

*Scientists for Global Responsibility (SGR) is a membership organisation promoting responsible science and
technology*info@sgr.org.uk www.sgr.org.uk

Dr Nick Wayth
Energy Institute
61 New Cavendish Street
London W1G 7AR
UK

Copy of an email sent to you on 14th March 2022

Dear Dr Wayth

As Responsible Science campaigner for Scientists for Global Responsibility (SGR), I am writing to follow-up on our October 2019 report on *Irresponsible Science: How the fossil fuel and arms industries finance professional engineering and science organisations*, which included an examination of the Energy Institute's record in these areas.¹ We have now created an update on the Energy Institute's progress since the report, to which we draw your attention.²

Firstly, I would like to recognise the Energy Institute's new energy and environment policy, signing of the Pledge to Net Zero, commitment to the Professional Bodies Climate Action Charter and current abstention from investments in arms.

However, as you will see in the update, we do retain concerns about the Energy Institute's recent record as follows:

- continuing financial ties to fossil fuels companies;
- the lack of readily available transparency regarding your investments in specific companies;
- relatively lax policies with respect to financial ties to fossil fuels companies benchmarked against learned society peers;
- the absence of a publicly available ethical investment policy that excludes investment in arms companies.

In view of these concerns, SGR calls on the Energy Institute to:

1. increase your transparency by disclosing all payments from corporate sources worth over £1,000 for corporate membership, advertising and for event sponsorship in your annual accounts, and by disclosing all the specific companies in which you hold investments of more than £5,000;

¹<https://www.sgr.org.uk/publications/irresponsible-science>

²https://www.sgr.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-03/Energy_Institute_progress_report.pdf

Part of the campaign awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2017

SGR Patrons include: Professor Keith Barnham • Alan Baxter CBE MICE MCONSE FIStructE Hon FRIBA •

Professor Roy Butterfield CEng MICE MStructE • Bill Dunster RIBA • Professor Tim Foxon • Professor Sandy Halliday CEng MCIBSE FRSA
• Professor Pauline Harrison CBE • Professor Alastair Hay • Professor Alice Larkin • Kate Macintosh MBE RIBA • Professor Bill McGuire •
Professor Ursula Mittwoch • Professor Jenny Nelson FRS • Professor Megan J W Povey • Professor William Powrie CEng FICE • Lord

- 2(a). rapidly phase out your financial ties, including investments, sponsorship and advertising, from any and all companies whose carbon emission targets/ activities are not in line with the 2°C or less Paris Agreement goal - this currently includes all major companies in the coal, oil and gas sector;
- 2(b). as a first step on the route to implementing action '2(a)', make no new investments in the coal, oil and gas sectors;
3. direct your fund manager to be guided by fossil fuel free indexes (including from FTSE and MSCI) and schemes such as the Transition Pathway Initiative³ to invest only in firms whose ambitions are currently on track for global warming of 2°C or less, rather than the less stringent criterion of being in line with current government commitments, which are not sufficient to protect the world from 'dangerous' climate change;
4. redirect your investments to industries/ organisations that mitigate climate change and promote planetary health, such as energy conservation, renewable energy and energy storage;
5. estimate and report on the carbon footprint of your investment portfolio using tools such as the Montreal Pledge website⁴;
6. eliminate any financial links to corporations that have received significant penalties in the last five years related to law-breaking or major malpractice or are likely to in the near future;
7. in line with the recommendations of the ShareAction report on investment managers⁵, strengthen the due diligence of your asset manager selection by reviewing their performance in the areas of climate-related voting and engagement, climate-related policy commitments and accounting for impacts of investments, and be aware that signing up to supportive initiatives such as the PRI or Climate Action 100+ does not always correspond with having a fit-for-purpose responsible investment approach;
8. Create a publicly-available ethical investment policy that formalizes your current abstention from investments in arms companies as a long-term commitment.

Considering the practical implementation of these actions, we think the Energy Institute could complete actions 1, 2(b), 3, 5-7, and 8 during this year, with the other actions to be completed by the end of next year.

Of your professional society "colleagues", the British Psychological Society, Royal College of Physicians, British Medical Association, the Royal College of General Practitioners, the Faculty of Public Health, the Royal College of Emergency Medicine and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health have all now fully divested from fossil fuels, are in the process of doing so, or have committed to do so. The British Medical Association took the lead, beginning its journey back in 2014. All these organisations also exclude investment in arms companies.

Some other professional bodies examined in the *Irresponsible Science?* report have tightened up their policies on fossil fuels and arms since publication of the report. For example, the Geological Society has introduced investment policies that exclude arms and the most carbon-emitting fossil fuels – thermal coal and tar sands – and is going further than this by not currently investing in any form of fossil fuel, whilst the Royal Meteorological Society has excluded investment in fossil fuels and arms, and the Institute of Materials, Minerals and Mining has ceased to invest in arms and the most carbon-emitting fossil fuels.

³ <https://www.transitionpathwayinitiative.org/>

⁴ <https://montrealpledge.org/>

⁵ <https://shareaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/ShareAction-Climate-Report-III-Final.pdf>

You may also be interested in SGR's new Science Oath for the Climate⁶, where scientists, engineers and academics commit to holding their professional associations, institutions and employers to these same standards on climate change as they've committed to themselves.

We believe the shift in wider expectations about good climate governance means that the reputational sensitivity of the issue has only risen since the publication of the *Irresponsible Science?* report, especially given the UK's continued COP26 presidency this year and the resulting international attention on UK carbon emissions, goals and institutions as well as the recent ruling by a Dutch court that Shell must reduce its carbon emissions⁷. Similarly, the continued controversy over UK arms exports that contribute to breaches of international humanitarian law (such as those to Saudi Arabia) and the statement by the UN Secretary General's office that the UK government decision in March to increase the size of the nation's nuclear warhead stockpile by 44% is a breach of Article VI of the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty⁸ is also likely to have strengthened public opposition to financial ties to arms companies and those involved in the nuclear weapons sector.

I look forward to hearing your response. If you reply within two weeks we will take your reply into account as part of our media work around this and similar letters that we have written to a selection of professional scientific and engineering organizations. All the letters and accompanying reports will be made public as part of this media work.

Thank you and best wishes

Dr Liz Kalaugher
Responsible Science Campaigner

⁶ <https://www.sgr.org.uk/projects/science-oath-climate-text-and-signing>

⁷ <https://theconversation.com/shell-ordered-to-cut-its-emissions-why-this-ruling-could-affect-almost-any-major-company-in-the-world-161754>

⁸ <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/boris-johnson-uk-nuclear-weapons-international-law-b1817827.html>