

## Tackling Mobile Combustion Emissions Part Il: Converting Activity Data to GHG Emissions

In the first part of this paper, we focused on the activity data that should be collected for the various types of mobile combustion activity in which an organization is engaged. Our attention now turns to converting that activity data into greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

We'll look at three specific examples of activity databusiness travel by air, business travel by rail and employee commute by private vehicle. Our goal is to introduce some general methodologies through these examples that can then be applied to any dataset of mobile combustion activity.

## 4. CATEGORIZING ACTIVITY DATA

Recall that activity data is converted to emissions by multiplying activity (expressed in various units) by emissions factors. Before doing so, we must organize our activity data into categories and subcategories and then identify the appropriate emissions factor to apply to each. Herein lies the challenge (and the art) of tracking mobile combustion emissions.

Previously, we discussed the trade-offs inherent in seeking the appropriate level of granularity at which to track our activity data. We explained that finer granularity improves the accuracy and precision of our emissions calculations at the expense of complicating our data collection and maintenance burden ${ }^{1}$. Let's look at converting a mobile combustion activity dataset for a hypothetical organization to see an example of how this trade-off plays out.
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## A Hypothetical Activity Dataset

Table 1 provides an example of a simplistic categorization of mobile combustion activities (and the data collected for each) for a hypothetical organization. It exemplifies coarse granularity.

Table 1: Simple Subcategorization of Activity Data

| Activity Category | Subcategorization of Activity | Total Activity Data |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Business Travel | Rail | 843,722 miles |
|  | Air | $3,756,300$ miles |
| Fleets | Delivery Fleet | 188,470 gallons of fuel |
|  | Service Fleet | 914,720 gallons of fuel |
| Employee Commute | Private Vehicle | 433,980 miles |
|  | Bus | 216,833 miles |

### 4.1 Emissions Factors

Now that we have our activity data categorized and quantified, the next step is to find the right emissions factors to apply. In Scope 5, we provide several emissions factor libraries. These pull mobile combustion emissions factors from various reputable sources, most notably, The Greenhouse Gas Protocol (a partnership of the World Resources Institute and The World Business Council for Sustainable Development) and The Climate Registry, referred to from here on as $W R I$ and $T C R$, respectively. Each of these organizations in turn, pull emissions factors from multiple sources including the EPA and the IPCC. We mention these specific sources only as examples. There are numerous reputable sources of emissions factors.

Occasionally we may be fortunate enough to find a single emissions factor from an authoritative table that unequivocally applies to one of our specific subcategories of activity data. More often, we'll find it necessary to 'reverse engineer' tables of emissions factors so that we can identify the underlying activity data variables that are material in converting from activity to emissions. We may then readjust the subcategorization of our activity data based on an understanding of these variables and the sensitivity of the emissions factors to each of them. The goal of this iterative process is to arrive at a subcategorization of activity data and a set of emissions factors for each subcategory such that we:

1. Produce a reasonably accurate estimate of our mobile combustion emissions based on reputable emissions factors.
2. Surface opportunities to reduce emissions through specific activity changes, on an ongoing basis.

In the case that an organization is reporting its emissions under a specific protocol, it may be necessary to apply activity subcategorizations and emissions factors from a certain authority's table verbatim. In most cases, some degree of flexibility is appropriate and we will find ourselves iterating through the process described previously. The specific manner in which we do so will vary from one activity subcategory to a nother and the specific tables of emissions factors that are available.

These same emissions factors are available within Scope 5 under the WRI library, Public Transport category.

### 4.2 The Business Travel Dataset

Our hypothetical business travel dataset includes two numbers-one for total miles flown by air and one for total miles traveled by rail. Appropriate emissions factors for these can be found in Table 16 of the WRI's emissions factors for public transportation, an excerpt of which is illustrated in Figure 1:

| Vehicle and Type | Region | CO2 | CO2 Unit | CO2 Unit - Denominat |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Air - Domestic | Other | 0.17147 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Short Haul - Seating Unknown | Other | 0.097 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Short Haul - Economy Class | Other | 0.09245 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Short Haul - First/Business Class | Other | 0.13867 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Seating Unknown | Other | 0.11319 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Economy Class | Other | 0.08263 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Economy + Class | Other | 0.13221 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Business Class | Other | 0.23963 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - First Class | Other | 0.33052 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Domestic | UK | 0.17147 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Short Haul - Seating Unknown | UK | 0.097 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Short Haul - Economy Class | UK | 0.09245 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Short Haul - First/Business Class | UK | 0.13867 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Seating Unknown | UK | 0.11319 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Economy Class | UK | 0.08263 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Economy + Class | UK | 0.13221 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Business Class | UK | 0.23963 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - First Class | UK | 0.33052 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Domestic | US | 0.17147 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Short Haul - Seating Unknown | US | 0.097 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Short Haul - Economy Class | US | 0.09245 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Short Haul - First/Business Class | US | 0.13867 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Seating Unknown | US | 0.11319 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Economy Class | US | 0.08263 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Economy+ Class | US | 0.13221 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - Business Class | US | 0.23963 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |
| Air - Long Haul - First Class | US | 0.33052 | Kilogram | Passenger Kilometer |

Figure 1: Excerpt from WRI Table 16—Emission's Factors for Public Transport

## Business Air Travel

Looking back at our hypothetical activity dataset, we have one number for air travel3,756,300 miles. The full WRI table has 27 emissions factors for air travel! What do we do? The problem is that the WRI has categorized air travel at a finer granularity than our air travel dataset. We have several options:

- Go back and recategorize our activity data to match the WRI categories.
- Seek an alternate source of emissions factors that more closely corresponds to our level of categorization.
- Start with the WRI's numbers to derive some sort of average or summary numbers that yield a set of emissions factors corresponding to our level of categorization.

