



**Meeting of the EFFC Sustainability Working Group held on Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> May between 09:00 – 12:00 (BST) / 10:00 – 13:00 (CET) via WebEx Conference Call**

**In Attendance:**

Ruben Van den Bröck	Belgium
Luke Deamer	UK
Jeroen Ritzer van Dinther	Netherlands
Chris Harnan (Chair)	UK
Juliette Léchard	France
Heleni Pantelidou	UK
Rick Riggelink	Netherlands
Alexander Rostert	Germany
Alexander Zöhler	Austria

**Present:**

Ciaran Jennings	EFFC Secretary
Isabel Jennings	EFFC Secretariat

	<b>Actions</b>	
<b>A Körbler</b>	Contact Lafarge on their work on carbon capture.	1 <sup>st</sup> July
<b>C Jennings C Harnan</b>	Look at addressing the issues raised about working group representation	ASAP
<b>Low Carbon Concrete TG</b>	1) Ruben to send Isabel BBRI reports 2) Alex R to send Isabel German Cement Associate report 3) Circulate the German Cement Association report and BBRI reports with minutes	Ongoing ASAP ASAP ASAP
<b>KPI/Roadmap TG</b>	1) Outline new proposal for the short-term roadmap to present at the next meeting	Ongoing 1 <sup>st</sup> July
<b>I Jennings</b>	Organise next KPI/Roadmap TG meeting.	ASAP
<b>C Jennings</b>	Follow-up conversation with Claire Price and set a meeting to discuss BSI low carbon agenda.	1 <sup>st</sup> July

Minutes		
<b>1. Meeting Formalities</b>	The minutes of the meeting held on 24th February were approved.	
<b>2. EFFC Executive Meeting Feedback</b>	<p>Sustainability WG presentation – <a href="#">available here</a></p> <p>Chris commented that the group received Executive approval for the Sustainability Roadmap and ‘How to’ guides. Chris also noted that the Executive are happy with the prioritisation of the SDG’s and equally happy to review them yearly at the AGM.</p> <p>Luke stated that it will be important to collaborate with the National Federations whilst framing the “what, why, how and measure” sections of the guides. Chris noted the group was challenged by the Executive regards National Federation and contractor involvement. Chris commented that he will work with Ciaran to address these issues of representation.</p> <p>Chris noted the Executive felt a joint DFI-EFFC SWG might delay the EFFC’s progress. Chris explained that Luke presented a similar set of slides to the DFI SWG and that it is clear the DFI are still in the data collection phase. Luke commented the DFI would benefit from us sharing our work but that there would be no initial benefit to the EFFC SWG.</p> <p>Ciaran asked whether it is worth having a DFI SWG member join this group as an observer – likely Björn Böhle. Chris commented that, at the executive meeting, Maurice proposed a DFI-Europe representative join the group. Chris expressed his opinion that DFI Europe should not have a representative on the EFFC SWG but would be open to it if other members felt it would be beneficial.</p> <p>Jeroen asked what the advantage of collaboration with the DFI would be. Luke noted that there are two advantages – 1) EFFC metrics could be adopted in America and 2) we could share best practices/pre-existing company member initiatives.</p> <p>Chris noted that he has asked Hanno Bliss whether he would like to have someone from Bauer on this group.</p>	C Harnan C Jennings
<b>3. Low Carbon Concrete TG (update)</b>	<p><u>TEC-3 WG Progress</u></p> <p>Chris explained that he did not attend the last TEC-3 meeting, but that Luke enquired about creating a pan-European WG on cement. It was noted that Sue Arundale has put Chris in touch with the Cement Bureau, but they have had no contact yet.</p> <p>Chris noted that Cement Bureau appears to be undertaking a lot of pan-European work and the EFFC should look to co-ordinate with them if possible. Heleni explained that Cem Bureau are the main body on cement and the ‘go to’ body at EU level.</p>	

Heleni asked why the EFFC are taking a different route to the FPS on concrete. Chris noted that the FPS is UK-centric and the EFFC group needs to have a broader focus. Heleni agreed but noted that the lack of collaboration means work is overlapping. Ciaran commented that the FPS group is focusing on environmental sustainability and agreed they should try to coordinate the efforts. It was agreed that the EFFC should enable better communication with all National Federations.

#### Ruben BBRI update

Ruben noted that there has been a lot of progress in Belgium. Ruben explained that the BBRI have published the findings of their circular concrete project. It was noted that there were two positive reports from this project. [The first report is an update to the state of the art](#) (approx. 100 pages long) and the [second is titled “design and application of all sorts of circulate concrete”](#) (approx. 50 pages long).

Ruben commented the second report is a good ‘how to’ guide focusing on design, engineers and all other facets of construction. Ruben noted that these reports are in Dutch. The reports also provide links to examples of associations interested in circular concrete. Ruben noted the BBRI have also provided a guide on the use of concrete which is not of ‘European standard’.

Chris asked Ruben to send the reports across to Isabel for circulation. It was agreed the group would review and then look into translating if it deemed valuable.

In the meeting chat Jeroen commented that this website is a good online translator - <https://www.deepl.com/translator>.

