DEFRA	3	
MoD	2	
ONS	6	Newport, Gwent

10. This data, if taken together with tables 1-4 and 1-5, provides an interesting indication of the relationship between the staff specifically involved in sustainable development and the senior official responsible. Detailed comments on it are contained in paragraphs 22 to 25 of the Committee's report.

Section 2: INTEGRATING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT INTO DECISION MAKING

*2.1 (a) Please list the key achievements/initiatives made by your department in supporting the Government's objectives for sustainable development in the last year?
(b) Has your department independently set any new objectives or targets that relate to the priorities for Sustainable Development in Government Initiative identified in the last annual report on Greening Government i.e. integrating sustainable development in decision making, improving the performance of the Government Estate, promoting understanding of sustainable development across Government.*

11. In response to part (a) of this question, departments commented often at some length on a wide variety of initiatives or processes. These included, for example, the completion of Sustainable Development Reports (required as part of SR 2002), new policy initiatives, seminars, internal schemes and awareness campaigns etc. The information is not readily susceptible to meaningful analysis, but is clearly useful for presentational purposes in the summary report (ie Part 1 of the Sustainable Development in Government report). However, some of this activity does not amount to much, while some of it is either a formal requirement (eg the submission of Sustainable Development Reports as part of SR 2002) or

should be a routine part of a department's work (eg the use of Integrated Policy Appraisals). In many cases, it is questionable whether they can be described as "key achievements/initiatives... in the last year"—the wording of the question. For these reasons, the question itself is of limited usefulness.

12. Part (b) of the question specifically requires departments to list any new objectives or targets they might have set in the last year.

Dept	New objectives and targets set – EAC comments	Targets
CO	no data	nil
C&E	The response refers to one objective, but it is very vague and non-specific.. ["To complete a programme of projects aimed at improving productivity and competitiveness, combating social exclusion, and promoting sustainable development."]	nil
DCMS	The response refers to one objective, but it is very vague. ["To promote understanding of sustainable development issues and DCMS's relation to these..."] The response also refers to one new target, which is more specific. ["To produce a sustainable development strategy by the end of 2002."]	1 target
DTLR	The response refers to the development of the EMS and its benefits, but no objectives or targets are set.	nil
DfES	The response refers to a number of initiatives, and also to an existing target (5% renewable energy by March 2003). But no new targets or objectives are cited (though joining the Watermark initiative might involve some.)	nil
DfID	The response acknowledges that no new targets have been set, but it points out that the department is integrating the Millennium Development Goals into its operation planning. It also states that new [estate] targets will be set following the refurbishment of its 3 UK offices.	nil
DH	The response sets out an objective for the department, but it is very vague and non-specific. It also refers to agency objectives, giving PASA as an example.	nil
DWP	The department is developing a new SD strategy which will include new objectives and targets. The response also states "Independent DWP targets have been set in addition to those set by central Government." But it is unclear to what this refers.	nil
DTI	The department will revise its targets and make them 'smarter' as part of the Spending Review process.	nil
ECGD	The response refers to two very general objectives which may not in any case be new.	nil
FCO	Two specific objectives, though only one has a target date. ("To ensure that our sustainable development / environment training programme is operating effectively by the end of December 2001." "To assess [through an independent panel of experts] FCO funded environment projects...to ensure that projects recommended for funding fully incorporate sustainable development.")	2 objectives
HMT	Reference to HMT's role in SR 2002, and also to OGC Buying Solutions initiatives.	nil
HO	Response specifically acknowledges that no new targets set independently.	nil
IR	Response refers reader to part a response (which simply lists ongoing policy initiatives).	nil
LCD	no response	no response
LOD	No corporate targets / objectives, and none for CPS and SFO. TSols/LSLO have set one unquantified target ("To try to reduce water consumption within the department.")	1 target
DEFRA	Response refers only to development of the Integrated Policy Appraisal tool.	nil
MoD	Response refers to various ongoing work streams which might result in new targets.	nil
ONS	One target. ("To achieve ISO 14001 at all our main sites by the end of 2004 – ahead of the target set by Green Ministers.")	1 target

13. Many of the departments, in answering this question, have referred to initiatives or processes which would more appropriately have been included in their response to part (a) of the question. Only 5 objectives or targets were not vacuously general, and of them only 3 are in any way smart.

2.2 *What tools or processes did your department use to produce your Sustainable Development Report for SR2002?*

14. The Sustainable Development Reports (SDRs) which departments produce have not been made publicly available as the Treasury regard them as an inherent part of the Budget process. In its report on the 2002 Pre-Budget, EAC criticised this situation and highlighted the lack of public accountability which it reflected.

15. Departmental responses to this question highlight a variety of approaches, and—given the lack of access to the SDRs themselves—it is difficult to assess their effectiveness. Some departments have adopted a systematic and thorough approach. The DTLR, for example, subjected all individual bids to integrated appraisals which would highlight environmental and other impacts, and aggregated the results. Other departments, including the MoD and DEFRA, only applied integrated appraisals to a subset of its bids. DEFRA appeared to be the only department to match its top priority spending proposals against the department's objectives and draft PSA targets, and the sustainable development indicators.

16. By contrast, other departments give little or no real information, referring only to liaison and coordination, or to Cabinet Office and Treasury guidance. Proper comparative assessment of departmental performance in this area would require a detailed audit of the SDRs themselves and the processes by which they were compiled.

2.3 (a) *Has your department identified the contribution it makes to relevant sustainable development indicators? Please provide details. (b) Please provide any examples of how sustainable development has been incorporated into your department's policy objectives i.e. what references are included in your department's PSA targets and SDAs relating to sustainable development impacts? (c) Are there any further developments to incorporate environmental concerns/sustainable development into departmental aims and objectives? Please give details.*

17. This question effectively encouraged departments to set out a wide range of policies and initiatives including some which are primarily social or economic in nature. The CO, DfES and DH responses, for example, focus on social and economic policies relating to human health and education. By contrast, other departments, such as the MoD and the DTI, have tried to limit their responses to more environmentally related issues.

18. This raises the difficult but important issue of the meaning of the term 'sustainable development'. The EAC has previously expressed its concern that the wider breadth of the Government's Sustainable Development Strategy, introduced in 1999, could be used by departments to justify the claim that they are contributing to sustainable development even when they are citing purely economic or social objectives. The term 'sustainable development' was introduced in the late 1980s as a way of mainstreaming environmental objectives and suggesting that they could be achieved alongside social or economic

progress. Achieving environmental objectives is a fundamental component of the term. Environmental sustainability should form the framework within which all policy development and operational management should take place. Indeed, the Sustainable Development Research Network (SDRN), sponsored by DEFRA, have adopted a definition which reflects this by defining environmental aims as an essential component of eligible research.

19. Paragraph 32 of the Committee's report contains further discussion of responses.

2.4 Does your department: (a) specify environmental considerations when negotiating PPPs and PFIs? (b) internal audit service's remit encompass environmental issues and processes (both policy and operations)? If so, please provide details

20. Departmental responses to part (a) of this question were short and generalised. Only two departments (HMT, HO) cited specific contracts into which environmental considerations had been written. Apart from these two cases, no other examples were cited in any other responses. The DH categorically stated that such requirements are specified for all DH contracts. Two departments (DTLR, DWP) stated slightly less explicitly that environmental considerations are included in PFI contract terms. Other departments referred more vaguely to environmental considerations being taken into account (CO, DCMS), or else stated that they did not have any PPP or PFI contracts (DfES, DfID). One department referred to the forthcoming guidance which was eventually published by OGC in 2002.

21. The question itself is therefore of limited utility as there is insufficient detailed information to assess the extent to which environmental considerations have been incorporated. It would be more useful if departments were asked to list all PFIs/PPPs which were negotiated in the previous year and include for each a very brief statement on whether environmental considerations were incorporated.

22. The DfES did not acknowledge its influence on the education sector in terms of the extent to which environmental objectives could be built into PFIs for schools and colleges. This contrasted with a recognition by both DCMS and DH of their responsibilities in similar situations.

23. In responding to part (b) almost all departments claimed that the remit of their internal audit section did encompass environmental issues and processes (both policy and operations), as IA could audit any activities which support the delivery of departmental objectives. (Curiously, the ONS considered the question not applicable to it.) But it was not clear from the responses whether environmental issues are explicitly mentioned in the formal remit of IA teams. The Home Office acknowledged that they were not. Other departments failed to make this clear, though the wordings of their responses suggest that, in their cases too, there is no explicit reference. Once again, the utility of the question could be improved by obtaining information explicitly on this point.

24. In any event, it is clear from the responses that the extent to which Internal Audit teams actually examine environmental issues (whether policy or operations) will be very limited because of the systems of risk prioritisation used. Departments were not asked about actual

coverage by Internal Audit. It would be useful if they were. The results of the comprehensive audit which the Treasury have been carrying out are expected soon.

2.5 (a) Has your department introduced any new systems or procedures in the reporting year to ensure that environmental screenings and/or appraisals take place for any significant environmental impact caused by new or reviewed policies? (b) Do you maintain a record of the outcome of each environmental screening undertaken, as required? (c) How many free-standing environmental appraisals has your department published in the reporting year? Please give details.

25. This important question aims to probe how effectively departments are considering environmental issues when revising or developing new policies.

