Harmonizing Corporate Carbon Footprints

Lena Klaaßen (lena.klaassen@tum.de)
Technical University Munich
Christian Stoll
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Article

Keywords: Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Decarbonization, Carbon Accounting and Reporting, Value Chain Emissions

Posted Date: November 30th, 2020

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-99537/v1

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Nature Communications on October 22nd, 2021. See the published version at https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-26349-x.

Harmonizing Corporate Carbon Footprints

Lena Klaaßen[1,2], Christian Stoll[2,3]*

Abstract

Global greenhouse gas emissions need to reach net-zero around mid-century to limit global warming to 1.5°C. This decarbonization challenge has, *inter alia*, increased the political and societal pressure on companies to disclose their carbon footprints. As a response, numerous companies announced roadmaps to become carbon neutral or even negative. The first step on the journey towards carbon neutrality, however, is to quantify corporate emissions accurately. Current carbon accounting and reporting practices remain unsystematic and incomparable, particularly for emissions along the value chain (scope 3). Here we present a framework to harmonize scope 3 emissions by accounting for reporting inconsistency, boundary incompleteness, and activity exclusion. In a case study of the tech sector, we find that corporate reports omit half of the total emissions. The framework we present may help companies, investors, and policy makers to identify and close the gaps in corporate carbon footprints.

[1] TUM School of Management, Technical University of Munich, Germany.
[2] MIT Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA.
[3] TUM Center for Energy Markets, TUM School of Management, Technical University of Munich, Germany.
*Correspondence: lena.klaassen@tum.de

Introduction

Global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions need to reach net-zero around mid-century to limit global warming to 1.5°C.[1] This decarbonization challenge has, *inter alia*, increased the political and societal pressure on companies to disclose their GHG emissions, and urged climate action as a top priority for internal and external stakeholders.[2; 3] As a response, major companies – particularly from the tech sector – recently announced to become carbon neutral, or even carbon negative.[4–8]

The first step on the journey towards corporate carbon neutrality is to quantify the current level of emissions accurately. In absence of binding regulation, alliances of non-governmental organizations have shaped corporate carbon accounting practices. The World Resources Institute and the World Business Council on Sustainable Development set the global standard for corporations to assess their carbon footprint with the so-called 'GHG Protocol'.[9] The GHG Protocol distinguishes three categories of emissions: scope 1 refers to direct emissions from a company's own activities, scope 2 refers to emissions from the production of purchased energy, and scope 3 refers to emissions from up- and downstream activities along the value chain.[10]

The GHG Protocol initially required only the disclosure of scope 1 and 2 emissions, providing little guidance on scope 3 measurement. In 2011, the GHG Protocol filled this gap with a supplement that defines minimum boundaries for the measurement of up- and downstream scope 3 emissions.[11] And yet, measurement and disclosure of scope 3 emissions remain unsystematic and incomparable since the supplement falls far short of meeting the acceptance of the basic GHG Protocol standard.[12] Likewise on a jurisdictional level: France and the United Kingdom introduced mandatory carbon reporting schemes in 2012 and 2013, however, without binding scope 3 disclosure.[13; 14]

Consequently, scope 3 emissions may cause large discrepancies in corporate carbon footprints. For most industries in the United States (U.S.) and China, scope 3 emissions account for over 80% of the total emissions,[15; 16] and the share has grown globally over the past decades.[17] Although previous studies identify sources of error in scope 3 estimates,[12; 18–21] quantitative analyses remain scarce and little is known about the type and size of error. One study focusing on large U.S. companies, for instance, finds that companies on average reported less than 25% of their upstream scope 3 emissions in 2013.[22]

Here we present a framework to quantify scope 3 emissions in a standardized way. Firstly, we develop a framework to quantify omitted emissions by accounting for reporting inconsistency, boundary incompleteness, and activity exclusion. Secondly, we apply the framework to the tech sector, and exemplarily calculate harmonized corporate carbon footprints. To do so, we select companies from the Forbes Global 2000 list within the IT software and service (ITSS) and technology hardware and equipment (THE) industry. For the selected companies, we collect emission data disclosed in corporate reports (CRs), as well as information provided by the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) – the largest environmental disclosure registry.

Overall, we find that CRs omit half of the total emissions. For our sample of 56 tech companies, the gap between reported and harmonized emissions sums up to 391 megatons (Mt) carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e) per annum. 202 MtCO_2e thereof result from omitted upstream emissions and 189 MtCO_2e from omitted downstream emissions. On the industry level, we find similar deviations between harmonized and self-reported carbon footprints: for the ITSS sample +99%, and for the THE sample +110%. On the firm level, emissions increase in the median by a factor of four through the harmonization, with deviations ranging from +0.03% to a factor of +185x in one case.

The case study of the tech sector shows that self-reported corporate carbon footprints may be seriously and unevenly distorted, and thus are incomparable. The current lack of methodological clarity impedes effective carbon management strategies, hinders reduction target setting, and decreases the informative value for stakeholders. This becomes particularly fatal as transparency constitutes a prerequisite of promoting sustainable investment.