In fact, we'll see that variations of the problem illustrated surface when tackling pretty much any set of mobile combustion activity data for any organization. Typically, to resolve this problem, we use some combination of the three options listed above. In deciding which option to use, we must consider the materiality of the specific activity, not just in terms of its proportion of our organization's total emissions but also in terms of our ability to effect change.

In this case, we might decide that our organization's air travel emissions are not material enough to warrant the complexity of tracking activity data in 27 different categories to match the WRI's emissions factors. We might track our organization's air travel data at a slightly finer grain than the single category we imagined, but not in 27 categories.

So, we're faced with the choice of seeking an alternate source of emissions factors or trying to reduce the WRI's set into some sort of summary set. In order to decide how to move forward, it helps to look at some different sets of emissions factors so that we can see which variables across which subcategories are most significant. Looking at the WRI's numbers from Figure 1 in further depth we see that they are sub-categorized using several variables:

- Length of trip: long haul vs. short haul
- Location: UK, US or Other
- Class of travel: Economy or Business/First Class

There's also a category of domestic, which likely corresponds to some combination of the length of the trip and the type of aircraft typically used. Let's take a look at one of these variables-the location. Figure 2 is an excerpt from Scope 5's WRI library in which we can easily look at a subset of the emissions factors side-by-side:

| Air - Long Haul - Business Class - Other |  | $0.528293 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{km}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Air - Long Haul - Business Class - UK |  | $0.528293 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{km}$ |
| Air - Long Haul - Business Class - US |  | $0.528293 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{km}$ |

Figure 2: The Same Emissions Factor for Different Categories

We see that the same emission factors apply for long haul, business class regardless of location. In fact, when looking at the 27 categories in Figure 1, we see that there are actually only 9 different emissions factors. So, there's clearly no point in categorizing our organization's activity data into 27 categories.

How then should we sub-categorize our activity data? Further examination of the WRI emissions factors reveal that class of travel is an important variable-traveling first class incurs some three times more emissions than traveling in economy class! Furthermore, class of travel is a variable over which we have a great deal of control and therefore, the ability to effect change. Another variable that is significant is the length of trip. The WRI's emissions factors for long haul travel differ by anywhere from $12-58 \%$ from the equivalent factors for short haul travel.

Based on these findings, we would want to subcategorize our air travel activity data by class of travel at the very least and possibly by short haul vs. long haul as well. Thus, we might arrive at the following subcategories in Table 2. These are taken verbatim from the corresponding rows in the WRI table:

Table 2: Proposed Categorization for Air Travel

| Distance | Class of Travel | Emissions Factor $\left(\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2} / \mathrm{km}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Long Haul | Seating Unknown | 0.11319 |
|  | Economy | 0.08263 |
|  | Economy Plus | 0.13221 |
|  | Business | 0.23963 |
|  | First | 0.33052 |
| Short Haul | Seating Unknown | 0.097 |
|  | Economy | 0.09245 |
|  | First/Business | 0.13867 |

Our data maintenance burden is increased—we now have to collect and track business air travel data in eight categories instead of a single category. However, our categories now map directly to the WRI's emissions factors and we know exactly how to convert our distance-traveled data in each category to the corresponding emissions with a great degree of confidence.

We might look at ways of decreasing our data maintenance burden. What would it look like to reduce the number of activity data sub categories by eliminating short haul vs. long haul as a variable? The following table shows the difference in emissions factors between short haul and long haul for the same class of travel:

Table 3: Sensitivity of Emissions Factors to Long vs. Short Haul

| Class of Travel | Long Haul EF <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{km})$ | Short Haul EF <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{km})$ | Difference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Seating Unknown | 0.11319 | 0.097 | $-14 \%$ |
| Economy | 0.08263 | 0.09245 | $12 \%$ |
| Business | 0.23963 | 0.13867 | $-42 \%$ |
| First | 0.33052 | 0.13867 | $-58 \%$ |

From Table 3 we see that the differences in emissions factors between short and long haul for the seating unknown subcategory and the economy class subcategory are relatively minor. However, for business and first class, they're substantial. In the interest of balancing our effort to reduce complexity with the resulting loss of accuracy, we might settle for the following subcategorization:

Table 4: Simpler Subcategorization

| Class of Travel | Emissions Factor (kg/km) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Seating Unknown | 0.1051 |
| Economy | 0.0875 |
| Short Haul Business/First | 0.13867 |
| Long Haul Business | 0.23963 |
| Long Haul First | 0.33052 |

We now have five subcategories instead of eight. For the first two, we've used the average of the short and long haul emissions factors from Table 3. In doing so, we settle for a slight loss in accuracy-if, for example, we have a significant number of miles flown in short haul economy class and none in long haul economy class, we'd end up understating our emissions for economy class air travel by $6 \%$. If on the other hand, the number of miles flow in short haul economy class are close to the number flown in long haul economy class, we will have lost very little accuracy as a result of reducing the number of subcategories.