Dept	(a) New systems or procedures for screening	(b) Record of screening	(c) Environmental appraisals published
CO	No	No	None
C&E	Already exist, but for budgetary process only	Yes [<i>but confidential</i>]	None
DCMS	No	[<i>no response</i>]	None
DTLR	Yes, as part of IPA project	No	None (part of wider appraisal process)
DfES	Already exist	[<i>no response</i>]	None
DfID	No	No, but records are kept on individual files	None
DH	Unclear, pilot exercise only	Unclear, pilot exercise only	None
DWP	Unclear, new department	Unclear	None
DTI	Unclear	[<i>no response</i>]	Unclear
ECGD	Yes, as part of project screening	Unclear whether there is a central record	Yes, for some projects
FCO	Yes, consultation with EPD is mandatory	Unclear	None
HMT	Yes [<i>Already exist</i>]	No	None
HO	Yes [<i>but not mandatory?</i>]	No	None
IR	Already exist	Yes	Yes, as part of Budget
LCD	No [<i>no new systems</i>]	Yes	None
LOD	Not relevant	Not relevant	Not relevant
DEFRA	Yes, as part of IPA project	Yes	Unclear (move to integrated appraisals)
MoD	Yes [<i>but not mandatory?</i>]	No (is planned)	None
ONS	Not relevant	Not relevant	Not relevant

26. Part (a) of this question can create some potential ambiguities. It refers specifically to any new systems or procedures introduced during the last year. Where departments have responded negatively, this does not necessarily mean that they do not have procedures in place—as is indeed clear from DfID’s response to part (b). A couple of departments made it clear that they did have existing systems. Part (a) also fails to ask departments whether they have mandatory procedures which ensure that all policy proposals are subject to environmental screening. Some departments (eg HO, MoD) respond affirmatively on the basis of the development of guidance, but the latter in itself does nothing to ensure that screening is carried out. It would be more useful if the question specifically asked whether mandatory procedures are in place.

27. Part (b) is based on the requirement, set out in the 2000 Green Ministers Report, for departments to screen all new policies for environmental impacts and maintain a central

record of the results (and make it available to the public if they wish). Unfortunately, the question does not explicitly refer to a central list, and for that reason some departments may claim that the results of screening are available on individual policy files.

28. Only four departments (C&E, IR, LCD, DEFRA) claim to be maintaining a record of screening, while with the exception of ECGD none have published any free-standing environmental appraisals. The latter should be seen in the context of the move towards integrated appraisal—which brings together economic, social and environmental impacts in one overall assessment. This development has undermined the commitment made in the 2001 Green Ministers Report to the effect that all environmental appraisals should be published. However, it does nothing to prevent departments from maintaining a list of all screenings for their environmental impact as this would have to be done as part of an integrated appraisal.

29. There is currently a multiplicity of wider requirements on departments relating to appraisal. There is also a certain tension between approaches which attempt to calculate monetary values for environmental impacts, and those which set them alongside other impacts but in non-financial terms.

Section 3: IMPROVING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE GOVERNMENT ESTATE

Part 1: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

3.1.1 All departments were asked to review their data collection systems in September 2001. What findings has this produced and what improvements have been made?

3.1.2 Please provide the following details on your Environmental Management Systems: (a) number of EMSs in place (b) percentage of the department's staff covered by these (c) number of EMSs certified to ISO 14001 (d) percentage of department's staff covered by the ISO 14001 EMSs (e) work in progress / future plans for EMS.

3.1.3 Do your EMSs cover policy issues as well as management of the estate? If so, please provide details.

3.1.4 Do you have any new systems in place designed to deliver environmental improvements (other than EMSs)? If so, please provide details.

30. The ‘harder’ data which these questions yielded is summarised below.

Dept	% of staff covered by certified EMS	Does EMS cover policy?
CO	7	No (central dept). EMSs within some agencies may do
C&E	4	Unclear, but probably no.
DCMS	n/a	No
DTLR	45	No
DfES	1	No, but plan to include.
DfID	n/a	No, but are other procedures.
DH	8	No (central department). PASA EMS does include policy.
DWP	70	No
DTI	44	No
ECGD	0	Unclear
FCO	47	No
HMT	[blank]	No
HO	1	No
IR	13	Yes
LCD	0	No
LOD	n/a	n/a
DEFRA	16	No
MoD	1	Yes [<i>but note non-certified system</i>]
ONS	75	Unclear

31. In 1999, the EAC recommended targets for implementing EMSs. Indeed, the ongoing difficulties of obtaining reliable data in a number of areas still reflect the absence of structured systems for monitoring and managing activities. The table above shows that we are still very far from achieving widespread take-up across all departments. Indeed, in the case of the Cabinet Office percentage coverage appears to have gone down in comparison with data for the previous year. In this context, Part 1 of the Sustainable Development in Government report stated: “*The Government has agreed that to deliver challenging environmental targets for the Estate within this Parliament, a significant increase in the uptake of Environmental Management Systems is needed.*”

32. Apart from the MoD, only IR claims that its EMS covers policy issues—though it is unclear about how reliable this information is given the low level of staff covered by its EMS.

Part 2: ENERGY MANAGEMENT

(Target: all departments to contribute towards the Government estate target of a 1% pa on-going reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from buildings).

Please note that all departmental energy managers have been asked for their energy returns for 2000/01 & 2001/02 by DEFRA's Energy Policy Analysis team. Whilst the Green Ministers Officials Working Group are not necessarily responsible for this information (and we are not asking for the information here), you will want to be aware that we aim to report on these returns in this year's Sustainable Development in Government Annual Report.

3.2.1 Please provide the following details on your department's use of Combined Heat and Power: (a) How many CHP systems do you have (b) What is the total electrical and thermal capacity in kWh (c) What is the Quality Index for each system based on the Government's Quality Assurance Programme for CHP?

3.2.2 What is your department doing (including on-site regeneration) to increase the amount of renewable electricity your department uses? Have you introduced any other actions to reduce energy use?

3.2.3: (a) Please detail any schemes (size, location, fuel and commissioning date) which are in operation where renewable fuels are used to generate energy on your estate. Renewable fuels are considered as solar, wind, wood or other biomass schemes which could generate heat and/ or electricity and could be a mixture of renewable and fossil fuels. If you are using waste as a fuel please describe the scheme. (b) Have you introduced any other actions to reduce energy use?

33. Departmental responses to these questions are summarised in the table below.

Dept	Number of CHP systems	Percentage of electricity from renewables sources
CO	Whitehall DHS	[circa 75%]
C&E	None	26%
DCMS	None	[no data for department]
DTLR	2	0%
DfES	None	10%
DfID	None	10%
DH	None (department) but used widely in NHS Trusts	100% for 5 out of 6 London buildings. 99% for PASA
DWP	None	27%
DTI	None	33%
ECGD	n/a (leased)	5%
FCO	Whitehall DHS	0%
HMT	Whitehall DHS	0%
HO	None	[no quantified data for department]
IR	None	[0%]
LCD	None	[no data]
LOD	None	100% in 2 of 4 offices (includes main HQ building)
DEFRA	1	[no data]
MoD	10	[no data]
ONS	None	10%

34. Twelve departments do not operate any CHP system. Indeed, the only departments to do so are on the one hand the DTLR and on the other the three departments which utilise the Whitehall District Heating Service (DHS) system—namely CO, FCO, and HMT. Progress on CHP schemes therefore remains poor. Renewable energy, however, presents a more varied picture with some departments well ahead of the 5% March 2003 target. DH, CO and LOD clearly lead the field, with DTI, DWP and C&E also performing very well.

35. The questionnaire also includes data on carbon emissions and the progress made by departments to reduce carbon intensity. Set out below is the percentage change in carbon emissions in 2000-01 and 2001-02 against the 1999-2000 baseline. Negative numbers represent a reduction in carbon emissions.

	Weather corrected carbon emissions (tonnes C) 1999/2000	Percentage change 00/01	Percentage change 01/02	Met target? 00-01	Met target? 01-02
CO	1,960	-26%	28%	✓	✗
CPS	1,736	0%	4%	✗	✗
C&E	7,750	-22%	-17%	✓	✓
DCMS	462	0%	0%	✗	✗
DfES	3,053	-4%	-7%	✓	✓
DEFRA	3,261	4%	17%	✗	✗
DEFRA Labs	7,210	7%	4%	✗	✗
DH	2,231	-6%	-39%	✓	✓
DfID	618	8%	18%	✗	✗
DTI	5,368	-9%	-18%	✓	✓
DTLR	11,260	-6%	-11%	✓	✓
DWP	53,589	-6%	-	✓	
FSA	0	0%	0%	✗	✗
FCO	607	9%	0%	✗	✗
FC	3,155	0%	0%	✗	✗
HMT	371	-40%	-37%	✓	✓
HO	1,517	13%	1%	✓	✗
IR	7,251	0%	12%	✗	✗
LSLO	30,267	0%	4%	✗	✗
LCD	21	-2%	-7%	✓	✓
MoD	508,247	-1%	-8%	✓	✓
NIO	13,597	-16%	-11%	✓	✓
ONS	28,533	-2%	-3%	✓	✓
Prisons	2,277	-3%	-5%	✓	✓
SCS	99,660	4%	26%	✗	✗
S Prisons	2,336	-36%	-36%	✓	✓
SFO	11,839	3%	23%	✗	✗
T Sols	141	0%	-7%	✗	✓
TOTAL (exc. MOD)	247,547	-6%	-5%	✓	✓
TOTAL (incl. MOD)	755,794	-3%	-7%	✓	✓

36. This table should be seen in the context of the new target for all departments, set in 2000, of an ongoing 1% per annum reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, expressed in

terms of carbon savings. This target followed on from the long-standing 20% efficiency target over the previous decade, which the Government failed to meet.