Therefore, the framework we propose may help companies, investors, and policy makers to identify and close the gaps in corporate carbon footprints. The framework may help companies to identify shortcomings in their emissions calculations and align decarbonization strategies. Furthermore, the framework allows investors to gauge the exposure to potential regulatory changes, such as the ramp up of carbon pricing schemes. The framework may also help policy makers to compare the environmental impact of single companies and develop holistic carbon disclosure mandates.

Three Sources for Error and How to Overcome Them

Previous literature identifies multiple sources of error in publicly disclosed scope 3 emissions. We cluster these in three areas, which are reporting inconsistency, boundary incompleteness, and activity exclusion.

First, companies report scope 3 emissions inconsistently across different communication channels. Depoers et al. (2016) find that French companies disclose lower total GHG emission figures in their corporate reports (CRs) than to the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). The reason for the discrepancy can be found in partially or completely omitted scope 3 emissions, which suggest that companies intentionally understate scope 3 emissions in CRs.[18] This behavior might be reinforced by the evaluation scheme of the CDP, which openly communicates scores without indicating emission figures. In the evaluation process, the CDP disregards information outside the program responses and there is no obligation to provide consistent information in CRs.[23] Hence, a good score may improve a company's publicly perceived credibility with regard to the quality and completeness of their disclosures – despite reporting inconsistently across channels.

Second, emission calculations of scope 3 categories partly face incompleteness with regard to the minimum boundaries set by the greenhouse gas (GHG) Protocol. The GHG Protocol's scope 3 standard recommends companies to choose the most suitable calculation approach for each of the 15 scope 3 category depending on data availability and quality.[24] The proposed methods can be traced back to three basic carbon accounting approaches: economic input-output, process-based, or a hybrid of the two. Economic input-output analysis is a top-down technique that uses financial transaction data. Combined with emission factors, this method enables straightforward and system-complete emission calculations.[25] In contrast, process-based analysis is a bottom-up technique that uses detailed estimations of each step.[26] A hybrid model starts with a bottom-up estimate and fills the gaps with top-down figures.[27] To enhance specificity, companies are encouraged to draw on primary data for categories which are highly influential.[11] The CDP fosters primary data collection for upstream emissions through its 'Supply Chain Program', which contains emissions data of over 5,500 tier 1 suppliers of 115 member companies. However, only one third of the suppliers reports own scope 3 emissions.[28] As a consequence, most companies cannot quantify the emissions along their entire supply chain with primary data only, which results in boundary incompleteness if the gaps are not filled with secondary data.

Third, reporting companies may neglect relevant scope 3 activities entirely. Although the GHG Protocol's scope 3 supplement provides guidance for companies, the supplement falls far short of meeting the acceptance of the basic standard.[12] The CDP structures its questionnaire along the 15 scope 3 categories but leaves it to the participants to identify relevant categories (see supplementary data: sheet 4.3). It is estimated that two categories alone, *purchased goods and services* (category 1) and *use of sold products* (category 11), together account for almost the entire scope 3 emissions.[29] Still, across industries, the relative importance of categories appears to differ. The share that the categories 1 and 11 capture varies between 25% (electric utilities & independent power producers) and 85% (Electrical Equipment & Machinery).[30] As of 2017, only a quarter of the companies reporting scope 3 figures within the CDP disclosed emissions for all categories they consider as relevant.[30]

In sum, reporting inconsistency, boundary incompleteness, and activity exclusion contribute at different stages to errors in scope 3 emissions measurement. While reporting inconsistency occurs after the accounting process, boundary incompleteness and activity exclusion occur due to misjudgments prior to the actual measurement. As previous literature has discussed the three sources of error independently, our framework aims for completeness. Correcting for the errors in the three areas allows for quantification of omitted scope 3 emissions, as well as for calculating harmonized carbon footprints. Figure 1 illustrates the stepwise approach of the framework. The mathematical formulation can be found in the methods section.



Figure 1| Visualization of the framework to harmonize corporate carbon footprints.

To overcome the three sources of error, we analyze each independently to derive the combined effect. Therefore, we resort to information from CRs and the CDP (see supplementary data: sheets 4.1-4.4). CRs include voluntary reports, such as sustainability reports or annual reports, and mandatory reports, such as forms filed for state authorities. They provide information regarding the company's carbon footprint as well as financial and company-related details. The CDP responses supplement the data basis with more comprehensive environmental information. CDP responses contain emissions figures structured in accordance with the 15 distinct scope 3 categories and provide explanations on the methodology and justifications with regard to missing emission figures.

For reporting inconsistency, we quantify the error by taking the difference between the amount of emissions reported in the CR and in the CDP. We only consider scope 3 emissions since we assume that scope 1 and 2 emissions are reported completely and consistently.