## The Power of Averaging

Taking averages of multiple emissions factors in this manner can be a powerful strategy to reduce the number of subcategories of activity data (and the associated data management burden). We lose some amount of accuracy but we can minimize this loss by being careful in how we apply the strategy. In this example, we used average emissions factors where there was not a big difference between the set of emissions factors averaged. We maintained separate categories where there was a big difference between emissions factors.

In addition, the loss of accuracy is limited if actual activity is evenly distributed between the subcategories that we combine. This is generally more likely to be the case when we have a large number of data points making up our activity dataset.

In fact, it's likely that the WRI's emissions factor for seating unknown is an average emissions factor. It's probably a weighted average of the different classes based on the average distribution of passengers across classes of travel. As such, to the degree that our organizations' population of business travelers represents the general flying public, we could probably use the single seating unknown factor with little loss of accuracy—all of which brings us full circle, back to one activity subcategory for business air travel. Although this strategy might ease our data maintenance at a small cost to accuracy it does little to facilitate driving change.

## PRESERVING OPPORTUNITIES TO DRIVE CHANGE

To illustrate, assume that air travel is a material activity for our hypothetical organization. We track air travel emissions, for each department or division, for thousands of consultants that fly around the world. Our organization has the option of implementing programs that reduce air travel emissions, such as imposing an internal carbon fee or establishing competitions between departments.

One way for a department to lower their carbon fee or to 'win' a competition is to shift their travel away from the more emissions intensive classes of travel, towards economy class. If our organization doesn't sub-categorize air travel activity based on class of travel, we'll be unable to see or show any progress as a result of our efforts. Departments won't have emissions data at the granularity that enables them to reduce their carbon fee or to compete with each other.

In summary, it makes sense to use averages where possible to simplify our data maintenance burden. We can do so in a manner that maintains a reasonable level of accuracy. This serves our goal of producing credible and defensible emissions reports. However, for many organizations, credible reporting is just one of the goals of emissions reporting. Another goal is to drive behavior change to reduce cost and impact. In many cases, the averaging strategies discussed can be used with no adverse effect. In other cases, averaging might compromise our ability to drive behavior change.

## Another Source of Emissions Factors

When our subcategories don't match the subcategories of a particular authority's emissions factors, we suggested looking for an alternate source of emissions factors as one of the options available to us. Figure 3 illustrates a table of emissions factors from the EPA:

## Table 8 Business Travel Emission Factors

| Vehicle Type | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Factor (kg / unit) | $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ Factor ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{unit}$ ) | $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ Factor ( $\mathrm{g} /$ unit) | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Passenger Car ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | 0.355 | 0.021 | 0.015 | vehicle-mile |
| Light-Duty Truck ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | 0.485 | 0.020 | 0.022 | vehicle-mile |
| Motorcycle | 0.191 | 0.070 | 0.007 | vehicle-mile |
| Intercity Rail (i.e. Amtrak) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.136 | 0.0083 | 0.0030 | passenger-mile |
| Commuter Rail ${ }^{\text {D }}$ | 0.169 | 0.0085 | 0.0034 | passenger-mile |
| Transit Rail (i.e. Subway, Tram) ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 0.120 | 0.0025 | 0.0017 | passenger-mile |
| Buc | 0.055 | 0.0006 | 0.0005 | passenger-milo |
| Air Travel - Short Haul (<300 miles) ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | 0.251 | 0.0039 | 0.0083 | passenger-mile |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Air Travel - Medium Haul (>= } 300 \text { miles, } \\ & <2300 \text { miles) }{ }^{\text {F }} \end{aligned}$ | 0.143 | 0.0000 | 0.0047 | passenger-mile |
| Air Travel - Long Haul (>= 2300 miles) ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | 0.167 | 0.0006 | 0.0056 | passenger-mile |

Figure 3: EPA Emissions Factors for Business Travel

The last three rows of this table offer a simple categorization of air travel into only three subcategories. We could readily adopt this subcategorization for our air travel emissions. We'd be using a defensible set of emissions factors but would lose the opportunity to drive behavior change through class of travel as described previously.

## Business Rail Travel

For rail travel, like air travel, our initial subcategorization from Table 1 yields a single number corresponding to distance traveled: 843,722 miles. Let's see which emissions factors we might use to calculate the resulting emissions. Figure 4 illustrates another excerpt from the WRI's Table 16:

| Vehicle and Type | Reg | CO2 | CO2 Unit | CO2 Unit - Denc | CH4 | CH4 Ur |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Train - Light Rail | US | 0.163 | Kilogram | Passenger Mile | 0.004 Gram |  |
| Train - Tram | US | 0.163 | Kilogram | Passenger Mile | 0.004 Gram |  |
| Train - Average (Light Rail and Tram) | US | 0.163 | Kilogram | Passenger Mile | 0.004 Gram |  |
| Train - National Rail | US | 0.185 | Kilogram | Passenger Mile | 0.002 Gram |  |
| Train - Subway | US | 0.163 Kilogram | Passenger Mile | 0.004 Gram |  |  |

Figure 4: Another Excerpt from the WRI Tables

Upon examining the original WRI's Table 16, we see that there are two different sets of emissions factors for rail—one for National Rail and the other for various forms of light rail—subway, tram, etc. In general, it's likely that our business travel subcategory from Table 1 quantifies travel on national rail rather than light rail. This would be especially likely in Europe and other regions in which national rail is a common form of inter-city business transit ${ }^{2}$. Thus, we would use the emissions factors from the subcategory Train-National Rail to convert distance traveled to emissions.

