

Corporate Knights Building Back Better by Moving Forward Together	Q&A via ZOOM with Ralph Torrie
From June 3rd, 2020 Roundtable via Zoom (unedited file)	
Questions	Answers
Toby - can you let us know what plans Corporate Knights or others have that will keep the community established here in tact to now review and enact some of these outstanding ideas?	<p>live answered</p> <p>One option is to join existing groups. For municipal action, Climate Caucus is a growing and truly excellent option</p> <p>Thanks Robert: We will be sharing a synthesis report in the coming days, and using it as briefing materials empower action. We are also inviting everyone that has participated for ideas on how to take this forward, which we will incorporate into our next plan. We believe we have 60 days forge a strong and powerful consensus to move forward together and as Micahel Sabia said, seize the moment. Please contact me directly at toby@corporateknights.com</p>
will the slides used be made available to participants?	Yes
Emissions reductions for the Energy and EV innovation still in question mark, could you please comment	<p>live answered</p> <p>It is based on creating new industries (EV batteies, sustainable aviation fuels, carbon fibres) so the emissions reductions are scope 3, which are diificult to esimtate reliably.</p>
Builing back better: time frame please	10 yrs with 40% of fed contribution frontloaded in first two years to prime the pump of clean economy and act as a carrot to ensure provinces upgrade building codes for new builds and existing buildings as well as fair access to the grid
It would be really helpful to compile a list of such groups...	
Celine, Ralph: Are the investment #s (the Y axis) ANNUAL spending or cumulative spending? If so, cumulative to when ... 2030? The job #s are annual, so I'm trying to compare apples-to-apples	The graph that shows investment by program is showing the total investment over the 2021-2030 period. Similarly the bars for jobs indicate the total number of person-years of employment created by the investment.

<p>Why do all 3 levels of Gov't NOT inovate when it comes to Building Envelope? They continue to support 100% fossil fuel based products that offer zero sustainbability. When is this going to change?</p>	
<p>To harness the market to make this transformational change, we need to send strong enough price signals. Given the political push back to high carbon prices, what role do you see in “Flexible Regulations” like B.C.’s Low Carbon Fuel Standard, and the proposed Federal Clean Fuel Standard that would also extend to the Building sector?</p>	<p>Building performance standards much needed (ie regulated standards per sq m getting to net zero)</p>
<p>Is there a paper that will detail to your proposal(s)? I haven't seen specific recommendations yet. *detail your proposals</p>	<p>Yes. It will be on corporatetechnights.com shortly</p>
<p>exporting LNG from west canada will reduce emissions in a global level. Canada makes money and reduccion emissions. I do not know the difference between that and building electical charges</p>	
<p>Following up on Chris Ragan’s article in the Globe and Mail, where he states that governments don’t know which technologies will most cost-effectively reduce GHG emissions, how does the federal government “build back better” without being caught in a position where it is forced to pick what it thinks are “winners?”</p>	<p>live answered</p> <p>While a carbon tax is part of the policy toolkit, it will not be sufficient to get a green recovery done, certainly not fast enough because it doesn't address the key barriers standing in the way of things like electric cars or upgrading energy efficiency.</p>
<p>Does anybody have any insight as to whether performance contracts are an option being discussed at a government level?</p>	
<p>In listening to Tom I hear the manufacturing opportunity to supply low carbon technology, goods and materials to the world but If there needs to be a trade-off between Canadian emissions and the world's emissions (the greater good if you will), what should take precedence / how do we manage the dichotomy?.....thanks / good discussion</p>	

<p>As an individual, non-millionaire investor, I have tried to invest in ArcTern, Eat Beyond, Investeco, to mention just three. In every case, the 'Accredited Investor' requirements gate any 'regular' person. For sure, it is great if the entire economy and society go green. It will save the planet, but as it stands now, the rich are just going to get richer and the rest of us are going nowhere. Will part of the recovery plan include the opportunity for regular people to invest in and so benefit directly from this new economy. Is there any other way to really address the deep societal inequities and inequalities that we face, at all levels?</p>	
<p>Mr. Robertson, as Mayor, you faced incredible push back on some of what could be considered mild climate measures. Has enough changed in the past two years since your mandate ended to drive bigger changes in the way Vancouver and other cities look and feel to address GHGs that are within the control of local governments?</p>	
<p>I think Mr. Sabia's point about creativity is brilliant. What's a more creative way to frame economic success than in terms of growth?</p>	
<p>how can we be sure carbon doesn't find its way into the hydrogen fuel? hydrogen fuel can be made from fossil fuels. there's no guarantee it's going to be made cleanly.</p>	<p>The only way to keep all hydrogen-related carbon out of the system is to forego the option of making the hydrogen from natural gas (so-called blue hydrogen) and make hydrogen only via electrolysis with carbon-free electricity. (see related answer below). Because the potential to make blue hydrogen from inexpensive natural gas is so large, many argue that if we can reduce its carbon footprint by successfully deploying carbon capture and storage, then blue hydrogen production can be an intermediate step toward a longer term hydrogen production capacity based on carbon-free electricity and electrolysis.</p>
<p>Will the questions and answers from these sessions and the Chat discussions be posted online to continue the conversations?</p>	
<p>How do we contact the Senate National Finance Committee on building back better?</p>	
<p>I must be doing something wrong. I have on numerous occarions tried to connect with the Musqueam Nation. With zero results. What must I be doing to get their attention?</p>	

