

	Pro	Con
Science Based Targets	Internationally-recognised	Limited understanding by the general public
	Aligns to best practice (latest climate science from IPCC)	Hard to communicate (to stakeholders and public)
	Option of supplier-based target	Cannot use offsets to achieve target
	Third party verification	Doesn't ensure organisations set as ambitious targets as they can
	Ability to compare level of ambition across industries and competitors	Doesn't take a strong stance on whether the product / service is part of a low carbon future
	Any company can joining, including specific approach for SMEs	The goal post can be quite easily shifted over time as the organisation change and they re-calculate
	On-going reporting requirements focus on transparency rather than stringency	Hard to maintain strict accountability
	Applies to entirety of carbon footprint Requires CEO/MD level commitment	
3rd party verified Carbon Neutrality (e.g. Climate Active)	Third party verification	Limited focus on carbon management best practice (e.g. use of offsets to achieve target)
	Can use offsets to achieve target	Targets not necessarily aligned to climate science
	Best practice application of this includes all material aspects of carbon footprint	On-going fees and reporting requirements
	Straight forward to communicate and broadly recognised	Ability to scope out emissions
		Public scepticism about the validity / additionality of carbon offsets and credits Limited inclusion of scope 3 emissions for organisations
Net Zero	Broad definition	Inconsistent application (range of emissions, timeline and strategy)
	Offsets can be used neutralise residual emissions if reduction or elimination to zero	Difficult to assess level of ambition (i.e. contribution of a company to global emissions target)
	Internationally-recognised	Difficult to compare level of ambition across industries or competitors
		Limited focus on carbon management best practice (e.g. use of offsets to achieve target)
		No third party verification
		Targets not necessarily aligned to climate science
		Undefined pathway Commitment can lack detail and meaning if it is too far in the future (e.g. net zero by 2050)
100% Renewable energy use (e.g. RE100)	Internationally-recognised	Limited to purchased electricity emissions only
	Third party verification	Does not address supply chain issues
	Scope 2 emissions aligned to the climate science	Limited to 'influential' companies
	Defined pathway in terms of requirements (e.g. 60% by 2030, 100% by 2050)	Reporting requirements through RE100 mandated spreadsheet or CDP questionnaire
TCFD	Requires transparency on holistic climate action, beyond carbon	Range of coverage (light touch versus expensive undertaking)
	Board-level engagement	Limited understanding by the general public
	Tailored approach within the overall framework	Hard to communicate (to stakeholders and public)
	Internationally-recognised	Does not require immediate action
	Adoptable by all organisations	Does not necessarily align to climate science
	Brings the future nature of climate-related issues into the present Focus on risks/opportunities related to the transition to a low-carbon economy	
Carbon disclosure (e.g. CDP)	Consistent and transparent	Does not require action and therefore no alignment to climate science
	International alignment	Boundary of footprint can be voluntary
	Drives internal engagement, measurement and monitoring	