On the other hand, for many organizations, employee commuting activity likely includes travel by subway or tram, for which the alternate emissions factors from the table would be appropriate.
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### 4.3 The Employee Commute Dataset

In the employee commute category of our hypothetical dataset, we have two subcategories -private vehicle and bus. Let's see how we might calculate emissions for the private vehicle subcategory. Referring back to Table 1, we see that we're tracking activity for this subcategory in units of distance traveled. Let's search the WRI tables for an emissions factor for private vehicles that can be used to calculate emissions from distance-traveled activity.

We find what we're looking for in the WRI's Table 12-Emission Factors for US and Other Regions by Vehicle Distance. This table includes 166 subcategories of activities (one in each row) with the corresponding emissions factors (in separate columns).

Since we're going to apply this table to our subcategory of employee commute in private vehicles, we can omit the activity subcategories for the following vehicle types:

- Bus
- Heavy Duty Vehicle—Articulated
- Heavy Duty Vehicle—Rigid

We're left with 78 activity subcategories. The resulting table is illustrated in Figure 5.

Table 12. CO2, CH4 and N2O Emission Factors for US and other regions by Vehicle Distance

| Vehicle and Fuel and Vehicle Year | Region | CH4 | CH4 | CH4 | N2O | N2 |  | Fuel | EiFuel IFuel Efficier Fuel |  |  | CO2 | CO2 Unit CO2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1984-1993 | Other | - | - | - | - | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1994 | Other | - | - | - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | ile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1995 | Other | - | - | - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1996 | Oth | - | - | - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | asoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | - |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1997 | Oth | - |  |  |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1998 | Oth | - |  | - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1999 | Othe | - | - | - - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2000 | Other | - | - | - - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | - |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2001 | Other | - | - | - - |  | - |  | 22.5 | M | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | - |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2002 | Other | - | - | - - |  |  |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | - |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2003 | Other |  |  |  |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2004 | Other |  |  |  |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2005-prese | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.382166 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Diesel - Year 1960-1982 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.450266667 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Diesel - Year 1983-present | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.450266667 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Fuel Unknown | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 22.5 | Mil | US Gallon |  |  |  |  |
| Light Goods Vehicle - CNG | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | CNG |  |  |  |
| Light Goods Vehicle - LPG | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mil | US Gallon | LPG | 0.37654321 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Ethanol | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Ethanol |  | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1987-1993 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | e |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1994 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1995 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | - |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1996 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | le |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1997 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | ile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1998 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | e |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1999 | Other |  |  | - |  |  |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | le |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2000 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | ile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2001 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mil | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | ile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2002 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | le |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2003 | Other |  | - | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | ile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2004 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | ile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | ile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2005-prese | Oth |  | - | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | ile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.530786111 | Kilogram | ile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Diesel - Year 1960-1982 | Other | - |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.6253703 | Kilogram | ile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Diesel - Year 1983-1995 | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.62537037 | Kilogram | e |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Diesel - Year 1996-present | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | le | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.62537037 | Kilogram | ile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Fuel Unknown | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon |  |  |  |  |
| Motorbike - Non-Catalyst Control | Other |  |  | - |  | - |  | 50 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel | 0.20262 | Kilogram | ile |
| Motorbike - Uncontrolled | Other |  |  | - |  |  |  | 50 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel | 0.20262 | Kilogram | ile |
| Motorbike - Control Unknown | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel | 0.20262 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1984-19 | US | 0.0704 | Gram | Mile | 0.0647 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mil | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | ile |
| Passenger Car-Gasoline - Year 1994 | US | 0.0531 | Gram | Mile | 0.056 | Gram | Mil | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | le |
| Passenger Car-Gasoline - Year 1995 | US | 0.0358 | Gram | Mile | 0.0473 | Gram | Mil | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | le |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1996 | US | 0.0272 | Gram | Mile | 0.0426 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car-Gasoline - Year 1997 | US | 0.0268 | Gram | Mile | 0.0422 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1998 | US | 0.0249 | Gram | Mile | 0.0393 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car-Gasoline - Year 1999 | US | 0.0216 | Gram | Mile | 0.0337 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2000 | US | 0.0178 | Gram | Mile | 0.0273 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | e |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2001 | US | 0.011 | Gram | Mile | 0.0158 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2002 | US | 0.0107 | Gram | Mile | 0.0153 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2003 | US | 0.0114 | Gram | Mile | 0.0135 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2004 | US | 0.0145 | Gram | Mile | 0.0083 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2005-present | US | 0.0147 | Gram | Mile | 0.0079 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Diesel - Year 1960-1982 | US | 0.0006 | Gram | Mile | 0.0012 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mil | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel | 0.451111111 | Kilogram | ile |
| Passenger Car - Diesel - Year 1983-present | US | 0.0005 | Gram | Mile | 0.001 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel | 0.451111111 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Fuel Unknown | US | 0.031 | Gram | Mile | 0.032 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon |  |  |  |  |
| Light Goods Vehicle - CNG | US | 0.737 | Gram | Mile | 0.05 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | CNG |  |  |  |
| Light Goods Vehicle - LPG | US | 0.037 | Gram | Mile | 0.067 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | LPG | 0.357407407 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Ethanol | US | 0.055 | Gram | Mile | 0.067 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Ethanol |  | Kilogram | ile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1987-1993 | US | 0.0813 | Gram | Mile | 0.1035 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1994 | US | 0.0646 | Gram | Mile | 0.0982 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | le |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1995 | US | 0.0517 | Gram | Mile | 0.0908 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mil | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1996 | US | 0.0452 | Gram | Mile | 0.0871 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | e |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1997 | US | 0.0452 | Gram | Mile | 0.0871 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mil | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1998 | US | 0.0391 | Gram | Mile | 0.0728 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1999 | US | 0.0321 | Gram | Mile | 0.0564 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mi | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | e |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2000 | US | 0.0346 | Gram | Mile | 0.0621 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2001 | US | 0.0151 | Gram | Mile | 0.0164 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2002 | US | 0.0178 | Gram | Mile | 0.0228 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | - |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2003 | US | 0.0155 | Gram | Mile | 0.0114 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2004 | US | 0.0152 | Gram | Mile | 0.0132 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2005-prese | US | 0.0157 | Gram | Mile | 0.0101 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Diesel - Year 1960-1982 | US | 0.0011 | Gram | Mile | 0.0017 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.62654321 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Diesel - Year 1983-1995 | US | 0.0009 | Gram | Mile | 0.0014 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.62654321 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Diesel - Year 1996-present | US | 0.001 | Gram | Mile | 0.0015 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.62654321 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Fuel Unknown | US | 0.036 | Gram | Mile | 0.047 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon |  |  |  |  |
| Motorbike - Non-Catalyst Control | US | 0.0672 | Gram | Mile | 0.0069 | Gram | Mile | 50 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.203 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Motorbike - Uncontrolled | US | 0.0899 | Gram | Mile | 0.0087 | Gram | Mile | 50 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.203 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Motorbike - Control Unknown | US | 0.07 | Gram | Mile | 0.007 | Gram | Mile | 50 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.203 | Kilogram | Mile |