37. In terms of overall performance, the Government appears to have met this new target in both 2000-01 and 2001-02, with overall reductions of 3% and 7% respectively. Some individual departments, however, have conspicuously failed to meet the target, with carbon emissions increasing in one or both years against the baseline. These departments or agencies include DEFRA, DfID, HO, SFO, and IR. By contrast, huge reductions have been achieved in other departments or agencies (HMT, Scottish Prisons, C&E). The anomalous performance of the Cabinet Office could possibly be explained by estate changes.

38. The figures for departmental performance are based on temperature corrected emissions. It would be helpful if future versions of the Sustainable Development in Government report could also disclose absolute figures for carbon emissions. The DTI routinely follow this practice when publishing energy statistics. There have been significant changes in departmental structures over the last 2 years, and the impact of these is unclear—in particular, on the reliability of data collection systems. The National Audit Office could usefully carry out further work in this area to provide independent assurance on the reliability of the information presented in Sustainable Development in Government reports.

39. The Government views the ongoing 1% per annum reduction target as an interim target. In Part 1 of the Sustainable Development in Government report, it states that it will set during 2003 new energy targets based on an assessment of the Estate's performance against national standards. These targets have not yet been issued but will be based on the major benchmarking exercise which departments have been carrying out on all offices on their estates over the last few years. The current 1% target is straightforward and transparent, whereas the new targets will be based on a complex calculation of the individual make-up of each department's estate. It is even conceivable that some departments could be set targets which will allow them to increase their carbon emissions. Future departmental reorganisations could result in further difficulties.

Part 3: TRAVEL

3.3.1: Please complete the following table concerning details of your vehicle fleet: as at 31/03/02 what number of cars and vans were leased/owned by the Department, and what type of fuel do they use?

3.3.2: (a) Has your department made environmental improvements to its fleet vehicles? (e.g. procurement, fuel conversion, fuel usage targets)? Any future plans? (b) Does your department participate in the Motorvate scheme? (please provide details of action taken since joining) If not, any plans to join?

40. Departmental responses to these two questions are summarised, though this does not include departmental responses to question 3.3.2(a). The latter was open ended and most of the information provided was not auditable—though there were some interesting and specific information provided by some departments (eg C&E and DWP) on their future plans in this area.

Dept	Total cars / vans	Number of LPG or dual fuel	LPG vehicles % of total	Electric / electric hybrid	Members of Motorvate?
CO (GCDA)	190	85	45		No
C&E	2224	36	2	17	No
DCMS (Royal Parks)	33	33	100		No
DTLR	1101	58	5		No
DfES	105	5	5		No
DfID	2		0		No
DH	6		0		Assume no
DWP	3439	280	8	5 [?]	Yes
DTI	18		0		No
ECGD	1		0		No
FCO	41	5	12	3	[no response]
HMT	25	2	8		No
HO	1238	6	0		No
IR	2069	25	1	1	Assume no
LCD	568	1	0		No
LOD	18	1	6		No
DEFRA	513	10	2		No
MoD	7000		0	'a few electric'	No
ONS	15		0		No
Total (civil depts)	11606	547	4.7	25 approx	
TOTAL	18606	547	2.9		

41. Given the incentives which the Government has provided to encourage LPG since 1997, it is disappointing that only some 547 vehicles out of a total fleet of over 18,600 are LPG equipped. The performance of DWP is particularly creditable. Indeed, its 280 LPG vehicles constitute over half of all the LPG vehicles owned or leased by central Government departments, and amount to 8% of its total fleet. It also planned to purchase a further 600 LPG vehicles during 2002. It is worth pointing out that it is the only department to have joined the Motorvate scheme—and perhaps some of its commitment and success can be attributed to this. By contrast, the Home Office, Inland Revenue and Customs & Excise—none of which are members of the Motorvate scheme—perform particularly badly even though these three departments account for almost half of the 11,600 vehicles civil departments use.

42. The position with regard to the MoD is unclear. In referring to its 7000 leased vehicles, its database entry states 'Please see further information in respect of the caveats to the response to this question', but this information is not included. Nor does the MoD explicitly state how many LPG vehicles it has—though it does state that most of its vehicles are diesel.

3.3.3: (a) Does your department monitor business mileage from use of vehicles on a regular basis? (b) Does your department have an existing Uniform Mileage Rate? If so, when was it introduced? If not, have you reviewed the feasibility of introducing a rate, as required by July 2001?

3.3.4 Please provide the following details on your travel plans: number of travel plans, number of sites covered, percentage of department's staff covered by these plans,

details of any travel plan targets and monitoring systems that you have established/met.

3.3.5: Have the conclusions of monitoring travel plans led to any changes to the travel plan? e.g. encouraging use of video conferencing If so please give details.

43. The following table summarises departmental responses. It does not include information on uniform mileage rates as all departments have now adopted such a policy—though in many cases only from April 2002 (ie at the end of the reporting year).

Dept	Mileage monitoring	% of staff covered by travel plans	Travel plan quantified targets?
CO	Assume no	[no data]	No
C&E	No	[no data]	No
DCMS	Yes	100%	[no response]
DTLR	Yes	72%	No
DfES	Yes	100%	No
DfID	No	100%	No
DH	No	c. 100%	Yes
DWP	Yes	80%	No
DTI	Yes	[no data]	[no response]
ECGD	No	0%	No
FCO	Yes	98%	No
HMT	No	80%	Yes (Royal Mint)
HO	Yes	[no data]	[no response]
IR	Yes	95%	No
LCD	Yes	15%	No
LOD	No	70%	No
DEFRA	Yes	55%	No
MoD	Yes	11%	No
ONS	Yes	75%	No

44. Twelve departments monitor mileage usage by staff, while the remaining 7 either do not maintain the relevant data or do not use it for monitoring. Some departments cited difficulties in obtaining data on leased or pool cars. With the exception of ECGD (who were still developing a travel plan), the percentage of staff covered by travel plans varied from 11% (MoD) to 100%. A number of departments (eg HMT, LOD, DH) did not submit an overall figure but recorded separate percentages for different parts of the department, though it was possible to work out an overall percentage from the information given.

45. Many departments recorded high percentage coverage of staff but when they were asked for details of any travel plan targets, the responses were generally vague and unspecific. Only one strategic target could be identified—that of the Department of Health ‘to reduce business miles by a further 1% for the year 2002-03 compared to the year 2001-02’—and even here it appeared to apply to an agency rather than the department as a whole. In addition, the Royal Mint had set as a target and achieved a 10% increase in car sharing, though there was no reference to any further target being set.

Part 4: WATER

A target was agreed in March 2001, to reduce the maximum level of water consumption in offices to 11m³ per person per year by 31 March 2002, and a further 30% reduction over the next 2 years, achieving a level of 7.7 m³ by 31 March 2004. In addition, it was agreed that benchmarks for other metered buildings and sites should be established under the Watermark Project by 31 October 2001 with the aim of setting percentage targets for achieving initial reductions in departments' water use within the following year (by 31 March 2002).

3.4.1: Please provide the following details on your water consumption / usage and reduction measures: (a) for office buildings, water use (per person per year) for the last three years and the % improvement for each year. (b) Do you have an existing water consumption target for your non-office estates? If so, what is it? Are you taking part in the Watermark Project? What other consumption reduction measures have you undertaken? (c) Have you established benchmarks for other metered buildings and sites under the Watermark Project? Have you set any new targets for non-office buildings as the result of benchmarking?

46. The following table summarises the extent to which departments met the Government's target of reducing water consumption to 11m³ per person by March 2002.

Dept	Actual consumption 2001-02 (m ³ per person)	Met target? (target: <11m ³)
CO	[no data]	
C&E	[no data]	
DCMS	[no data]	
DTLR	9.6	Yes
DfES	12.4	No
DfID	[no data]	
DH	5.3 to 9.5	Yes
DWP	7.4	Yes
DTI	15.7	No
ECGD	[no data]	
FCO	[no data]	
HMT	[no overall data]	
HO	[no data]	
IR	[no data]	
LCD	13.2	No
LOD	[no data]	
DEFRA	8.2	Yes
MoD	[no overall data]	
ONS	8.7	Yes

47. Only 5 departments out of 19 have clearly met the March 2002 target, as reflected in their 2001-02 consumption figures. Eleven departments were unable to provide reliable data for 2001-02 consumption covering the whole of the department. The MoD, for example, had no metering information for the RN, RAF and Defence Logistics Organisation; while the Treasury did not include data for the Royal Mint. Moreover, some departments failed to provide a single overall statistic, preferring instead

to disclose various statistics for different parts of the department. This was the case with DH, though the nature of the data showed that the target had been met.

48. With regard to the other parts of this question, almost all departments were now taking part, or about to take part, in the Watermark project.