For boundary incompleteness, we classify an emission figure as incomplete in case it does not follow the category-specific minimum boundary of the scope 3 standard in the GHG Protocol (see supplementary data: sheet 3.3). To correct incomplete emission figures, we derive category-specific carbon intensities of the peer industry group. Carbon intensities and corrected emission figures are calculated utilizing key performance indicators as emission predictors (see supplementary data: sheet 2.4 and 3.2). We exclude peer companies with incomplete emission figures and use the median to control for outliers. A special case are emission figures subject to incomplete boundaries, but which still show higher intensities than the peer median. In such cases, we do not adjust the emission figures downwards but keep the self-reported value.

For activity exclusion, an activity is deemed excluded in case the company does not provide an emission figure even though the category is relevant to the business. We assume categories to be relevant unless the company specifically states that emissions are non-existent. All other justification, such as unavailability of data, non-significant amounts of emissions, or the lack of evaluation are not accepted. This strict approach helps to overcome the challenge posed by the qualitative formulation of the criteria for identifying relevant scope 3 activities in the GHG Protocol. It avoids different interpretations and limits the leeway granted in favor of enhanced comparability. We derive the emissions of excluded scope 3 categories analogous to the calculation of adjusted emissions in case of boundary incompleteness.

Case Study: Harmonizing Carbon Footprints of Tech Companies

Tech companies themselves have identified climate change as a key area of concern for their businesses since it poses important social and environmental issues that need to be managed. Several have announced progressive pledges to reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and become entirely carbon neutral or even carbon negative.[5–8] In addition to the general ambiguities in carbon disclosures, these climate action ambitions are criticized for a lack of transparency.[31]

The amount of energy consumed by tech companies elevated the need for a standardized view on carbon emissions in this sector. With their energy consumption, digital technologies cause 4% of global GHG emissions as of 2020, and the share is set to double by 2025.[32] The tech sector consists of industries that are among the highest emitting.[30] With 97% upstream scope 3 emissions, the United States (U.S.) computer manufacturing industry surpasses the industry average of 75%.[15; 33]

For our case study, we select companies that adhere to the Forbes Global 2000 List 2019. This index ranks the world's largest public companies according to sales, profit, assets, and market value.[34] The focus on public companies offers the advantage of higher data availability. The technology sector in the index is split into three industries: IT software and service (ITSS), technology hardware and equipment (THE), and semiconductors. To ensure the continued relevance of the sample, we exclude companies which are no longer part of the Forbes Global 2000 List 2020. This results in 55 ITSS companies, 51 THE companies, and 26 semiconductor companies spread across Asia, Europe, and the U.S (see supplementary data: sheet 3.4 for summary statistics). For our case study, we exclude the smallest group, semiconductor companies, since the framework's robustness is linked to the number of comparable peers. The framework set-up requires company-specific information from corporate reports (CRs) and the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). Thus, only companies, which submitted a CDP response in 2019 can be considered. Less than half and around two thirds of the companies in the ITSS and the THE sample respectively submitted a valid CDP response in 2019. This results in our final samples with 22 ITSS and 34 THE companies.

For the first source of error, reporting inconsistency, we find lower scope 3 emissions in the CR than in the CDP response for half the tech companies. In the ITSS sample, we find this gap between CR and CDP for 68% of the companies. Thereby, ITSS companies report certain scope 3 categories inconsistently. For instance, five out of the eight companies report emissions from *business travel* (category 6) and *employee commuting* (category 7) inconsistently. In the THE sample, 38% of the companies report inconsistently. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that disclosing no scope 3 emissions on either channel results in consistent reporting although full-scale reporting is absent. This applies to five companies in the THE sample but none in the ITSS sample (see supplementary data: 2.3).

For the second source of error, boundary incompleteness, we find that in total, the 56 tech companies report 379 category-specific scope 3 emission figures. Of these 379 figures, we find 16% to be incomplete. Boundary incompleteness applies to 22 companies, 10 from the ITSS and 22 from the THE sample. The extent at the firm level ranges from one to eight incomplete categories and appears particularly often in upstream categories such as *business travel* and *purchased goods and services* (see supplementary data: sheet 2.2 and 3.1 for details).

For the third source of error, activity exclusion, we find 283 excluded categories in total, spread across 18 ITSS and 29 THE companies (see supplementary data: sheet 2.1 and 3.1 for details). The extent of exclusion ranges from neglecting a single category to omitting the entire scope 3. Notably, categories which contribute significantly to total emissions are found lacking (e.g., 30% of the companies neglect *purchased goods and services* and 43% neglect *use of sold products*).

In total, we find for our sample of 56 tech companies a gap between reported and harmonized emissions of 391 megatons (Mt) carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e), of which 202 $MtCO_2e$ originate from omitted upstream and 189 $MtCO_2e$ from omitted downstream emissions. Accounting for these omitted emissions more than doubles self-reported emissions of 360 $MtCO_2e$ to harmonized emissions of 751 $MtCO_2e$. In the following, we present the combined effects on the industry, company, and category level.