Figure 5: Subset of WRI Table 12
Looking at Figure 5, we see that the table includes two sets of roughly equivalent activity subcategories, differentiated by region. The first set of activity subcategories (in the first 39 rows) is for the Other region. The second set (in the remaining 39 rows) is for the US region. Let's continue under the assumption that the employee commute subcategory for our hypothetical dataset applies only to the US region. We now have the table illustrated in Figure 6.

Table 12. CO2, CH4 and N2O Emission Factors for US and other regions by Vehicle Distance

| Vehicle and Fuel and Vehicle Year | Regiol ${ }^{\text {CH4 }}$ |  | CH4 UrCH4 UIN2O |  |  | N2O Uni N2O IFuel EFuel EFuel EfficieniFuel |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CO2 } \\ & \hline 0.391555556 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CO2 Unit CO2 L |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1984-1993 | US | 0.0704 | Gram | Mile | 0.0647 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol |  | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1994 | US | 0.0531 | Gram | Mile | 0.056 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1995 | US | 0.0358 | Gram | Mile | 0.0473 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1996 | US | 0.0272 | Gram | Mile | 0.0426 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1997 | US | 0.0268 | Gram | Mile | 0.0422 | Gra | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1998 | US | 0.0249 | Gram | Mile | 0.0393 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 1999 | US | 0.0216 | Gram | Mile | 0.0337 | Gram | Mi | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.39155555 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2000 | US | 0.0178 | Gram | Mile | 0.0273 | Gram | Mile | 22 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2001 | US | 0.011 | Gram | Mile | 0.0158 | Gram | Mile | 22 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.39155555 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2002 | US | 0.0107 | Gram | Mile | 0.0153 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2003 | US | 0.0114 | Gram | Mile | 0.0135 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.391555556 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2004 | US | 0.0145 | Gram | Mile | 0.0083 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.39155555 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Gasoline - Year 2005-pre | US | 0.0147 | Gram | Mile | 0.0079 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.39155555 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Diesel - Year 1960-1982 | US | 0.0006 | Gram | Mile | 0.0012 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.45111111 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Diesel - Year 1983-present | US | 0.0005 | Gram | Mile | 0.001 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | ile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesell | 0.45111111 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Passenger Car - Fuel Unknown | US | 0.031 | Gram | Mile | 0.032 | Gram | Mile | 22.5 | Mile | US Gallon |  |  |  |  |
| Light Goods Vehicle - CNG | US | 0.737 | Gram | Mile | 0.05 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | CNG |  |  |  |
| Light Goods Vehicle - LPG | US | 0.037 | Gram | Mile | 0.067 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | LPG | 0.357407407 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Ethanol | US | 0.055 | Gram | Mile | 0.067 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Ethanol |  | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1987- | US | 0.0813 | Gram | Mile | 0.1035 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1994 | US | 0.0646 | Gram | Mile | 0.0982 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1995 | US | 0.0517 | Gram | Mile | 0.0908 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.543827 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1996 | US | 0.0452 | Gram | Mile | 0.0871 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.5438271 | Kilogram | Mil |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1997 | US | 0.0452 | Gram | Mile | 0.0871 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.543827 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1998 | US | 0.0391 | Gram | Mile | 0.0728 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petro | 0.543827 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 1999 | US | 0.0321 | Gram | Mile | 0.0564 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petro | 0.543827 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2000 | US | 0.0346 | Gram | Mile | 0.0621 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.543827 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2001 | US | 0.0151 | Gram | Mile | 0.0164 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.543827 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2002 | US | 0.0178 | Gram | Mile | 0.0228 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2003 | US | 0.0155 | Gram | Mile | 0.0114 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2004 | US | 0.0152 | Gram | Mile | 0.0132 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.54382716 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Gasoline - Year 2005- | US | 0.0157 | Gram | Mile | 0.0101 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | Gasoline/Petrol | 0.543827 | Kilogram | Mil |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Diesel - Year 1960-19 |  | 0.0011 | Gram | Mile | 0.0017 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.6265432 | Kilogram | M |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Diesel - Year 1983-19 |  | 0.0009 | Gram | Mile | 0.0014 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.62654321 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Diesel - Year 1996-pre | US | 0.001 | Gram | Mile | 0.0015 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.62654321 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Light Goods Vehicle - Fuel Unknown | US | 0.036 | Gram | Mile | 0.047 | Gram | Mile | 16.2 | Mile | US Gallon |  |  |  |  |
| Motorbike - Non-Catalyst Control | US | 0.0672 | Gram | Mile | 0.0069 | Gram | Mile | 50 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.203 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Motorbike - Uncontrolled | US | 0.0899 | Gram | Mile | 0.0087 | Gram | Mile | 50 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.203 | Kilogram | Mile |
| Motorbike - Control Unknown | US | 0.07 | Gram | Mile | 0.007 | Gram | Mile | 50 | Mile | US Gallon | On-Road Diesel I | 0.203 | Kilogram | Mile |