Part 5: WASTE MANAGEMENT

3.5.1: (a) How many of your department's offices are covered by the target: All departments should have paper recycling and minimisation schemes in place in all offices with over 50 staff by 31 March 2002? (b) Do you have paper recycling and minimisation schemes in place for these offices? Please provide details? (c) What proportion of staff (% of total departmental staff) are covered by a scheme?

49. Parts (a) and (b) of this question cover only offices with more than 50 staff—but it is impossible to know how the number of sites in responses here relates to the total number of sites a department occupies or indeed to the total number of sites with more than 50 staff. Part (c) of the question, however, is of more use, as it asks for the proportion of the department's total staff which are covered by a scheme.

Dept	% Total Staff covered by scheme
CO	[no data]
C&E	[no data]
DCMS	100%
DTLR	70%
DfES	100%
DfID	100%
DH	100%
DWP	100%
DTI	80%
ECGD	[no data]
FCO	c. 100%
HMT	[no overall data, but > 90% by end 2002]
HO	> 90%
IR	[no data, but will be covered in PFI deal]
LCD	100%
LOD	100%
DEFRA	89%
MoD	[no data]
ONS	100%

50. 6 departments were either unable to provide data in response to this question, or did not provide a summary figure for the entire department. The absence of any quality criteria for such schemes is a significant weakness, as it is not obvious that individual schemes operated by different departments are equally effective.

3.5.2: All departments should be recovering a minimum of 40% of total office waste, with at least 25% of that recovery coming from recycling or composting. Please provide a breakdown of waste composition amounts, and percentage recovery. NB: This year's weights should be given in metric tonnes

51. This important target was first set in 1999 in the First Annual Report of the Green Ministers Committee. Data from the questionnaire responses is summarised in Part 1 of the published 2002 report.

Dept	Total waste (tonnes)	Total waste recovered (tonnes)	Recovery (target = 40%)	Paper (tonnes)	Paper as % of total waste recovered
CO	<i>no data</i>				
C&E	<i>no data</i>				
DCMS	8	8	98%	3	26%
DTLR	4720	2387	51%	<i>no data</i>	<i>no data</i>
DfES	1772	611	34%	250	41%
DfID	<i>no data</i>				
DH	594	482	81%	398	83%
DWP (DSS only)	16172	8895	55%	8895	100%
DTI	717	293	41%	285	97%
ECGD	<i>no data</i>				
FCO	1343	415	31%	163	39%
HMT	358	123	35%	105	85%
HO	<i>no data</i>				
IR	<i>no data</i>				
LCD	4262	1462	34%	1462	100%
LOD	<i>no data</i>				
DEFRA	889	414	46%	267	65%
MoD	<i>no data</i>				
ONS	1253	366	29%	318	87%

52. On the basis of these figures (and discounting DWP for the reasons set out below), only 6 departments out of 19 have met the main waste recovery target set in 1999 by Green Ministers. Nine departments were still unable to provide data on waste recovery. This reflects the absence of effective environmental management systems. In addition, of the 10 departments which were able to provide some data, there were two where the data appeared to be incomplete. The DWP return did not include the Employment Service agency—partly reflecting recent changes in departmental structures. Secondly, the reference in the Treasury’s return to the non-availability of data from the Royal Mint raises question marks over whether the figures for HMT included OGC.

53. In response to this question, departments were also asked to provide additional data on the composition of the waste which had been recovered. Paper dominated these statistics, and the second part of the table includes the tonnage of paper recovered/recycled, also measured as a percentage of the total waste recovered. This percentage ranges from 39% (FCO) and 41% (DfES) to 97% (DTI) and 100% (LCD)—presumably because those departments with very high percentages are recovering little from other waste streams. But if this is the case, it is difficult to understand why these same departments appear to be recovering much higher percentages of their total waste.

54. As paper recycling accounts for such a high proportion of recovery, the secondary target of ensuring that at least 25% of the recovery comes from recycling or composting has easily been met by those departments which were able to provide data. It would be possible to replace it with a more challenging target or set of targets.

3.5.3: *What other waste initiatives do you have e.g. waste minimisation, improved data collection systems or other recovery schemes such as composting?*

55. The responses to this question prompted a range of very short comments from most departments. Some responses were informative (eg where responses sought to give an overview of developments as in the case of DTI, DWP and DEFRA), others less so.

Part 6: PROCUREMENT

3.6.1 *Please give an update on any new developments in integrating environmental factors into purchasing decisions (e.g. making contractors aware of departmental environmental policy, obliging contractors to follow this policy, monitoring of environmental considerations of decision making).*

56. Departmental responses to this question cite a variety of initiatives which cannot readily be summarised and which in any case hardly provide an objective analysis. The EAC has expressed in previous reports its concern over environmental aspects of procurement policy. The Government is intending to make public the results of the cross-departmental procurement working group which was set up two years ago and reported to Ministers towards the end of last year.

3.6.2 *All departments, when undertaking new or refurbishment construction projects should, wherever appropriate, use BREEAM or equivalent and, where using BREEAM, meet the targets for ratings set out in Achieving Sustainability in Construction Procurement. Have you carried out any environmental assessments using BREEAM (or an equivalent) during the reporting year? Please give details of any such assessments.*

57. As departments have only been asked to provide details of assessments using BREEAM (or an equivalent), it is not possible to establish whether any projects have gone ahead without the use of such an approach. In future, the question could be revised so that departments are asked to provide details of all projects undertaken during the year. Future versions of the questionnaire could also probe to what extent departments are going beyond the minimum requirements of best practice by, for example, requiring far more challenging energy use targets for new buildings reflecting the need to move towards zero space heating requirements.

3.6.3 (a) *Have your suppliers received a clear statement of the Government's commitment to purchase timber and timber products from legally binding and sustainable sources?* (b) *Do you require your suppliers, as a term of the contract, to produce evidence of sustainable and legal timber sources?*

3.6.4 *What actions have you taken toward buying only timber /timber products from sustainable and legal sources? (e.g. incorporation into procurement guidance).*

3.6.5 Please provide details, by spend, of timber procured in the following categories in the last financial year: (a) spend on certified products (b) spend with evidence of sustainable sourcing but not certified (c) spend with no evidence about sustainability available (d) total spend.

58. The Committee has considered timber procurement issues extensively in its report *Buying Time for Forests*, published in 2002. The responses to the first two questions have not therefore been considered in detail—particularly as they do not provide a basis for systematic analysis. However, the responses to the third question (3.6.5) reveal significant weaknesses in data availability.

Dept	Spend on certified products	Spend with evidence of sustainable sourcing but not certified	Spend with no evidence about sustainability available	Total Spend
O	<i>Not significant</i>			
C&E	<i>No data</i>			
DCMS	<i>No data</i>			
DTLR	£2,174,073	£0	£660,636	£2,834,709
DfES	<£512,767	£0	<£512,767	£512,767
DfID	£0	£800,000	£0	£800,000
DH	<i>No data</i>			
DWP	<i>No data</i>			
DTI	£1,300,000	£0	£0	£1,300,000
ECGD	£0	£0	£0	£0
FCO	£27,666	£53,194	£0	£80,860
HMT	£476,000			£476,000
HO	<i>No data</i>			
IR (see below)	£4,000,000	£4,000,000	£4,000,000	£4,000,000
LCD	£412,345	£725,821	£8,082	£1,146,248
LOD	<i>No data</i>			
DEFRA		£160,839		£160,839
MoD	<i>No data</i>			
ONS	£21,281	£34,792	100	£56,174

59. Figures for those departments which did provide some data show a considerable range of expenditure on certified timber, from 100% for the DTI and HMT down to less than 50% for ONS, LCD, and FCO—though these departments claim that there was evidence of sustainability in a significant proportion of its non-certified purchases. The Inland Revenue has clearly made some mistake in entering its data, while the position with DfES is unclear. On the basis of the information provided, it is not possible to assess the reliability of any of the figures provided—even in those cases where they appear plausible.

3.6.6 (a) Are you using the mandatory EU energy-labelling scheme for electrical products as a decision aid for procurement? (b) Do you regularly use other criteria in negotiating contracts (e.g. EU eco-labelling, products qualifying for Enhanced Capital Allowances, criteria established under the Energy Saving Trust's Product Endorsement scheme or any other national schemes)

60. The responses demonstrate that there is considerable scope for departments to build in environmental considerations when procuring electrical equipment. The MoD's response also shows that, at least in the case of that department, further information was provided which has not been made available on the web-site. It is not clear why ECGD has chosen to answer 'not applicable' here, unless it refers to the use of OGC. Given the importance of OGC in coordinating procurement requirements, a key issue is the extent to which OGC builds such environmental criteria into all its contracts. The Treasury response states only: 'OGC: Offer and use products that meet the highest EU-energy labelling rating possible.' There is no explicit assurance that OGC is indeed pursuing environmental objectives in all the contracts it negotiates.