<p>What is the panel position on climate action and economic stimulus primarily, strategically and strongly focusing on local communities first?</p>	<p>For my part (Torrie), I think local agency is all-important and have spent most of my career working with local governments on how they can use their direct and indirect influence in the community to bend development toward sustainability. Climate change epitomizes the wisdom of "think globally, act locally"!</p>
<p>Do you think that it is important to obtain broad public support from within the communities where "green" (sustainable) investments are taking place? If so what would be a successful path forward policy or (existing) mechanism to leverage such approach."</p>	<p>Support for green investments will build as their many advantages and cobenefits become visible. We are however in an emergency response mode when it comes to climate change, and business and government leadership is required, without necessarily always waiting for broad public support or even market demand to already exist.</p>
<p>Hi Bruce, why is that? Why can't we start with green hydrogen? CCS is HUGELY expensive and not very effective top date...</p>	
<p>Celine, are you referring to offshore tax evasion when talking about loopholes in the canadian tax system?</p>	
<p>Canada's Financial Sector seems to MIA is this. Could Mark Carney give them a prod?</p>	
<p>Have you examined the GHG, \$ and jobs benefits of Smart Growth scenarios -- if the better homes and workplaces were concentrated in TOD areas and 15-minute communities? My recent blog on the topic: https://www.greenresilience.com/smart-growth</p>	<p>This is one of a number of subjects that we did not cover in this series but which can make an important contribution to the transition. Thanks for the link!</p>
<p>What is meant by "other" investment? If not public or private, where is this coming from?</p>	<p>Public utilities or other levels of government</p>
<p>Is climate resilience actively considered in these proposals? For example, in terms of energy investments that integrate understandings of a changing climate - e.g. proposed updates to the Canadian Electrical Code -- https://www.csagroup.org/article/development-of-climate-change-adaptation-solutions-within-the-framework-of-the-csa-group-canadian-electrical-code-parts-i-ii-and-iii/</p>	<p>This is a great point. In the past climate mitigation and climate adaptation have been carried on as separate areas of activity and policy. This is no longer feasible, if it ever was. While we did include allowance for flood protection and climate resilience in the investment analysis of the buildings sector, we need to do better at integrating climate resilience and climate adaptation investments.</p>
<p>How many understand that we need to move forward on a platform based on the principles of Sustainability? The economy is only one component of a sustainable future that needs to include environmental stewardship and social responsibility!</p>	
<p>Do we finally understand that GDP is not an indicator of a successful society, country? Jeremy Rifkin has been working with Eu leaders to demonstrate how to move to secure future that is not reliant on GROWTH dependent on FINITE resources!</p>	<p>I think most would agree that GDP is not an indicator of anything except the output of the economic system. That does not mean it is useless, only useless as a measure of things like success, or happiness, or even prosperity.</p>

<p>It is curious that food security hasn't been a focus of this series (unless I've missed it).</p>	<p>There was a session on agriculture and forests.</p> <p>I agree. Its a huge issue for the regular folks I deal with daily.</p>
<p>All well and done to suggest that the federal government will kick things off with stimulus funding but we've heard it all before - how do we get beyond the political inertia in climate action?</p>	
<p>I agree that GDP is not an indicator of a successful society, country - we need to take a more holistic approach to economic development to include social and environmental indicators as well as economic indicators. What does the panel think?</p>	
<p>How can we ensure Community Benefits policies, developed to create economic opportunities for including economic disadvantaged and equity seeking groups in a sustainable economy , are maintained in Federal-Prov-Mun infrastructure and economic stimulus?</p>	<p>Yes, community benefits provisions are critical for ensuring the low carbon transition is just and equitable and that its many cobenefits are realized.</p>
<p>How does the Canadian Government build a greener economy and infrastructure when each Department purchases without environmental or Canadian content guidelines? For example, The Royal Canadian Navy just purchased \$5 million worth of mechanical mills that will enable them to use a lot of energy and convert the waste generated in the frigates to highly combustible dry lint. The practice is neither environmentally sound nor safe for either the ship or the site where the waste lint is offloaded. Yet, the RCN did not have to consider either the environmental impact or the source (Canadian or foreign) for this purchase. Meanwhile, the Canadian Government and the RCN have funded the innovations and development of the best environmental technology being used on many commercial ships and cruise ships for waste management. Cleantech Innovation is greatly supported in Canada, but not commercialized in Canada. How do we change this practice?</p>	
<p>Hydrogen technologies for producing clean energy has been part of the energy landscape in Ontario since the 70's. In Germany , because the residue is H2O , it is used to propel water vehicles. How come we don't embrace this non fossil fuel alternative. In addition an economic source that is sustainable.</p>	<p>Hydrogen is a carrier, like electricity, and like electricity the extent to which it is carbon-free depends on how it is made. Most of the hydrogen that is made today is made from natural gas -- sometimes called blue hydrogen -- with the resultant CO2 emissions vented to the atmosphere. If hydrogen were to be developed as a major energy carrier in Canada, much more of it would be produced than now. Proposals to reduce the carbon footprint of blue hydrogen include capturing and storing the carbon deep underground, the so-called carbon capture and storage option (CCS). If successfully deployed at scale, this reduces the carbon intensity of blue hydrogen, but not to zero. Hydrogen can also be made with electrolysis and here again the carbon intensity of the hydrogen depends on how the electricity is made. If the electricity is carbon free (e.g. solar, wind) then the hydrogen can be considered a zero carbon energy carrier, and is referred to as green hydrogen.</p>
<p>expansion of resource land trusts could perhaps entrench enviro protection?</p>	<p>Yes, it has been and will continue to be an effective approach.</p>
<p>Where is the sustainability lobby?</p>	

what sort of ROI could be provided by green bonds to attract investor away from other bonds?

That is an interesting question, worthy of a separate Corporate Knights panel! One observation is that the green investments have been outperforming average market returns. The mobilization of the investments at the scale we are talking about in this series requires business and financing innovation, quite apart from the question of the rate of return. Another key question is how to best utilize public investment to leverage private money while creating permanent capacity in the private sector to build the green economy.