Figure 6: Even Shorter Subset of WRI's Table 12

We're left with only 39 subcategories to map to our single miles driven number from our hypothetical dataset. This is much better than the 166 subcategories in the original Table 12, but we can do better. Let's examine the emissions factors for the remaining 39 subcategories. The table in Figure 6 includes three emissions factors for each subcategory, one each for $\mathrm{CH}_{4}, \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ (in columns D, G and N , respectively).

## METHANE AND NITROUS OXIDE ( $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ AND $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ )

Recall from section 3.1 in Part I of this whitepaper that the contribution of $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to total $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions tends to be rather small. Working from our table in Figure 6, the average contribution of $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ is about $2.5 \%$.

If we further disregard the subcategories for the alternate fuels (LPG, LNG, CNG and Ethanol), and for model years prior to 2004, the average drops to $0.76 \%^{3}$. It seems reasonable to drop these subcategories-after all, it's unlikely that our employee commute vehicles include many LPG, LNG or CNG fueled vehicles (there may be a few Ethanol fueled vehicles). While some of our commuting employees may do so in model year vehicles prior to 2004, most probably do not. So, $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ are not likely to be material to our employee commute activity, especially if we disregard older vehicles. We turn our attention next to the emissions factors for $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$.

[^2]
## CARBON DIOXIDE (CO ${ }_{2}$ )

The histogram in Figure 7 illustrates the distribution of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions factors across the remaining subcategories from Figure $6^{4}$.


Figure 7: $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Emissions Factors

These correspond, from left to right, to:

- Motorbikes
- Light Goods Vehicle: LPG
- Passenger Car: Gasoline (all years)
- Passenger Car: Diesel (all years)
- Light Goods Vehicle: Gasoline (all years)
- Light Goods Vehicle: Diesel (all years)

If we exclude the single emissions factor for LPG fueled light goods vehicles, we're left with five different emissions factors.

[^3]
## Reducing the Number of Subcategories

As a result, we're ready to consider a reduced set of five activity subcategories for employee commute by private vehicle, as illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5: Five Subcategories for Employee Commute Activity

| Vehicle Type | Fuel Type | Emissions Factor (kg/mile) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Passenger Car |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| Gasoline | 0.0000146 | 0.0000081 | 0.3916 |  |
| Liesel | 0.0000005 | 0.000001 | 0.4511 |  |
| Motorbike | Gasoline | 0.00001545 | 0.00001165 | 0.5438 |
|  | Diesel | 0.000001 | 0.00000153 | 0.6265 |

Note that for $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions factors we used averages across the remaining subcategories (excluding model years prior to 2004) for both passenger cars and light goods vehicles and we used the emissions factors corresponding to control unknown for motorbikes. This is reasonable as we saw earlier that $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ contribute negligibly to our overall employee commute emissions.

## Let's review quickly how we got here:

- We started with the 166 activity subcategories in the WRI's Table 12.
- We omitted the heavy-duty vehicle subcategories because they're irrelevant to employee commuting.
- We limited the employee commute activity that we're considering to the US region.
- We assumed that the contributions of $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions would be negligible because most commuting
- would not be in cars with model years prior to 2004
- would be in either gasoline or diesel cars (not LNG, LPG, CNG or Ethanol)


## Improving Our Subcategories-The Role of Fuel Efficiency

We've arrived at a very reasonable set of only 5 subcategories and corresponding emissions factors that we can use to calculate our employee commute emissions. We could stop here but we might be missing some opportunities. We might be able to adjust our set of subcategories such that we improve our accuracy or are more likely to identify opportunities for change, without substantially impacting our data maintenance burden.
Let's dig in a little further.
In reviewing Table 5, we see that the variables that materially affect employee commute emissions are:

- Type of fuel (diesel vs. gasoline)
- Type of vehicle (passenger car vs. light goods vehicle vs. motorbike)

Fuel type has an obvious impact on emissions factors-gasoline, diesel and other fuels simply differ in carbon content. But how does vehicle type impact emissions?