Dept	(a) EU energy labelling scheme	(b) other criteria
CO	No	No
C&E	Yes	Yes
DCMS	Yes	Assume no
DTLR	Use OGC	Yes
DfES	Yes	No
DfID	Yes	No
DH	Yes	Yes
DWP	Yes	No
DTI	Yes	Yes
ECGD	N/A	N/A
FCO	Yes	Yes
HMT	Yes	
HO	Use OGC	
IR	Yes	
LCD	No	No
LOD	No	No
DEFRA	Yes	Yes
MoD		See response at Annex K
ONS	No	No

3.6.7 Government has stated its preference for naturally cooled buildings. Has your department installed any new air conditioning systems in the reporting year? If so, has your department ensured that they are: (a) free of ozone depleting substances such as HCFCs and (b) free of gaseous and non-gaseous substances such as HFCs that contribute to climate change where it has been safe, cost-effective and technically feasible to do so.

(NB: This question is in line with the UK Climate Change Programme which recognized that (a) HFCs should only be used where other safe, technically feasible, cost effective and more environmentally acceptable alternatives do not exist; (b) HFCs are not sustainable in the long term – the Government believes that continued technological developments will mean that HFCs may eventually be able to be replaced in the applications where they are used; (c) HFC emission reduction strategies should not undermine commitments to phase out ozone-depleting substances under the Montreal Protocol; (d) HFC emissions will not be allowed to rise unchecked.)

61. Departmental responses are summarised below:

Dept	Has a new a/c system been introduced during the year?	(a) Free of ozone depleting substances (eg HCFCs)	(b) Free of climate change gases (eg HFCs)
CO	Yes	Assume YES	Assume NO
C&E	Not answered		
DCMS	No data		
DTLR	No		
DfES	No		
DfID	Yes	Yes	No
DH	Yes	Yes	No (see below)
DWP	Yes	Assume YES	Assume NO
DTI	Assume yes	Yes	Yes
ECGD	No		
FCO	No		
HMT	No		
HO	Yes	Assume NO	Assume NO
IR	Yes	Yes	Yes
LCD	Yes	Yes	Yes
LOD	No		
DEFRA	Yes	Yes	Yes
MoD	Yes	Yes	No
ONS	No		

62. Responses did not always clearly state whether new air conditioning systems had been installed during the year (eg C&E). Nor did they generally provide any information on the scale of such systems. In the case of a number of departments, it was apparent that the systems being purchased were small stand-alone units; less information was available in other cases. DCMS was unable to answer the question at all, while the Cabinet Office failed to answer the two questions posed explicitly. DH also answered part (b) incorrectly—stating that their systems were free of climate change gases when in fact their response goes on to acknowledge that they included HFCs.

63. Some departments seem to have made little effort, even in the case of small-scale systems, to obtain HFC-free units—when other departments in the above table appear to have no difficulty in purchasing environmentally-friendly units. The EAC has also questioned the issue of why the Home Office installed in its new HQ building an air conditioning system which is based on the use of HFCs. This was an issue which the EAC raised with their Green Minister in the course of following up claims that timber from unsustainable sources was being used in the construction of the new building.

3.6.8 All departments should have participated in the OGC/DWP pilot scheme for purchase of recycled paper and other recycled paper products. Please supply the following information regarding your department's paper procurement: (a) Contracts—does your department use the OGC managed former DETR contract or the OGC/DWP contract? If not what alternative arrangements do you have? (b) Desk top paper (printers and copiers)—total amount of paper purchased (reams)—number of reams (%) purchased that met the 80% post-consumer waste specification as set out in the "Green Guide for Buyers". (c) Paper for printed publications—total amount of paper purchased (metric tonnes)—what proportion (%) met the minimum 75%

specification for recycled fibre content—do your publications (internal and external) include an appropriate “Green Claim”?

64. In response to the question on contracts, most departments had their own contracts: relatively few used either the OGC/DWP or the former DETR contracts. Many of these contracts did, however, include provisions for purchasing recycled paper. Parts (b) and (c) of the question, however, reveal that the use of recycled paper varied widely between departments, as our summary analysis in the table below demonstrates.

Dept	Proportion of paper purchased that met the 80% specification	Proportion of paper for printed publications which met the 75% specification	Do your publications include an appropriate “Green Claim”?
CO	<i>No data</i>	<i>No data</i>	<i>Not answered</i>
C&E	<i>No data</i>	<i>No data</i>	<i>Not known</i>
DCMS	100%	100%	Some
DTLR	95%	100%	Yes
DfES	16%	<i>No data</i>	No
Dfid	2%	<i>No data</i>	Yes
DH	74%	<i>No data</i>	No
DWP	1%	16% / 68%	No
DTI	38%	100%	Yes
ECGD	<i>No data</i>	<i>No paper purchased</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
FCO	43%	0%	[blank]
HMT (HMT only)	4%	<i>No data</i>	No
HO	3%	<i>No data</i>	No
IR	2%	[blank]	Some
LCD	0%	0%	Yes
LOD (CPS only)	100%	<i>No data</i>	[blank]
DEFRA	25%	83%	Yes
MoD	2%	9%	No
ONS	100%	0%	No

Part 7: BIODIVERSITY

3.7.1 *In the last year what (a) Action has your department taken to take account of biodiversity in new or amended policies and programmes? (b) Action has your department taken, in accordance with the “Making biodiversity happen across Government: Green Ministers biodiversity check list” to promote biodiversity on your estate? (c) Steps has your Department taken to ensure English Nature is consulted about operations carried out or authorised by your department or its associated public bodies which may directly or indirectly damage an SSSI in accordance with Schedule 9 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000?*

65. In response to these questions, departments cited a variety of initiatives—from small scale (eg the Cabinet Office’s conservation area at the rear of 70 Whitehall) to rather more strategic (eg DH, MoD). Those departments which control—either directly or indirectly—large estates have a particular responsibility in this area. MoD, DWP and DH are obvious examples. DfES have not adapted a similar approach with regard to schools and colleges despite the extent of the land they manage.

Part 8: EMPTY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY

3.8.1 Please complete the following table about vacant UK dwellings owned or controlled by your Department as of 01/04/02, if properties are in either Scotland, Wales or N. Ireland please state: (a) number of dwellings as of 01/04/02 (b) number of vacant dwellings as of 01/04/02 (c) number of dwellings vacant for 6 months or more on 01/04/02.

3.8.2 Please give details of any target to reduce the number or duration of vacant stock owned or controlled by your Department, or of any other related action?

66. The only significant domestic property owners are the DTLR (626 dwellings), HO (755), and the MoD (55,834). However, the number of dwellings which had been vacant for 6 months or more (as at 1 April 2002) was only 13, 15, and 864 respectively. Moreover, the MoD is planning to dispose of up to 7,500 properties over the period 2002-03 to 2004-05.

Section 4: PROMOTING UNDERSTANDING OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Part 1: RAISING AWARENESS

4.1.1 All departments should now have strategies in place for raising awareness of sustainable development and environmental issues. If this is not the case please use the box below to state what plans are in hand to launch the strategy and when. If you do have a strategy in place, please give details of any developments in the reporting year and any tangible results.

4.1.2 Please give details on arrangements for monitoring the effectiveness of your awareness raising strategy. What were the main conclusions from the monitoring exercise? Have the results of measuring effectiveness led to any changes to the strategy?

Dept	Formal awareness raising strategy?	Monitoring of awareness raising strategy and results
CO	Unclear. But response cites many raising awareness initiatives and its SD Strategy	None. IA to audit awareness strategy in February 2003.
C&E	Unclear. But have developed an SD e-learning package with other organisations.	No formal monitoring but feedback from contacts in department.
DCMS	No. Formal strategy currently being developed.	No data held.
DTLR	Unclear. But reference to DETR formal strategy (launched July 2000).	Baseline survey conducted in March 2001. Findings made available to both new departments.
DfES	Unclear. But reference to plans to develop a new departmental SD website	No formal monitoring, but compilation of SDR for SR 2002 highlighted areas of weakness.
DfID	Unclear. But reference to a new Communications Strategy (launched October 2001).	Baseline study in summer 2001 found limited awareness. No monitoring as yet, as it is too early
DH	Unclear. But reference to many other initiatives.	None as yet.
DWP	No. (a new department).	None as yet, as it is a new department.
DTI	Unclear. Response refers only to the department's SD strategy.	No formal monitoring but feedback from Sustainability Seminars.
ECGD	Unclear.	No formal monitoring but feedback from SD courses.
FCO	Yes. Formal strategy agreed in April 2000 and baseline study conducted in Autumn 2000.	Baseline study to be repeated in Autumn 2002 and used to assess effectiveness of strategy.
HMT	Unclear	None as yet. But will be audited.
HO	Unclear.	No formal monitoring, but staff feedback monitored.
IR	Unclear	No formal monitoring but informal feedback from staff/
LCD	Unclear. But response does refer to an Environment Strategy.	No formal monitoring but feedback from trainees.
LOD	Unclear.	No formal monitoring but feedback from users / trainees.
DEFRA	Unclear.	Yes. Questions included in DEFRA's staff attitude survey.
MoD	Yes.	No formal monitoring as yet.
ONS	Unclear.	None by department, but is effectiveness is being tested as part of EMS accreditation.

67. In responding to the first question, some departments (eg DTI) referred to their Sustainable Development Strategy, while others cited a variety of promotional activities as if this, in itself, amounted to a strategy. It is impossible as a result to ascertain whether most departments have formal strategies in place. It would be more useful if the question asked for copies of their awareness raising strategies, the last occasion on which it was formally reviewed, and whether the strategy is available on the department's website.