On an industry level, emissions levels differ widely between the ITSS and THE industry in absolute terms; companies in the THE sample have eight times higher emissions than in the ITSS sample after the harmonization. Still, the relative gap between self-reported and harmonized emissions appears to be similar. For the ITSS industry, total harmonized carbon emissions nearly double the self-reported figures, which leads to an increase of 39.5 $MtCO_2e$. The increase is based on reporting inconsistency at 60%, boundary incompleteness at 19%, and activity exclusion at 20%. For the THE industry, total harmonized emissions more than double, with an increase of 351.5 $MtCO_2e$. The increase is based on reporting inconsistency at 31%, boundary incompleteness at 24%, and activity exclusion at 55%. Figure 2 illustrates the results for both samples.



Figure 2 | Total harmonized carbon emissions of the ITSS and THE sample in 2019. The different sample sizes need to be considered when comparing absolute figures (ITSS: n=22; THE: n=34). The analysis is based on CDP responses of 2019 and CRs of the corresponding reporting period. Carbon intensities are calculated by dividing total carbon emissions by total revenues of the sample. See supplementary data: sheet 2.1-2.3 for calculations.

On a company level, the omitted scope 3 emissions are unevenly distributed, both in absolute and relative terms. We find deviations ranging from 0.03% to a factor of 185x, with a quadrupling in the median (see supplementary data: sheet 1.1 for details). This is about twice as high as the increase on industry level, underlines the skewness of the distribution within the sample, and highlights the incomparability of self-reported carbon footprints. In the ITSS sample, almost one third of the companies is subject to omissions in all three areas, another third is subject to two error types. The remainder is affected by one error type. Companies subject to reporting inconsistencies tend to omit a large share of emissions; almost 200% in the median. In cases of boundary incompleteness and activity exclusion, emissions increase in the median by 83% and 117% respectively. For companies from THE sample, 25% are subject to all three error types, and 40% fail on two types (thereof, 65% with boundary incompleteness and activity exclusion). The remaining 35% of the companies fall under one type of error (thereof, more than 80% activity exclusion). For THE companies, reporting inconsistency, boundary incompleteness, and activity exclusion increase emissions by 76%, 21%, and 32%

respectively in the median. Figure 3 and Figure 4 chart the harmonized carbon footprints on company level for both industries.



Figure 3 | Harmonized carbon footprints of ITSS companies. Analysis is based on CDP responses of 2019 and CRs of the corresponding reporting period. See supplementary data: sheet 2.1-2.3 for calculations.



Figure 4 | Harmonized carbon footprints of THE companies. Analysis is based on CDP responses of 2019 and CRs of the corresponding reporting period. See supplementary data: sheet 2.1-2.3 for calculations.

On a category level, we find that most omitted emissions result from a few dedicated categories. The main part of the increase results from flawed disclosure in the two categories *purchased goods and services* and *use of sold products*. Besides these two, only omitted emissions from *capital goods* contribute a two-digit share with 10% in the ITSS sample. Interestingly, the relative share of the categories remains fairly constant for all three types of error (see supplementary data: sheet 2.1 and 3.1 for comparison). Figure 5 depicts the breakdown by category for both samples.



Figure 5 | Distribution of omitted emissions by scope 3 category. Analysis is based on CDP responses of 2019 and CRs of the corresponding reporting period. See supplementary data: sheet 2.1-2.3 for calculations.

Conclusions and policy recommendations

This paper highlights that current carbon accounting and reporting practices remain unsystematic and incomparable, particularly for emissions along the value chain (scope 3). The framework we present enables the closing of gaps in corporate carbon footprints by accounting for reporting inconsistency, boundary incompleteness, and activity exclusion. We find that companies report different emission levels on different channels, fail to meet the minimum boundaries of emitting activities, or omit relevant scope 3 categories entirely.

In a case study of the tech sector, we find that corporate reports largely understate emissions. By harmonizing scope 3 emissions, we find for a sample of 56 major tech companies a gap between self-reported and harmonized emissions of 391 megatons (Mt) carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e). Thereof, 202 MtCO_2e originate from omitted upstream emissions and 189 MtCO_2e from omitted downstream emissions, which represents an almost equal contribution to the increase. Accounting for these omitted emissions more than doubles the amount of self-reported emissions of 360 MtCO_2e to harmonized emissions of 751 MtCO_2e. The size of the gap between self-reported and harmonized corporate carbon footprints suggests a limited consistency in scope 3 emission measurements, which impedes meaningful comparisons. The omitted emissions per annum just from our sample are in the same ballpark as the total annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions produced by the nation of Australia.[35] Fortunately, companies with progressive reduction pledges show less discrepancies with a gap of less than 20% (i.e., Microsoft, Google, and Apple).

