



## COP26 SPONSORSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP: CLIMATE CRITERIA

### Summary

1. Proposed **climate criteria** to be used when assessing an organisation's suitability for sponsorship and/or partnership (in-kind or financial) for COP26.
2. Next steps to progress this workstream

### Questions

- Do you agree to the proposed check list for climate criteria and the method used to prioritise organisations as potential sponsors/partners (Annex A)?
- Do you have any comments on the list of potential organisations that could be included as sponsors/partners, or suggestions to identify further potential sponsors/partners (Annex B)?

### Background

3. There is cross-Whitehall agreement to the high-level principle that we should seek to maximise sponsorship for COP26 in a way that enhances the outcomes and minimises the cost to Government. This would require criteria including human rights, financial, due diligence, legal and procurement requirements, as well as the climate criteria.
4. This paper presents potential climate criteria to assess whether an organisation is a suitable sponsor or partner (in-kind, including loans/secondments or financial) for COP26. The aim is to increase the chance that HMG accepts sponsorship and builds partnerships with organisations that will enhance the COP26 narrative and align with HMG policies, and minimise the risk of a partnership that detracts from COP progress and outcomes. Although there will still be an element of political and reputational risk associated with partnering with external organisations– this checklist will help mitigate this by ensuring due diligence is carried out.
5. Cabinet Office are looking into commissioning other Government departments on the wider criteria.

### Proposed Method

6. The proposed criteria builds on the *UNFCCC's Climate Change Due Diligence Checklist* used for COPs. I have also considered the principles used as part of BEIS policies including the Powering Past Coal Alliance and wider BEIS policies including criteria used by the Green Climate Fund in accrediting bodies.
7. The proposed criteria is based on the following principles, that sponsors/partners should:
  - Ensure their activities align with the COP26 narrative and with current HMG climate policies and legislation;
  - wherever possible be UK-based/UK employer to demonstrate the UK's climate strengths; and
  - there should be a diverse range of sponsors/partners to support our All of Society approach and to avoid the image of the event being too biased.

8. The proposed method sets out the following categories:

- Category A (Red) – **Exclusionary criteria**. This section includes violation of environmental law. If an organisation scores a YES in this section, they are immediately excluded.
- Category B (Yellow) – **Caution**. This section assesses an organisation's engagement in carbon-intensive sectors and whether they have passed the bar for inclusion in wider BEIS initiatives. If an organisation scores a YES in any part of this section caution is advised, and inclusion would need to be considered and agreed by a cross Whitehall panel/Board discussing the level of risk. It may be that the organisation is in transition towards more climate friendly policies. A negative point is awarded for every YES score so that organisations can be ranked.
- Category C (Green) – **Positive screening**. This section sets out positive statements of actions that support COP26 and our wider climate objectives. Organisations will be awarded a positive point for every YES score. Those with the highest weighted scores are the most aligned with our agenda and should be put forward for consideration of relevant sponsorship/partnering. This will help us to prioritise which organisations we would recommend working with. Discussion by a panel/Board would also need to consider whether positive statements can counterbalance negative ones. We are considering whether we can use this as a tool to encourage organisations who want to partner with us, to increase their positive rating by signing up to our wider initiatives.
- A recommendation for whether we should partner with the organisation or not should take into consideration the scores across all categories.

9. Although important, climate considerations need to be made alongside other criteria, particularly:

- Assessment of its workforce and ethics, including human rights and diversity and inclusion (FCO lead);
- Due diligence - Serious Fraud Office, Financial Conduct Authority, National Crime Agency (CO/DCMS lead)
- Legal and procurement requirements (CO lead);
- Whether it is value for money, and it will reduce HMG costs (HMT and CO lead).

### Next Steps

- Annex C sets out a draft project plan covering next steps. [REDACTED]
- Following this, the Cross Whitehall Sponsorship Working Group will need to agree the criteria. Additional decisions for the WG include: the package of offers for potential sponsors/partners; agreement on an engagement strategy and how to approach these organisations (including lines to take).

#### Attachments:

Annex A: COP 26 Climate Criteria Sponsors & Partners Check List

Annex B: List of potential sponsors/organisations

Annex C: Project Plan for Sponsorship