## Vehicle type impacts emissions in two ways:

- Different types of vehicles have different types of engines, which emit different amounts of $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ per mile.
- Different types of vehicles differ in their fuel efficiencies, which determine the volume of fuel burned and therefore the amount of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emitted per mile.

Let's ignore the impact on $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ for the time being and let's focus instead on $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions, which dominate. Recall that $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions are a function mostly of the volume of fuel burned but the activity units we're using are distance. The two are linked by a vehicle's fuel-efficiency. Looking back at the WRI's table in Figure 6, we see the fuel efficiencies assumed by the WRI in column 'J' for different vehicle types- 50 mpg for motorbikes, 22.5 mpg for passenger cars and 16.2 mpg for light goods vehicles. In Figure 8 we see an excerpt from the WRI's Table 10, which documents emissions factors for gasoline and diesel by volume.

| Table 10. CO2 Emission Factors by Fuel |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel | Region | CO 2 | CO2 Unit | 02 Unit |
| Jet Fuel | Other | 9.428 | Kilogram | US Gallon |
| Aviation Gasoline | Other | 8.333 | Kilogram | US Gallon |
| Gasoline/Petrol | Other | 8.59873 | Kilogram | US Gallon |
| On-Road Diesel Fuel | Other | 10.131 | Kilogram | US Gallon |
| Residual Fuel Oil (3s 5 and 6) | Other | 11.125 | Kilogram | US Gallon |

Figure 8: Emissions Factors by Volume

Using the following formula, these emissions factors, combined with the assumed fuel-efficiencies produce the expected $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions factors by distance:
$\frac{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}{\text { mile }}=\left(\frac{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}{\text { gallon }}\right) /\left(\frac{\text { mile }}{\text { gallon }}\right)$

It follows that one obvious way to sub-categorize our employee commute activity categories is by fuel type and by fuel-efficiency, as illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6: Eight Subcategories for Employee Commute Activity

| Activity Subcategory | Fuel Type | CO 2 Emissions Factor (kg/mile) $^{\text {Vehicles with fuel-efficiency }}$in the range of $40-50 \mathrm{mpg}$ <br> (Avg. 45 mpg ) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gasoline <br> Vehicles with fuel-efficiency <br> in the range of $30-40 \mathrm{mpg}$ <br> (Avg. 35 mpg) | Diesel | 0.1911 |
| Vehicles with fuel-efficiency <br> in the range of 20-30 mpg <br> (Avg. 25 mpg) | Gasoline | 0.2251 |
| Vehicles with fuel-efficiency <br> in the range of $10-20$ mpg <br> (Avg. 15 mpg) | Gasoline | 0.2457 |

In this example, we've created activity subcategories for each of a number of fuelefficiency bands. This strategy has a number of advantages over the WRI's approach:

1. By being explicit in identifying our activity subcategories based on fuel-efficiency rather than vehicle type, we make it easier to manage and categorize activity data ${ }^{5}$.
2. We can dial in different level of granularity by choosing to use more bands or fewer bands.
3. The WRI uses a fuel-efficiency figure of 22.5 for all passenger car emissions factors.

This is an outdated figure which would likely result in overstating emissions.
In this iteration, we adjusted our set of five activity subcategories from Table 5 to produce eight subcategories. We've increased the number of subcategories but our new set is likely to be easier to use and more accurate. We've conveniently brushed over $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions to get to this point, but, as noted previously, the average values that we're using will likely yield reasonable approximations since the overall contribution of these component gases is so small.

## An Alternate Subcategorization

A study conducted for Scope 5 by Scott Salyer proposes a slightly different approach to subcategorizing activity data. In this approach, subcategories are also defined by bands but the bands correspond to a range of model years rather than fuel efficiency. Further, three separate sets of bands are identified—one for passenger vehicles, another for light trucks and a third for an overall light duty fleet.

Scott's approach requires a slightly greater number of activity subcategories than the five or eight that we proposed previously but it has the advantage of more faithfully accounting for $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions and is still simpler and much more accurate than the subcategorization suggested in the WRI's Table 12.

[^4]
### 4.4 Fuel Volume Activity Data

We've been looking at calculating MCEs for our employee commute activity for which activity data is available in the form of distance-traveled. We've found that the dominant component of MCEs arise from $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, which depends on volume of fuel burned rather than distance traveled. As a result, our calculations have depended on subcategorizing our distance-traveled activity data by vehicle type or model year (as proxies for fuel efficiency) or by explicitly identifying bands of fuel efficiency.