The case study provides only a snapshot of how reporting inconsistency, boundary incompleteness, and activity exclusion affect corporate carbon footprints. Future research should therefore explore further sectors – and include further companies – to gauge the total gap between self-reported and actual corporate footprints. As harmonized carbon footprints are calculated on the basis of peer companies, larger samples may better control for outliers. Nonetheless, besides the tradeoff between homogeneity and size of the sample, secondary data and adjusted emission figures may never capture all company-specific circumstances. The challenge of comparability remains as companies may choose different approaches to account for up- and downstream players in different parts of the world. Thus, the calculated emission estimates represent a mix of calculation methods and regional characteristics. Still such case studies may provide insights on industry level, and point to gaps in corporate carbon footprints.

In light of the current underreporting, it seems unlikely that voluntary guidelines will trigger more accurate carbon disclosure in the future. Binding regulations with unambiguous guidelines might be more effective. While reporting inconsistency could easily be avoided through obligations to synchronize emission data in corporate reports with any other channel such as the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP), boundary incompleteness and activity exclusion require more profound advancements.

One option to close the gaps is mandatory regulation for improved full-scale value chain disclosures. In 2019, for instance, the European Union introduced non-binding guidelines for reporting climate-related information, which strongly recommend to disclose scope 3 emissions.[36; 37] The guidelines acknowledge the need of comprehensive corporate carbon disclosures and might mark the first step towards binding mandates. Moreover, the European Commission currently reviews the entire Non-Financial Reporting Directive as part of the action plan on financing sustainable growth, which also includes climate-related information.[38] The public consultations in this context show that more than two-thirds of the users see significant issues with the reliability, comparability, and completeness of the currently reported data, and there is strong support for a requirement on companies to use a common standard.[39] Still, without enhanced digitalization of processes, there is a risk of major inefficiencies in corporate reporting along the supply chain as it requires handling of extensive and complex data.

An alternative approach is binding scope 1 and 2 emission disclosure on an international level. Besides transparency for external stakeholders, binding mandates can also yield emission reductions without a negative effect on financial performance, as initial empirical evidence from the United Kingdom indicates.[40; 41] Additionally, this would make it easier for companies to add up scope 1 and 2 emissions of all suppliers in order to obtain their scope 3 emissions. Binding scope 1 and 2 emission disclosure would furthermore facilitate effective border carbon adjustments.[42] Scope 3 emissions may partly be interpreted as the outsourced environmental damage, and even within the same industry, relative scope 1 and 2 emissions can vary significantly if carbon-intensive activities are shifted to external suppliers.[43] A topical example is the outsourcing of IT infrastructure to cloud service providers.[44] Preventing carbon leakage to jurisdictions with less stringent climate policy regimes calls for transparency on corporate carbon footprints and product embedded emissions.

Methods

This section provides the formulas to harmonize a company's carbon footprint by quantifying omitted scope 3 emissions. The total carbon footprint is calculated from the sum of the three emission scopes.

$$CF_{Harmonized} = E_{Scope\ 1} + E_{Scope\ 2} + E_{Scope\ 3_{Total}} \tag{1}$$

with:

- $CF_{Harmonized} = harmonized\ carbon\ footprint\ [t\ CO_2e]$
- $E_{Scope\ 1} = scope\ 1\ emissions\ [t\ CO_2e]$
- $E_{Scope\ 2} = scope\ 2\ emissions\ [t\ CO_2e]$
- $E_{Scope\ 3_{Total}} = total\ scope\ 3\ emissions\ [t\ CO_2e]$

This framework focuses on scope 3 emissions and thus assumes scope 1 and 2 emissions to be complete and consistently reported across communication channels. Total scope 3 emissions are composed of the emissions reported in the corporate report (CR) and the omitted emissions.

$$E_{Scope\ 3_{Total}} = E_{Scope\ 3_{CR}} + E_{Scope\ 3_{Omitted}} \tag{2}$$

with:

- $E_{Scope\ 3_{Total}} = total\ scope\ 3\ emissions\ [t\ CO_2e]$
- $E_{Scope\ 3_{CR}} = scope\ 3\ emissions\ reported\ in\ CRs\ [t\ CO_2e]$
- $E_{Scope\ 3_{Omitted}} = omitted\ scope\ 3\ emissions\ [t\ CO_2e]$

Omitted scope 3 emissions are defined as the sum of reporting inconsistency (*RI*), boundary incompleteness *(BI)*, and activity exclusion *(AE)*.

$$E_{Scope\ 3_{Omitted}} = E_{Scope\ 3_{RI}} + E_{Scope\ 3_{BI}} + E_{Scope\ 3_{AE}} \tag{3}$$

with:

- $E_{Scope\ 3_{RI}} = omission\ due\ to\ reporting\ inconsistency\ [t\ CO_2e]$
- $E_{Scope\ 3_{BI}} = omission\ due\ to\ boundary\ incompleteness\ [t\ CO_2e]$
- $E_{Scope\ 3_{AE}} = omission\ due\ to\ activity\ exclusion\ [t\ CO_2e]$