68. In practice, it is clear from the table that few departments – with the obvious exception of the FCO—have any structured approach to monitoring the effectiveness of their strategies.

4.1.3 Have departmental staff attended any CMPS courses on sustainable development issues in Government? Please give details of courses attended and the roles of officials involved if possible. [Course details/role of official]

4.1.4 Does your department offer training or guidance (in addition or as an alternative to CMPS courses) in support of the Government's sustainable development strategy and its relation to your department? Any future plans in this area? Please provide details (e.g. poster campaigns, literature, seminars, workshops etc).

4.1.5 Departments were required to produce guidance or training on screening of options by March 2001. What training or guidance does your department provide in support of environmental appraisals and screenings, and green operations issues? Any future plans in this area? Please provide details.

69. Only perhaps between 15 and 20 staff across all departments attended any CMPS courses on sustainable development. One would not necessarily expect large numbers as such courses are primarily aimed at managers. However, the paucity of attendees is extraordinary when one considers that there are over 370,000 staff in civil departments and agencies alone.

Dept	Number of staff attending CMPS courses
CO	[no records]
C&E	Several
DCMS	0
DTLR	0
DfES	[no records]
DfID	0
DH	2
DWP	Several
DTI	0
ECGD	0
FCO	[no response]
HMT	0
HO	1
IR	[unclear, but probably 0]
LCD	0
LOD	0
DEFRA	2
MoD	1
ONS	Several

70. With regard to the provision of internal training, little 'hard' evidence was provided by departments. Some departments cited one-off initiatives (eg seminars), while failing to make clear how much emphasis was placed on sustainable development in internal training courses, and how widespread (in terms of numbers of staff) the coverage of these courses was. Future versions of these questions could be redrafted in such terms in order to produce more meaningful results.

71. Mainstreaming environmental objectives in policy making and appraisal processes is of crucial importance if there is to be over time a strategic shift towards a more sustainable UK. On the basis of the responses to these questions, it is difficult to assess whether the initiatives departments have cited will have any significant effect on the core of established policy staff. A formal requirement for environmental appraisal as part of the development of an integrated appraisal tool may help, but the responses clearly show that a great deal more progress needs to be made here.

4.1.6 Does your department report on its sustainable development impacts. Is it considering doing so? Is it a stand alone report or is there a section in the annual report. Does it cover policy, operations, or both?

72. The table below also includes information on whether the department produces a separate environmental or sustainable development report.

Dept	Method of reporting	Separate SD / Environmental report?
CO	Green Ministers Annual Report Departmental Report	No
C&E	Departmental Report	Yes
DCMS	Departmental Report	No
DTLR	n/a	n/a
DfES	Departmental Report	No
DfID	Departmental Report	No
DH	Departmental Report	No
DWP	Annual Sustainable Development report	Yes
DTI	Departmental Report	No
ECGD	Departmental Report	No
FCO	SR 2002 SDR	No
HMT	Departmental Report Chancellor's Sustainability Report	Yes (Chancellor's Sustainability Report, coordinated by C&E)
HO	Departmental Report Prison Service Annual Environmental report	Yes (Prison Service)
IR	Departmental Report	[See HMT above]
LCD	Departmental Report	No
LOD	Departmental Report	No
DEFRA	Annual operations report (planned) Annual review of SD strategy	Operations report planned
MoD	Departmental Report Annual Environment and Safety Report	SD report planned
ONS	None	No

73. Examination of departmental annual reports suggests that coverage of environmental and sustainable development impacts is generally very weak and unstructured. It is therefore surprising that so many departments have cited their annual reports as the main means of reporting.

Part 2: WIDER PUBLIC SECTOR

4.2.1 What follow up actions/monitoring have you taken relating to your action plan for integrating sustainable development into the work of your associate bodies? Please provide details of significant actions.

4.2.2 Please provide any examples of good practice by associate bodies with regard to sustainable development and greening government.

4.2.3 Have the aims and objectives of sustainable development been incorporated into any new NDPBs?

4.2.4 Can you briefly detail any action you have taken in support of the Sustainable Development in Government initiative in relation to the bodies identified below? [This question only has to be answered by the departments with responsibility for the following bodies: local authorities (DTLR); schools (DfES); NHS Trusts (DH); Employment Service (DWP); courts (LCD); police (HO); and international work (DTLR, DfID & FCO)]

74. The Second Annual Report of the Green Ministers Committee (2000) included a target for all departments to complete, by March 2001, action plans for integrating sustainable development into the work of their associate bodies. The questions for last year's report were framed in such an open manner as to allow departments to respond without even mentioning, in some cases, the role of these action plans, what targets they contained, and what monitoring had been undertaken against them. Many of the responses to these questions are general in nature containing little 'hard' information, and no attempt has therefore been made to summarise them.

Section 5: SOCIAL ISSUES

We are collecting data on social issues from departments this year in order to bring the Sustainable Development in Government Initiative more in line with the full scope of sustainable development as outlined in A better quality of life. We have tried not to duplicate data collection by the Cabinet Office—that is why we have not included questions on issues covered by the Civil Service Reform report or Civil Service Statistics such as IIP and progress against diversity targets. We are particularly interested in what data departments collect on social issues and how it is disseminated (we are not asking for detailed information). This year is a test run in collecting information on issues wider than the purely environmental. In the annual report, we plan to give an overview of Government's performance as an employer and signal what areas ENV(G) should consider in more detail in the future.

(N.B. Relevant sustainable development indicators are included in questions where appropriate.)

5.1 How does your department report on its performance as an employer? e.g. in annual report, via departmental website, providing information to Cabinet Office. What issues does the annual report cover? e.g. staff satisfaction, staff retention and turnover, training and development. [method of reporting on performance as an employer/staff issues covered in annual report.]

5.2 Do you make any additional information available to staff? e.g. staff survey results on intranet?

5.3 Does your department report on progress against cross-Government targets e.g. ethnic, disabled and women targets? (E5, T2) Has your department set any social targets in addition to the cross-Government diversity targets? [The Diversity Targets

for 2004/05 are: 35% women in the SCS (doubling from 17.8% in 1998), 25% women in top 600 posts (doubling from 12.7% in 1998), 3.2% minority ethnic staff at SCS level (doubling from 1.6% in 1998), 3.0% disabled staff at SCS (doubling from 1.5% in 1998)

[Progress against cross-Government targets / additional social targets]

5.4 Does your department report on stakeholder engagement? e.g. customer stakeholder groups or employees stakeholder groups. Does your department liaise with and support local communities, authorities or organisations ? e.g. on local transport/parking, school governing, nuisance, use of facilities for local events. Please give details and the percentage of staff involved. (H4, H8)

5.5 Does your department have a formal policy on home-working? Please provide details. What percentage of staff work from home (a) partly, (b) full time? (C5, C8, C9)

5.6 Are flexible working hours (FWH) or other specific Work-Life (W/L) Balance practices in operation? Do you provide guidance to staff on Work-Life Balance? Please provide details. (C5, C8, C9)

5.7 What sport facilities are in place for staff e.g. gyms, sponsorship? (H6, F3, C10) Does the Department undertake health campaigns and screenings e.g. stress management, eyesight testing, heart campaigns, blood donor sessions? (H6, F3, C10) please provide details.

5.8 If you haven't been able to answer questions 5.5–5.7, do you collect similar information to that requested? If so, please give details.

75. No analysis has been made of this section of the questionnaire for the reasons set out elsewhere.

Formal minutes

Wednesday 5 November 2003

Members present:

Mr Peter Ainsworth, in the Chair

Mr Gregory Barker

Mr Paul Flynn

Mr Colin Challen

Joan Walley

Mr David Chaytor

Mr David Wright

Mrs Helen Clark

The Committee deliberated.

* * *

Draft Report [*Greening Government 2003*], proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chairman's draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 76 read and agreed to.

Foreword read and agreed to.

Annex read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Thirteenth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

A paper was ordered to be appended to the Minutes of Evidence.

Ordered, That the provisions of Standing Order No. 134 (Select Committees (reports)) be applied to the Report.

Ordered, That the Appendix to the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee be reported to the House.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 12 November at half past Three o'clock.]