#### Alexander Rostert Presentation - German Cement Industry document

Alexander R shared his presentation – [see presentation here](#).

Alex commented that the German cement industry document on the decarbonisation of cement and concrete has now been partially translated - [executive summary in English](#). Alex noted that there is an element of a timeline at the start with scenarios up to 2050 presented – and any pre-requisites for this including a political framework.

The report states that since 1990 German cement manufacturers have already reduced CO2 by 22% due to thermal efficiency and an increased use of alternative energy/fuels. It notes the CO2 emissions associated with clinker production cannot be reduced any further. Therefore, efforts to fully decarbonise will heavily depend on raw materials. Carbon capture, utilisation and storage (CCUS) plays a part in all potential savings.

Alex stated that this will require cooperation throughout the supply-chain including manufacturers, designers, architects and contractors. It will also require policy frameworks to adapt as they need to allow for competitive markets. It was noted green cement needs to be promoted equally with the same opportunities to excel.

R van den  
Bröck  
I Jennings

<p>Alex commented that they have drafted 2 scenarios - an 'ambitious reference' and a 'climate neutrality' scenario. Alex noted that there are significant external effects of both scenarios – the natural process of decarbonisation and decrease in construction demand.</p> <p>Alex explained that an important part of the carbon neutrality scenario is the innovation of breakthrough technologies – e.g., CEM VI, the use of hydrogen as an energy source and CCUS. The report suggests the industry could provide a carbon sink by 2050 if CCUS is efficiently utilised. Alex noted that the measurement assumptions are included in the presentation with a clear reference to the ambition and climate neutrality scenarios.</p> <p>Alex explained that more than double the amount of power will be necessary for clinker production as a result of carbon capture technologies. Therefore, the availability of renewable energy is crucial for this scenario – along with an improved infrastructure grid.</p> <p>The 5 bricks which form the prerequisites for the scenarios include – availability of renewable energy and power grids; suitable infrastructure for CO2 transport; policy framework for competitiveness and innovation; markets for low-and carbon-neutral cement/concrete; and societal acceptance for industrial transformation.</p> <p>Alex commented that he would circulate the overview and the paper to be included in the minutes.</p> <p>Chris thanked Alex for his presentation and opened the floor for discussion.</p> <p>Rick asked Alex who owns this paper. Alex commented that this paper is from the German Concrete Association and was published in December 2020. Rick then asked what steps Züblin are planning to take to decarbonise cement and concrete. Alex noted that it is difficult for the construction industry to lead on the issue of CO2 reduction as we have a lot less influence as we are required to use their materials.</p> <p>Heleni noted that we do have influence as, from a design POV, the industry is already seeing client requests for low carbon materials. Heleni noted that if every specification requires you to have low carbon concrete the industry will make sure to adapt quickly. Heleni urged that we should start pushing for the decarbonisation of cement and stated that we need to make the first step together so we can adapt. Heleni noted that the group may want to compare with the <a href="#">UK concrete road map</a>. Luke agreed with Heleni commenting that we have more influence than we think.</p> <p>Ruben noted that the two scenarios heavily rely on breakthrough technologies and that there are major obstacles to overcome before these are viable. It was commented that there are already some initiatives for capture/storage. For example, Ruben commented that <a href="#">Heidelberg Cement</a> are planning carbon capture in Belgium.</p>	<p>A Rostert</p>
--	------------------

	<p>Alex noted that this is a political paper and, of course, they are trying to involve other stakeholders. Alex commented that it is understandable that they cannot make all the strides on their own.</p> <p>Luke warned that depending on carbon capture is difficult because it is a big innovation. Chris agreed with Luke but noted that the low hanging fruit is carbon capture and renewable energy. Chris commented without carbon capture the goals of 2050 will not be achieved.</p> <p>Luke noted that in order to capture Keller’s scope 1+2 we would have to plant a forest the size of Berlin every year before taking into consideration our scope 3 emissions (materials). We cannot off-set or capture that volume of CO2 as it is. Luke stressed that we need to have a massive reduction before we can be a sure of that.</p> <p>Ruben agreed with Luke, commenting that carbon storage is a big problem and the solution will likely be a mix of different solutions/technologies. It was agreed this needed to be a collaborative effort. Ruben noted that sometimes you just have to start and see where we get.</p> <p>Ciaran commented a potential challenge could be getting new low carbon materials used across the industry. Ciaran noted that a line will need to be drawn between what is industry practice and what provides a market advantage.</p>	
<p><b>4. KPI/Roadmap TG (update)</b></p>	<p>Luke commented that the group spent a long time pulling together the Executive slides and formulating a strategy plan. Luke noted that the first best practices have been collated from Maud’s CO2 performance ladder presentation. Luke explained the next step is pulling together the first ‘How to’ guides. Luke noted that, for the metrics piece of this work, there is still a lot of discussion about how to approach carbon intensity long-term.</p> <p>Jeroen noted that the group needs to pull together a plan covering all associated costs – especially as a dashboard platform will cost money and the ‘How to’ guides will be time intensive.</p> <p>Jeroen commented that the last time a budget was discussed there was no clear answer whether this would be funded by the EFFC, FIEC or member companies. Ciaran noted that the EFFC funds projects through the special projects fund, but we could also look for sponsorship as was done for the Tremie Guide.</p> <p>It was agreed the challenge with this project is producing something with real value. Luke commented that the group have discussed compiling a proof of concept for a few SDGs to prove value. Jeroen noted a simplified dashboard showing quick wins would definitely be a good starting point. Jeroen stressed that this needs to be an add-on which brings value to the companies.</p> <p>Ciaran suggested the EFFC’s aim should be to set the framework by defining the information we are capturing whilst using common, scalable</p>	