1) Reporting inconsistency

Reporting inconsistency is observable in a scenario in which a company is reporting different levels of scope 3 emissions across communication channels. We calculate the difference by deducting the amount of scope 3 emissions reported in the CR from the amount of scope 3 emissions reported in the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). The framework does not allow for negative values for reporting inconsistency. For cases in which scope 3 emissions in the CR are higher than in the CDP response we set reporting inconsistency to zero since we assume CDP data to be generally more comprehensive.

$$E_{Scope\ 3_{RI}} = E_{Scope\ 3_{CDP}} - E_{Scope\ 3_{CR}}, \qquad s.t. \quad E_{Scope\ 3_{RI}} \geq 0 \tag{4}$$

with:

- $E_{Scope\ 3_{CDP}} = scope\ 3\ emissions\ reported\ in\ CDP\ [t\ CO_2e]$
- $E_{Scope\ 3_{CR}} = scope\ 3\ emissions\ reported\ in\ CR\ [t\ CO_2e]$

2) Boundary incompleteness

We define a scope 3 category as incomplete if the respective minimum boundary described in the GHG Protocol (see supplementary data: sheet 3.3) is not met. We adopt the classification of the 15 distinct scope 3 categories used by the CDP and originally proposed by the GHG Protocol.[11] The sum of all complete scope 3 categories constitutes the total scope 3 emissions.

$$E_{Scope\ 3_{Total}} = \sum_{i=1}^{15} e_i \tag{5}$$

with:

- $e_i = emissions\ of\ scope\ 3\ category\ i\ [t\ CO_2e]$
- $i = scope\ 3\ category\ type\ (1 = \ purchased\ goods\ and\ services,$
  $2 = capital\ goods, \ldots, 15 = investments)$

To recalculate adjusted values for incomplete emission figures, we derive category-specific carbon intensities of the peer industry group. The carbon intensity of each scope 3 category results from the median of the ratios of the category-specific emissions to the emission predictors across all observed companies. Ratios are only included if the emission figure is above zero and considered complete. Emission predictors vary across scope 3 categories and need to be determined under the constraints of data availability (see supplementary data: sheet 3.2).

$$Order\ \left(\frac{e_i}{P_i}\right)_j, \quad j = 1, \ldots, N,\ by\ size,\ \forall\ e_i = complete \cap\ e_i > 0 \tag{6}$$

$$f: N \rightarrow N, \qquad s.t.$$

$$\left(\frac{e_i}{P_i}\right)_{f(1)} \geq \left(\frac{e_i}{P_i}\right)_{f(2)} \geq \cdots \geq \left(\frac{e_i}{P_i}\right)_{f(N)}$$

$$I_i = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{e_i}{P_i}\right)_{f\left(\frac{N}{2}+1\right)} & for\ N\ odd \\ \frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\frac{e_i}{P_i}\right)_{f\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)} + \left(\frac{e_i}{P_i}\right)_{f\left(\frac{N}{2}+1\right)}\right] & for\ N\ even \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

with:

- $I_i = median\ carbon\ intensity\ of\ scope\ 3\ category\ i\ [t\ CO_2e/[P_i]]$.
- $P_i = emission\ predictor\ of\ scope\ 3\ category\ i\ \left[[P_i]\right]$
- *j = observed peer company (1, ..., N)*

We calculate the adjusted emissions of the incomplete scope 3 categories by applying the respective category-specific carbon intensity to the company's emission predictor.

$$e_{i,adjusted} = P_i * I_i \quad (8)$$

with:

- $e_{i,adjusted} = adjusted\ emissions\ of\ scope\ 3\ category\ i\ [t\ CO_2e]$

The sum of the differences between the adjusted emissions and the initially reported emissions over all categories represents the omission due to boundary incompleteness.

$$E_{Scope\ 3_{BI}} = \sum_{i=1}^{15} e_{i,adjusted} - e_{i,initial}, \quad \forall\ incomplete\ e_i \quad (9)$$

with:

- $e_{i,initial} = initial\ emissions\ of\ scope\ 3\ category\ i\ [t\ CO_2e]$

3) Activity exclusion

The exclusion of activities that cause emissions results from the disregard of entire scope 3 categories. We assume a category to be excluded if the company does not provide an emission figure in the CDP response despite considering the category to be relevant for their business. We derive the added emissions of undisclosed scope 3 categories with the aid of emission predictors analogous to the calculation of adjusted emissions in case of boundary incompleteness.

$$e_{i,added} = P_i * I_i, \quad \forall\ e_{i,initial} = 0\ and\ relevant \quad (10)$$

with:

- $e_{i,added} = added\ emissions\ from\ scope\ 3\ category\ i\ [t\ CO_2e]$

The omission due to activity exclusion is the sum of the added emissions of the excluded scope 3 categories.

$$E_{Scope\ 3_{AE}} = \sum_{i=1}^{15} e_{i,added} \tag{11}$$

Supplemental information

Supplemental Information can be found online at [doi].