Witnesses

Wednesday 2 July 2003

Page

(HC 961-i)

Fiona Mactaggart MP, Green Minister, **Ms Margaret Aldred**, Resources and Performance Director General, **Mr Richard Tippett**, Environmental Issues Manager, and **Mr Tony Edwards**, Head of Buildings and Estate Management, Home Office

Ev. 11

List of written evidence

Home Office

Ev. 1 (HC 961-i)

Home Office

Ev. 24

Past reports from the Environmental Audit Committee since 1997

2002-03 Session

First	Pesticides: The Voluntary Initiative, HC100 (<i>Reply, HC 443</i>)
Second	Johannesburg and Back: The World Summit on Sustainable Development–Committee delegation report on proceedings, HC 169
Third	Annual Report, HC 262
Fourth	Pre-Budget 2002, HC 167 (<i>Reply, HC 688</i>)
Fifth	Waste – An Audit, HC 99 (<i>Reply, HC 1081</i>)
Sixth	Buying Time for Forests: Timber Trade and Public Procurement - The Government Response, HC 909
Seventh	Export Credits Guarantee Department and Sustainable Development, HC 689 (<i>Reply, HC 1238</i>)
Eighth	Energy White Paper – Empowering Change?, HC 618
Ninth	Budget 2003 and Aviation, HC 672
Tenth	Learning the Sustainability Lesson, HC 472 (<i>Reply, HC1221</i>)
Eleventh	Sustainable Development Headline Indicators, HC 1080
Twelfth	World Summit for Sustainable Development – From rhetoric to reality, HC 98

2001-02 Session

First	Departmental Responsibilities for Sustainable Development, HC 326 (<i>Reply, Cm 5519</i>)
Second	Pre-Budget Report 2001: <i>A New Agenda?</i> , HC 363 (<i>HC 1000</i>)
Third	UK Preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, HC 616 (<i>Reply, Cm 5558</i>)
Fourth	Measuring the Quality of Life: The Sustainable Development Headline Indicators, HC 824 (<i>Reply, Cm 5650</i>)
Fifth	A Sustainable Energy Strategy? Renewables and the PIU Review, HC 582 (<i>Reply, HC 471</i>)
Sixth	Buying Time for Forests: <i>Timber Trade and Public Procurement</i> , HC 792-1, (<i>Reply, HC 909, Session 2002-03</i>)

2000-01 Session

First	Environmental Audit: <i>the first Parliament</i> , HC 67 (<i>Reply, Cm 5098</i>)
Second	The Pre-Budget Report 2000: <i>fuelling the debate</i> , HC 71 (<i>Reply HC 216, Session 2001-02</i>)

1999-2000 Session

First	EU Policy and the Environment: An Agenda for the Helsinki Summit, HC 44 (<i>Reply, HC 68</i>)
Second	World Trade and Sustainable Development: An Agenda for the Seattle Summit, HC 45 (Including the Government response to the First Report 1998-99: Multilateral Agreement on Investment, HC 58) (<i>Reply, HC 69</i>)
Third	Comprehensive Spending Review: Government response and follow-up, HC 233 (<i>Reply, HC 70, Session 2000-01</i>)
Fourth	The Pre-Budget Report 1999: pesticides, aggregates and the Climate Change Levy, HC 76
Fifth	The Greening Government Initiative: first annual report from the Green

	Ministers Committee 1998/99, HC 341
Sixth	Budget 2000 and the Environment etc., HC 404
Seventh	Water Prices and the Environment, HC 597 (<i>Reply, HC 290, Session 2000-01</i>)

1998-99 Session

First	The Multilateral Agreement on Investment, HC 58 (<i>Reply, HC 45, Session 1999-2000</i>)
Second	Climate Change: Government response and follow-up, HC 88
Third	The Comprehensive Spending Review and Public Service Agreements, HC 92 (<i>Reply, HC 233, Session 1999-2000</i>)
Fourth	The Pre-Budget Report 1998, HC 93
Fifth	GMOs and the Environment: Coordination of Government Policy, HC 384 (<i>Reply Cm 4528</i>)
Sixth	The Greening Government Initiative 1999, HC 426
Seventh	Energy Efficiency, HC 159 (<i>Reply, HC 571, Session 2000-01</i>)
Eighth	The Budget 1999: Environmental Implications, HC 326

1997-98 Session

First	The Pre-Budget Report, HC 547 (<i>Reply, HC 985</i>)
Second	The Greening Government Initiative, HC 517 (<i>Reply, HC 426, Session 1998-99</i>)
Third	The Pre-Budget Report: Government response and follow-up, HC 985
Fourth	Climate Change: UK Emission Reduction Targets and Audit Arrangements, HC 899 (<i>Reply, HC 88, Session 1998-99</i>)

APPENDIX**Supplementary Memorandum from Fiona Mactaggart MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State and Green Minister, Home Office****THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS OF HOME OFFICE GRANTS TO VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY GROUPS**

When I appeared before the Committee on 2 July¹, I undertook to submit a memorandum outlining the contribution that grants awarded by the Home Office to voluntary and community organisations made to environmental and sustainable development objectives.

The UK Government's approach to building sustainable communities recognises the need to improve the places where people live and work, giving them the chance to play their part in shaping change. It involves meeting people's social needs—promoting better health, housing and access to services and recreation and improving local surroundings—revitalising town centres, tackling degraded urban environments and reducing crime and the fear of crime. It also involves addressing problems of poverty and social exclusion in the most deprived communities and making it easier for people to get involved in their communities. The building of sustainable communities is a crucial element in the Government's sustainable development strategy.

The Home Office has a vital role to play in this vision of a sustainable society and recognises the value that the voluntary and community organisations can play in achieving it. Two of the Home Office's PSA targets demonstrate our commitment to working with partners across society to achieve these sustainable development objectives. The PSA target on community cohesion and race is to bring about measurable improvements in race equality and community cohesion across a range of performance indicators, as part of the Government's objectives on equality and social inclusion. The target on the voluntary and community sector is to increase voluntary and community sector activity, including increasing community participation, by 5% by 2006.

The Department, through delivery of its own key PSA targets and the cross cutting and shared agenda with many delivery partners, is making a very positive contribution to the sustainable development indicators relating to:

- Voluntary activity
- Community activity
- Crime
- Fear of crime
- Education
- Truancies and exclusions from school
- Poverty and social exclusion
- Local deprivation
- Housing
- Health
- Quality of surroundings
- Ethnic minority employment
- Women in public appointments and senior positions
- Employment
- Economic output
- Investment
- Participation in sport and cultural activities

The valuable work of the community and voluntary sector is supported in two main ways. A number of grant schemes have been established to address specific issues and a dedicated Home Office Directorate, the Active Communities Directorate, created to further support their work in the community to deliver our shared objectives of a sustainable, vibrant and cohesive communities.

The Active Communities Directorate alone has funding over the next three years of over £188 million available to support the community and voluntary sector as well as providing a dedicated resource of specific teams tasked with developing the voluntary and community sector's contribution to delivery of public services. This includes a community development team to work with organisations to review and implement small, local grant schemes and a capacity building team to develop a coherent strategy for the provision of capacity building and infrastructure support to voluntary and community organisations in order to enhance workforce and governance skills. Encouragement and facilitation of volunteering and mentoring schemes is the specific role of the Community Involvement Team.

As well as playing a key role in the promotion of the Government's vision for a sustainable society, the Active Communities Directorate, and other units within the Home Office, make grants to build capacity of the organisations at national, regional and local levels and to help the sector in engaging with the Government's agenda.

¹ Please see Minutes of Evidence, HC 961-i, 2002–03, Ev.1–23

However, it is clear that there are tangible but difficult to measure benefits to be gained from a number of other grant schemes not directly associated with the voluntary and community sector. For example, grant funding for improvements in capacity building for other organisations provides opportunity for the development of strong and strategic relationships and partnerships across the community locally. This increases the ability to engage with community stakeholders, including those from the supported voluntary and community sector, and should provide robust and clear frameworks for the development of close community working and the tackling of shared local issues.

DIRECT GRANT SCHEMES

In relation to voluntary and community organisations, there are a number of different grant schemes which contribute to the wide ranging social progress sustainable development objectives. The attached annex, summarises the grant schemes funded by the Home Office, the amounts awarded and the sustainable development benefits of the scheme.

The Mentoring Fund has been established to enable all non-profit mentoring organisations to improve the network of mentoring services by better use of and access to information and communication technology. It also provides for better sustainable, long-term development of the services and helps to build the capacity of organisations enabling them to serve their volunteers and clients and support or improve their services. 65 organisations have been supported with funding totaling £1.8 million a year.

The Time Limited Development Fund is aimed at developing community activity in deprived areas by giving funding for the salary costs of a Community Support worker for three years. Addressing concerns over lack of workforce resource, the Community Support Worker provides valuable assistance at grass roots level to help achieve the Home Office targets on increasing community participation. The scheme supports 113 organisations at a cost of £4.5 million this year with £13.5 million funding made available throughout the three-year scheme.

The Volunteering programme provided funding to 56 organisations for £8.1 million in 2002–03 to increase participation in communities through volunteering. The Government sees volunteering as a substantial social investment that creates social capital and makes a major contribution to a healthy civil society. Amongst those awarded grants are umbrella voluntary organisations that develop practitioner networks, promote, pilot and disseminate good practice and match up people interested in volunteering with opportunities and build local partnerships and strong local networks. Of the 56 organisations in receipt of funding, significant grants have been made to the Experience Corps, Timebank and Community Channel. Further information on the volunteering programme can be found in the “Volunteering: A code of practice” published as part of the Home Office compacts series.

Public Sector Volunteering Match Funding supports the creation of 66,000 new volunteering opportunities in the delivery of public services, including work in libraries, colleges, prisons, sports coaching and the Merseyside Fire Service. £60 million matched funding has been allocated for the scheme for 2001–04 making it £120 million in total. This scheme is administered by seven departments, including the Home Office.

Sector Development grants aim to support national voluntary and community sector umbrella bodies by building capacity of the organisations and to help the sector in engaging with the Government’s agenda. 34 organisations were supported at a total cost of just under £4 million in 2002–03. Sector Development grants aim to build infrastructure and indirectly contribute towards our target of getting more people active in their communities. For example, the National Association of Councils for Voluntary Service as an umbrella organisation gives membership to smaller organisations to provide training and other workforce and resource assistance to build infrastructure networks across the sector.