	<p>tools. Ciaran noted that most people having access to Office 365 which means software like Power BI would work well. Ciaran concluded that we need to sell the value of a common reporting framework.</p> <p>Jeroen commented that each National Federation (NF) will have their own frameworks to get to the same goal. Jeroen suggested we ask the NFs for 4-5 KPIs per SDG and then provide simple detail the how, why and what. This will keep the documents easy to understand and adopt.</p> <p>Chris commented that his understanding is the first KPIs are scope 1 + 2 emissions compared with €1 million revenue &amp; per 100,000 hours worked. Luke noted that the Executive slides gave examples for carbon but there will be others to add regards material use. Chris noted that this commitment is a major step for the EFFC so we cannot look to add everything at once – despite the importance of material use.</p> <p>Chris suggested that the group stick to these three KPIs initially and then add more later. Ruben agreed noting that the EFFC need to be there for the NFs and not overwhelm them. Luke noted, in this case, that CO2e per €1 million revenue and per 100,000 hours worked is a brilliant starting point – especially as larger companies will already have this data.</p> <p>Jeroen noted that the group is already struggling to get feedback on the KPIs and roadmap. Chris agreed and commented that getting this data is going to be a lot of hard work and will require us to do a lot of chasing. It was agreed that simplifying the process will make this easier.</p> <p>Luke asked Chris whether the commitment was from companies or NFs. Chris noted that he made the point it needs to be both and we will then need to do the sorting between the data.</p> <p>Luke noted that there is very little value in analysing that type of aggregated data so will not need a platform. Chris commented that this data would map change opposed to actual numbers. Luke warned that yearly fluctuations would skew the data considerably.</p> <p>Jeroen commented that the KPI TG will go away and come back with a new proposal for the short-term roadmap. Isabel agreed to set up a KPI TG meeting in June.</p>	I Jennings
<p><b>5. DFI-EFFC Conference, Berlin 2022</b></p>	<p>Ciaran explained that over 100 abstracts have been submitted so far and that the deadline for full papers is Friday 18<sup>th</sup> July.</p> <p>Ciaran noted that the next step for the organising committee is to appoint session chairs. The session chairs will need to attend the conference and have the freedom to organise their session – e.g., whether they are panel discussions, presentations etc.</p> <p>Ciaran noted that no session chairs have been confirmed yet but that it is the EFFC role of getting contractors. It was noted that session chairs will also need volunteers to help review papers.</p>	

	<p>Jeroen and Luke volunteered to review papers – although Luke is also submitting a paper. The group nominated Chris to put his name forward as the session chair for sustainability.</p>	
6.	<p><b>EFFC SWG webinar (update)</b></p> <p><a href="#">[please find full recording here]</a></p> <p>It was noted the webinar is going live on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> May and that it would be uploaded to the EFFC website afterwards.</p> <p>The webinar slides were shared for the group to review. The group commented that the presentations look interesting and informative.</p>	
7.	<p><b>FIEC, Sustainability at European level (updates)</b></p> <p>a. FIEC Sustainability WG</p> <p>Nothing to discuss.</p> <p>b. FIEC TEC-3</p> <p>Luke commented that the last TEC-3 meeting was uninspiring and in line with traditional FIEC ways of ‘oppose everything’.</p> <p>Luke noted they mostly discussed the ‘energy performance of buildings’ directive which does not directly impact the geotechnical sector too much. Luke commented that they essentially decided to oppose everything which helps to measure carbon emissions in a building. Luke commented that he did provide solutions to standardising how we calculate carbon emissions but have decided to oppose anyway.</p> <p>Jeroen asked why they want to oppose the legislation. Luke commented that they think it is simply too much hard work and would ‘be a mess’.</p> <p>Luke commented that they also discussed the #BuildingLife Campaign which they are part of with the Green Building Council. Luke noted the campaign is looking to set carbon reduction targets of 40% by 2030. This would impact the entire built environment. Luke commented that FIEC are not planning on signing the targets because they do not see that it is feasible or fixed.</p> <p>Luke concluded by saying that he did raise the idea of compiling best practices and pushing forward that way. The answer was they are too busy, so the project was declined.</p> <p>Chris commented that this is a problem with the Chair and noted that we should monitor any progress but not to bother contributing.</p> <p>c. FIEC Taxonomy WG</p> <p>Nothing to discuss.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p>	

	Nothing to discuss.	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Next steps and next meeting</b> It was agreed the next steps would be a KPI TG meeting in June.	