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Sabine Englberger and Sebastian Kahlert for valuable feedback.

Author contribution

L.K. conceived the study. Both authors contributed to the design of the study. L.K. aggregated and analyzed the data. Both authors drafted the manuscript.

Declaration of Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. IPCC (2018). Global Warming of 1.5 ºC. https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/.

2. United Nations (2019). The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2019. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2019/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2019.pdf.

3. BlackRock (2020). Letter to CEOs. https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/investor-relations/larry-fink-ceo-letter.

4. Amazon (2019). Sustainability: Thinking Big. https://sustainability.aboutamazon.com/.

5. Apple (2020). Apple commits to carbon neutrality for supply chain and products by 2030. https://www.apple.com/newsroom/2020/07/apple-commits-to-be-100-percent-carbon-neutral-for-its-supply-chain-and-products-by-2030/.

6. Microsoft (2020). Microsoft Will Be Carbon Negative by 2030. https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/corporate-responsibility/sustainability/operations#primaryR2.

7. Facebook (2020). Facebook's Net Zero Commitment. https://sustainability.fb.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Facebooks_Net_Zero_commitment_September_Final.pdf.

8. Google (2020). Realizing a carbon-free future: Google's Third Decade of Climate Action. https://www.gstatic.com/gumdrop/sustainability/carbon-free-by-2030.pdf.

9. Green, J. F. (2010). Private Standards in the Climate Regime: The Greenhouse Gas Protocol. Business and Politics, *12*(3), 1–37.

10. GHG Protocol (2004). A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard. https://ghgprotocol.org/corporate-standard.

11. GHG Protocol (2011). Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard: Supplement to the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard. https://ghgprotocol.org/standards/scope-3-standard.

12. Patchell, J. (2018). Can the implications of the GHG Protocol's scope 3 standard be realized? Journal of Cleaner Production, *185*, 941–958.

13. Defra (2019). Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/850130/Env-reporting-guidance_inc_SECR_31March.pdf.

14. Data.gouv.fr (2020). Bilans d'émissions de GES publiés sur le site de l'ADEME (BEGES). https://www.data.gouv.fr/en/datasets/bilans-demissions-de-ges-publies-sur-le-site-de-lademe-1/.

15. Matthews, H. S., Hendrickson, C. T., and Weber, C. L. (2008). The importance of carbon footprint estimation boundaries. Environmental Science & Technology, *42*(16), 5839–5842.

16. Yang, J., and Chen, B. (2014). Carbon footprint estimation of Chinese economic sectors based on a three-tier model. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, *29*, 499–507.

17. Hertwich, E. G., and Wood, R. (2018). The growing importance of scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions from industry. Environmental Research Letters, *13*(10), 104013.

18. Depoers, F., Jeanjean, T., and Jérôme, T. (2016). Voluntary Disclosure of Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Contrasting the Carbon Disclosure Project and Corporate Reports. Journal of Business Ethics, *134*(3), 445–461.

19. Downie, J., and Stubbs, W. (2013). Evaluation of Australian companies' scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions assessments. Journal of Cleaner Production, *56*, 156–163.

20. Kennelly, C., Berners-Lee, M., and Hewitt, C. N. (2019). Hybrid life-cycle assessment for robust, best-practice carbon accounting. Journal of Cleaner Production, *208*, 35–43.

21. Downie, J., and Stubbs, W. (2012). Corporate Carbon Strategies and Greenhouse Gas Emission Assessments: The Implications of Scope 3 Emission Factor Selection. Business Strategy and the Environment, *21*(6), 412–422.

22. Blanco, C., Caro, F., and Corbett, C. J. (2016). The state of supply chain carbon footprinting: analysis of CDP disclosures by US firms. Journal of Cleaner Production, *135*, 1189–1197.

23. CDP (2019). Scoring Introduction 2019. https://b8f65cb373b1b7b15feb-c70d8ead6ced550b4d987d7c03fcdd1d.ssl.cf3.rackcdn.com/cms/guidance_docs/pdfs/000/000/233/original/Scoring-Introduction.pdf?1479494696.

24. GHG Protocol (2013). Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions: Supplement to the Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting & Reporting Standard. https://ghgprotocol.org/scope-3-technical-calculation-guidance.

25. Lenzen, M. (2001). Errors in Conventional and Input-Output—Based Life—Cycle Inventories. Journal of Industrial Ecology, *4*(4), 127–148.

26. Joshi, S. (1999). Product Environmental Life-Cycle Assessment Using Input-Output Techniques. Journal of Industrial Ecology, *3*(2-3), 95–120.

27. Crawford, R. H. (2008). Validation of a hybrid life-cycle inventory analysis method. Journal of Environmental Management, *88*(3), 496–506.