It follows that without impractically fine-grain fuel-efficiency data (knowing the fuel efficiency at which each mile of our distance-traveled data was traveled) our MCE calculations are subject to quite a bit of error. We can get much more accurate results if activity data is available in the form of volume of fuel burned ${ }^{6}$. In certain cases, volume of fuel burned may actually be available. In these cases $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions can be readily calculated using emissions factors from various sources, such as the WRI's Table 10 (illustrated in Figure 8) or Table 13.1 from The Climate Registry, illustrated below.

|  | Table 13.1 US Default $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Emission Factors for Transport Fuels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Climate Registry |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel Type | Carbon Content (Per Unit Energy) | Heat Content | Fraction Oxidized | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Emission Factor (Per Unit Volume) |
| Fuels Measured in Gallons | kg C / MMBtu | MMBtu I barrel |  | $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ / gallon |
| Gasoline | 19.150909 | 5.25 | 1 | 8.7775 |
| Diesel Fuel | 20.170909 | 5.796 | 1 | 10.20648 |
| Aviation Gasoline | 18.886364 | 5.04 | 1 | 8.31 |

Figure 9: TCR Emissions Factors by Volume of Fuel Burned

[^5]When using activity data in the form of volume of fuel burned, total emissions in the form of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ e will be more accurate, however the contributions of $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ will be elusive as these depend on distance traveled (and engine type) rather than fuel volume ${ }^{7}$. These can still be estimated by assuming fuel-efficiencies, in this case, to convert from volume of fuel burned to distance traveled. Alternatively, The Climate Registry offers a simple estimation method (SEMS) that can be used to estimate $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions given $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions (see Figure 10).


Table 13.9 SEMS $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$
Emission Factors for Gasoline and Diesel Vehicles

The Climate Registry

| GHG | MT GHG per MT of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ | 0.0000494 |
| $\mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 0.0000353 |
| Source: Derived from EPA Inventory of U.S. GHG Emissions and Sinks 1990- <br> 2012 (April 2014), Table 2-15. Only includes data for passenger cars and light- <br> duty trucks. |  |

Figure 10: TCR's SEMS

## CLOSING STATEMENTS

Calculating GHG emissions resulting from various activities is a complex undertaking. It's particularly complicated for mobile combustion emissions (MCEs), which present challenges in the variety of activity data that might be available or required. Deciding how to collect and categorize activity data is the first challenge. Converting that activity data to emissions is the second challenge.

## We assume that the motivation to calculate MCEs arises from two underlying goals:

- To be able to communicate a reasonably accurate and defensible number to various stakeholders.
- To be able to identify opportunities to change behaviors such that emissions and costs can be reduced.

With these challenges and goals in mind, we've examined strategies for calculating MCEs, using a few specific examples. We hope that these help guide you, our readers, in a direction that helps you meet your goals in tackling MCEs for your organization.

[^6]Scope 5 is a cloud-based software service that helps organizations of all types collect, structure, track, analyze and communicate their sustainability data, benefiting their top and bottom lines. In addition to using the service to produce GHG reports, many of our customers use Scope 5 to go beyond reporting to identify opportunities and to communicate their progress to a variety of stakeholders.

1
Capture and manage any activity data, whether environmental, social or governance.


3
Analyze your data to gain transparency and to identify opportunities to improve performance and save costs-demonstrate success!


Scope 5 includes resource libraries that put up-to-date emission factors from recognized authorities at your fingertips to make it easier for you to calculate your GHG emissions and to assure that your results are reliable and meaningful. Scope 5 is intuitively and flexibly designed to be managed independently by your workforce talent or in conjunction with ours. We'd love the chacge to help make your data easy-to-use, convenient and work for you!

2 Calculate impacts of your activities such as greenhouse gas emissions, cost and other custom impacts.


4 Make reporting to the Carbon Disclosure Project, Global Reporting Initiative, B Corporation, and other reporting platforms easier.

| Scope-1 Records |  |  |  |  | Expand All |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trackers by Countr | Activity | Emisalons, All cases (tonnes) |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |
| - Argentina | 17,113.1367 gallons (US) | 0.1221 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.1224 |
| - Australla | 75.7803 gallons (US) | 0.7676 | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.7717 |
| - Brazil | 62.9340 gallons (US) | 0.6375 | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.6409 |
| - Canada | 274.0479 gallons (US) | 2.7760 | 0.0004 | 0.0000 | 2.7909 |
| - China | 4,219.1041 gallons (US) | 4.6857 | 0.0006 | 0.0000 | 4.7107 |
| - Denmark | 7,565.9190 gallons (US) | 0.0540 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0541 |
| - Finland | 4,382.6326 gallons (US) | 0.0313 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0313 |
| - France | 20,061.3090 gallons (US) | 0.1431 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.1435 |
| - Germany | 31,502.6482 gallons (US) | 0.2248 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.2253 |
| - India | 31.1408 gallons (US) | 0.2969 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.2986 |
| - Ireland | 30,350.8532 gallons (US) | 0.2166 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.2171 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Data management is made easier when it's easy for more stakeholders in the reporting chain to categorize activity. It's made harder when no stakeholder can easily determine the appropriate category for a specific activity.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ In calculating emissions for rail travel outside the US using the WRI's Table 16, be sure to use the emissions factors from the appropriate rows (UK or other). They differ significantly from the US factors.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Dropping activity subcategories for motorbikes reduces the contributions of $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ further yet, to only 0.36\%.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ Charting a histogram in this manner can be a valuable tool in distilling out the meaningful activity subcategories from complex emissions factor tables. In this case, we see that, although there are 39 activity subcategories in the table, there are only six different emissions factors.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ Data management is made easier when it's easy for more stakeholders in the reporting chain to categorize an activity. It's made harder when no stakeholder can easily determine the appropriate category for a specific activity.

[^5]:    ${ }^{6} \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions will be less accurate than they would be when the activity data is distance traveled but the contribution of these gases tends to be quite small.

[^6]:    ${ }^{7}$ Even when we had distance traveled activity data, $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions were challenging to calculate because of the practical constraints around categorizing according to engine type.