The Capacity Building grant scheme aims to develop community skills and build local infrastructure. The scheme supports 28 organisations with total funding of just over £2 million in 2002–03. Amongst the sectors, which benefit from the scheme is the black minority ethnic (BME) voluntary and community sector. It was recognised that the capacity of the BME voluntary and community sector to be a full and equal partner with Government and the mainstream sector was limited. Capacity building within BME organisations is directed towards policies and initiatives that enhance the skills of individuals within organisations. This can be achieved by developing initiatives, which provide various types of support and advice in addition to strategic and/or project funding. For example, Home Office recently provided funding for a “Twinning” programme to encourage equal partnerships between larger established mainstream organisations and BME voluntary and community sector organisations to build the fundraising capacity of the BME sector.

The Strategic Relations scheme also aims to support regional and local voluntary and community sector umbrella bodies by providing funding to 34 organisations for a total of £3.1 million in 2002–03. It helps build the capacity of voluntary sector organisations eg the 18 regional networks (nine generalist and nine BME), and the Council of Ethnic Minority Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations.

Grants in Aid are payments given to finance all or part of the running costs of an organisation. Funding totaling £13.3 million a year is made to four, key national organisations, ie the Women’s Royal Voluntary Service, National Council of Voluntary Organisations, Community Development Foundation and the Experience Corp for their work in the community which meets the shared aims and objectives of the Home Office to achieve a sustainable and inclusive community.

The Capital Modernisation Fund aims to modernise volunteer bureaux services and to provide easier access to involvement in community activities. It supported 21 organisations with capital grants of £4.6 million in 2002-03. This grant scheme provides investment capital, such as refurbishment of buildings or buying computers etc, to improve infrastructure and resources projects to match the quality of services provided to their communities.

The Community Cohesion Pathfinder Programme provides support for the voluntary and community sector to focus on and promote community cohesion. The programme recognises the needs of marginalised communities and aims to build the capacity of communities themselves to challenge statutory and voluntary services and provide a bottom up approach to community cohesion. The programme funds the community and voluntary sector to achieve outcomes in relation to producing evidence of their contribution to community cohesion in partnership with the local authority, evidence of how they effectively contributed to and supported the overall pathfinder action plan and evidence of having built community capacity and understanding of community cohesion within their voluntary and community sector and having encouraged community facilitation. Fourteen pathfinder areas were selected and each was awarded £285,000 for the period February 2003 to September 2004. £90,000 was provided to the lead community and voluntary sector organisation in the local authority area, £150,000 to the local authority and the remaining £45,000 to the Community Champions programmes targeted at young people.

Positive Activities for Young People is a cross government and lottery funded school holidays programme that aims to use high quality cultural, sporting and educational activities to cut street crime, promote community cohesion and encourage young people to return to education and training. The Home Office contribution to the first year funds of £25 million is £1.5 million. The programme is targeted at eight to 19 year olds and those most at risk will receive key worker support. The scheme is administered through the nine regional Government Offices who have in turn appointed sub-regional Lead Delivery Agents (LDAs). It is the responsibility of LDAs to assess local needs and commission and deliver services appropriately.

The Family Support Grant is designed to develop policies and programmes to ensure that every parent has access to the support they need to build confident families. The Government recognises the role of the voluntary sector in providing services to parents and aims to empower them in bringing up children. The Family Policy Unit runs an annual competition programme to develop effective and accessible support for families. The Unit is responsible for the development and management of the Family Support Grants programme. This was established to provide infrastructure funding for national voluntary organisations promoting parenting support and to improve parenting support through the promotion of innovative methods of work at a national/regional/local level in the voluntary sector. The current grant scheme funded 119 projects at a total cost of £5.3 million in 2002-03 and organisations which have already benefited include those giving advice and support to parents and families, with particular emphasis on work with boys, young men and fathers. Funding since the programme started exceeds £10 million and has made a real difference to parents coping with the pressures of modern family life. The Family Policy Unit transferred to the Department for Education and Skills in June 2003.

The Connecting Communities Grant was developed in 2000 to tackle racial disadvantage at grass roots level and promote dialogue between communities, to strengthen the collective voice of minority ethnic communities in order to help them engage more effectively with service providers and policy makers. The scheme aims to remove the barriers faced by women and young men in accessing opportunities for employment, training and further education. In particular, it encourages people from minority ethnic communities to seek employment in the police, fire, prison and probation services in order to help create a workforce which is representative of the communities they serve. The grant scheme also helps to counter racist, negative stereotyping of minority ethnic communities by celebrating the positive contribution they have made to life in this country.

Grants totalling £11.6 million was awarded to 75 voluntary and community sector organisations between October 2000 and March 2003 and a further £15 million has been made available for a new round of funding under Connecting Communities from September 2003 to March 2006.

The new grant awards, to be announced shortly, will also focus on new work to build trust and understanding between minority ethnic communities and public authorities. There will also be work under the grant to build trust and understanding between communities of different ethnic or faith origin in order to promote unity, shared values and community cohesion.

Street Crime Initiative brings together the police, criminal justice agencies, several Government departments and local bodies to bring an unprecedented level of focus and co-ordination to address street crime. As part of the initiative Victim Support were granted £1.5 million in 2002-03 to complement resources available to both enhance the service to victims of street crime and to ensure they stayed confident in the criminal justice system. It also helps provide the support to victims to pursue cases through to prosecution to achieve a reduction in the attrition rate.

The Adventure Capital Fund is a new initiative piloting new forms of financial investment for community enterprise to overcome the constraints that have hindered innovation. The Home Office has contributed £2 million funding to the scheme to secure long term finance to provide the resources and expertise to plan for the future and work towards promoting capacity building and enable a wide range of organisations to contribute to community renewal and on a sustainable basis.

August 2003

Annex

SUMMARY OF HO GRANTS TO VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR

Grant Scheme	Purpose of Grant	No of Organisations Supported	Total Amount awarded	Sustainable Development Benefits
Mentoring Fund	Improve network of mentoring services	65	£1.8 million in 2002–03	Employment, poverty and social exclusion, education, truancies, crime, fear of crime, ethnic minority employment, women in public appointments and senior positions, voluntary activity and community spirit.
Time Limited Development Fund	Develop community activity in deprived areas	113	£4 million in 2002–03	Poverty and social exclusion, local deprivation, voluntary activity, community spirit, employment.
Volunteering Programme	To increase participation in communities	56	£8 million in 2002–03	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, local deprivation, crime, fear of crime, employment, economic output, housing, health, education and quality of surroundings.
Public Sector Volunteering Match Funding	Community Participation and support of delivery of public services	24	£12 million in 2002–03	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, local deprivation, crime, fear of crime, employment, economic output, housing, health, education, participation in sport and cultural activities and quality of surroundings.
Sector Development	Capacity building and engagement with Government	34	£3.9 million in 2002–03	Voluntary activity, community spirit, education, poverty and social exclusion, local deprivation, employment, crime, fear of crime.
Capacity Building	Development of community skills and build activity	28	£2 million in 2002–03	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, ethnic minority employment, local deprivation, crime, fear of crime, education, employment.
Strategic Relations	Build capacity of national umbrella voluntary sector organisations	44	£3.1 million in 2002–03	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, ethnic minority employment, local deprivation, crime, fear of crime, education, employment.
Women's Royal Voluntary Service	Provide support to those in need of care within the local community	1	£4.2 million	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, access for disabled people, access to services, health.
National Council of Voluntary Organisations	Provide support to voluntary organisations	1	£0.8 million	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, ethnic minority employment, local deprivation, crime, fear of crime, education, employment.

Grant Scheme	Purpose of Grant	No of Organisations Supported	Total Amount awarded	Sustainable Development Benefits
Community Development Foundation	Work to achieve sustainable and inclusive communities	1	£1 million	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, local deprivation, crime, fear of crime, education and ethnic minority employment.
Experience Corp	Provide expertise and guidance to communities through the experience of retired people	1	£7.2 million	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, local deprivation, crime, fear of crime, education.
Capital Modernisation Round 2	Modernisation of the volunteer bureau	21	£4.7 million	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, local deprivation, crime, fear of crime, education, access to services.
Community Cohesion Pathfinder Programme	Focus on and support community cohesion.	14	£4 million 2/03–9/04	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, local deprivation, crime, fear of crime, education, quality of surroundings.
Positive Activities for Young People	Cut crime and build communities	Administered by DCMS—programme under assessment.	£1 million HO contribution (£25 million cross govt)	Crime, Fear of Crime, Truancies, Education, Poverty and social exclusion, local deprivation, participation in sport and other cultural activities, community spirit, voluntary activity.
Family Support Grant	Provide services to parents.	119	£5.3 million	Crime, fear of crime, community spirit, voluntary activity, education, truancies and exclusions from schools, ethnic minority employment, participation in sport and cultural activities.
Connecting Communities	Tackle racial disadvantage and promote dialogue	75	£11.6 million 10/00–3/03	Ethnic minority employment, poverty and social exclusion, employment, education, voluntary activity, community spirit.
Street Crime Initiative	Victim Support	1	£1.5 million	Fear of crime, crime, voluntary activity, community spirit
Adventure Capital Fund	Support delivery of long term improvements to communities	30	£2 million	Voluntary activity, community spirit, poverty and social exclusion, crime, fear of crime, quality of surroundings.