28. CDP (2019). CASCADING COMMITMENTS: Driving ambitious action through supply chain engagement. https://6fefcbb86e61af1b2fc4-c70d8ead6ced550b4d987d7c03fcdd1d.ssl.cf3.rackcdn.com/cms/reports/documents/000/004/072/original/CDP_Supply_Chain_Report_2019.pdf?1550490556.

29. CDP (2016). Out of the starting blocks: Tracking progress on corporate climate action. https://b8f65cb373b1b7b15feb-c70d8ead6ced550b4d987d7c03fcdd1d.ssl.cf3.rackcdn.com/cms/reports/documents/000/001/228/original/CDP_Climate_Change_Report_2016.pdf?1485276095.

30. Science Based Targets Initiative (2018). Value Change in the Value Chain: BEST PRACTICES IN SCOPE 3 GREENHOUSE GAS MANAGEMENT. https://sciencebasedtargets.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/SBT_Value_Chain_Report-1.pdf.

31. Greenpeace (2020). Microsoft, Google, Amazon – Who's the Biggest Climate Hypocrite? https://www.greenpeace.org/usa/microsoft-google-amazon-energy-oil-ai-climate-hypocrite/.

32. The Shift Project (2019). Lean ICT: Towards digital sobriety. https://theshiftproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Lean-ICT-Report_The-Shift-Project_2019.pdf.

33. Huang, Y. A., Weber, L. C., and Matthews, H. S. Carbon footprinting upstream supply chain for electronics manufacturing and computer services. In *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Sustainable Systems and Technology* (pp. 1–6). https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSST.2009.5156679

34. Forbes (2020). The World's Largest Public Companies 2019: Global 2000 By The Numbers. https://www.forbes.com/sites/jonathanponciano/2019/05/15/worlds-largest-companies-2019-global-2000/#5e8a5d3c4ada.

35. International Energy Agency (2019). Key World Energy Statistics 2019. https://webstore.iea.org/download/direct/2831?fileName=Key_World_Energy_Statistics_2019.pdf.

36. European Comission (2019). Commission guidelines on non-financial reporting. https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/non-financial-reporting-guidelines_en#climate.

37. European Comission (2019). Guidelines on non-financial reporting: Supplement on reporting climate-related information (2019/C 209/01). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52019XC0620(01)&from=EN.

38. European Comission (2020). Non-financial reporting by large companies (updated rules): Public consultation. https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/12129-Revision-of-Non-Financial-Reporting-Directive/public-consultation.

39. European Comission (2020). Summary Report of the Public Consultation on the Review of the Non-Financial Reporting Directive. https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/12129-Revision-of-Non-Financial-Reporting-Directive/public-consultation.

40. Downar, B., Ernstberger, J., Reichelstein, S., Schwenen, S., and Zaklan, A. (2020). The Impact of Carbon Disclosure Mandates on Emissions and Financial Operating Performance. Retrieved from Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung website: https://www.diw.de/documents/publikationen/73/diw_01.c.791134.de/dp1875.pdf

41. Jouvenot, V., & Krueger, P. (2020). Mandatory Corporate Carbon Disclosure: Evidence from a Natural Experiment Requirements. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3434490. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3434490

42. Mehling, M. A., van Asselt, H., Das, K., Droege, S., and Verkuijl, C. (2019). Designing Border Carbon Adjustments for Enhanced Climate Action. American Journal of International Law, *113*(3), 433–481.

43. CDP (2020). CDP Full GHG Emissions Dataset: Technical Annex IV: Scope 3 Overview and Modelling. https://6fefcbb86e61af1b2fc4-c70d8ead6ced550b4d987d7c03fcdd1d.ssl.cf3.rackcdn.com/comfy/cms/files/files/000/003/076/original/2020_01_23_Scope_3_Overview.pdf.

44. Mytton, D. (2020). Hiding greenhouse gas emissions in the cloud. Nature Climate Change, *701*(10), 1.

Figures



Figure 1

Visualization of the framework to harmonize corporate carbon footprints.



Figure 2

Total harmonized carbon emissions of the ITSS and THE sample in 2019. The different sample sizes need to be considered when comparing absolute figures (ITSS: n=22; THE: n=34). The analysis is based on CDP responses of 2019 and CRs of the corresponding reporting period. Carbon intensities are calculated by dividing total carbon emissions by total revenues of the sample. See supplementary data: sheet 2.1-2.3 for calculations.



Figure 3

Harmonized carbon footprints of ITSS companies. Analysis is based on CDP responses of 2019 and CRs of the corresponding reporting period. See supplementary data: sheet 2.1-2.3 for calculations.



Figure 4

Harmonized carbon footprints of THE companies. Analysis is based on CDP responses of 2019 and CRs of the corresponding reporting period. See supplementary data: sheet 2.1-2.3 for calculations.



Figure 5

Distribution of omitted emissions by scope 3 category. Analysis is based on CDP responses of 2019 and CRs of the corresponding reporting period. See supplementary data: sheet 2.1-2.3 for calculations.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- Supplementarydata.xlsx