



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_3971
Title of the Manuscript:	Chasing the Whale: USU’s Quest for Carbon Neutrality

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors’ response to final evaluator’s comments
I still don’t think you can evaluate the initiative without reference to cost. If data not available an estimate would be better than nothing.	We have included a section (new section 3.3) about the program costs, and we agree that a failure to mention costs at all was a deficiency of the paper. However, the paper does not represent a cost-benefit analysis of the program – rather, we look for evidence of net reductions in consumption pursuant to the goal of GHG emission reductions. USU’s facilities department has released some rough aggregate numbers about capital investments in energy consumption reduction projects, but the specifics are spread across hundreds of project reports, the majority of which are not readily available. As discussed in the new section, one of the departments guiding principles is cost savings. We have no reason to doubt that the projects have a net present value with payback timetables in the short- to medium-term. Although the broader GHG emission reduction goals represent monetary costs to the university, we believe the focus of our paper (energy consumption reduction) does not represent a net cost to the university. What our analysis does show is that, even in the presence of these programs, there is not significant evidence for net reductions in energy consumption. In short, the projects are not sufficient to reduce consumption. They likely represent a curbing of consumption; consumption would be higher absent these projects. Our point is that the projects are ineffectual for the stated goal of the ACUPCC, even if they do not represent a cost. Better no cost (or a positive NPV) than ineffectual spending, but the stated goals we evaluate are reduction oriented.