



Carbon Footprint Analysis and Environmental Initiatives: A Case Study of Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, H.P., INDIA

Ritika Bhardwaj^{a+++} and Pawan Kumar Attri^{a#}

^a School of Environmental Sciences (Department of Interdisciplinary Studies) H.P. University Summer Hill Shimla-5, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJEE/2023/v22i4511

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/110120>

Original Research Article

Received: 02/10/2023
Accepted: 08/12/2023
Published: 12/12/2023

ABSTRACT

Carbon footprints (CFs) serve as a metric for quantifying the release of greenhouse gases (GHGs) attributable to a specific organization or activity. Taking a step towards fostering sustainable practices in education institution involves reporting CF levels within college campuses. This research centers on computing the carbon footprint of Himachal Pradesh University's Shimla campus (2020-2023), with a focus on understanding emissions trends, particularly the transition from lockdown (2020–2021) to post-lockdown (2021–2022 and 2022–2023) periods amid the COVID-19 pandemic. The study aims to address the challenge posed by educational institutions' substantial energy demands, contributing significantly to GHG emissions. Achieving net-zero emissions remains a formidable task for educational institutions, even with options like remote work

⁺⁺Student;

[#]SRO/Assistant Professor;

^{*}Corresponding author: E-mail: ritikabhardwaj1575@gmail.com;

and learning. The study underscores the persisting challenge of insufficiently addressing these concerns, despite the potential for students to play a role in mitigating greenhouse gas emission issues with the right information and resources. The research employs the Greenhouse Gas Protocol method to compute the Scope 1 carbon footprint of energy sources, encompassing kerosene, petrol, diesel, and LPG. This approach empowers educational institutions and businesses to construct dependable inventories of their GHG emissions, facilitating progress monitoring and the cultivation of sustainable practices aligned with climate objectives. By utilizing the Greenhouse Gas Protocol, the study evaluates Scope 1 emissions from energy sources like kerosene, petrol, diesel, and LPG, offering a systematic approach for institutions to create reliable inventories aligned with climate goals. The findings highlight kerosene as the predominant contributor, prompting the study to recommend curbing the use of conventional energy sources and transitioning to alternatives. Additionally, the research conducts Scope 2 emission calculations to compare the carbon footprint resulting from electricity consumption, contrasting coal-based electricity generation with hydropower generation. Valuable insights are provided for universities to leverage calculated carbon footprints in identifying effective emission reduction strategies. The study identifies information gaps and inefficient data collection as significant challenges, proposing energy-saving measures and enhanced procurement strategies as beneficial mitigation measures.

Keywords: Carbon footprint; greenhouse gases; Himachal Pradesh University Shimla; GHG protocol; COVID-19.

1. INTRODUCTION

Global warming is a fact that originates from a single scientific issue and spreads to encompass a wide variety of global issues about politics, business, society, technology, the environment, and ecology [1]. The immediate and easily noticeable consequence of global warming is the rise in temperatures across the globe [1]. The planet has already warmed by 1.9 degrees Fahrenheit (1.1 degrees Celsius) since the start of the preindustrial era 250 years ago [2].

Experts caution that if we do not address the root causes of climate change, which are the burning of fossil fuels like coal, oil, and gas, the temperature may worsen to 4 degrees Celsius (7.2 degrees Fahrenheit) by the year 2100 [2]. Furthermore, the majority of the consequences of climate change that have been observed since the 1950s, such as warming oceans, melting glaciers, and increasing sea levels, are now attributed to human activity, according to experts, who are at least 95% positive of this. It was estimated that 7% of the total GHGs are emitted from anthropogenic sources [1].

In order to power factories, smelters, and steam engines during the Industrial Revolution, humans began burning coal and other fossil fuels, which increased the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. The world has been warming as a result of human activity ever since [3].

One of the main reasons for this is the excessive emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the

atmosphere leading to global warming and its consequences. First and foremost, the Kyoto Protocol was designed to restrict the increase of greenhouse gas emissions due to concerns about these emissions and their impact [4]. The Kyoto Protocol set a goal to use a variety of adaptable mechanisms, such as carbon trading, under which, industrialised nations committed to lowering their yearly hydrocarbon emissions by an average of 5.2% by 2012 [5].

Global warming, which is determined by the amount of greenhouse gas emissions emitted into the atmosphere, is the primary cause of climate change. Determining an organization's present environmental performance in terms of its Carbon Footprint (CF) is the first step for those who want to help achieve the climate-neutral goal. The GHG Protocol (2004) is the most significant regulatory framework for GHG emission accounting. It defines the CF as the total quantity of GHG emissions produced by an organization's activities, either directly or indirectly, and typically expressed as the carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) [6].

The organisations engaged in education, research and community services, play an important role in sustainable development and the fight against climate change. CF is a very useful tool for exercising a greater degree of control over activities that impact the environment and also provides a baseline on which to evaluate the effect of future mitigation efforts on campus [7]. According to Cynthia

Klein-Banai's study on [8] higher education institutes can take a leadership role by estimating their emissions, developing climate change plans, and identifying reduction potentials. Although, across the globe, these kinds of initiatives have been taken by several universities: The Universities of Leeds, UK [9]; the University of Illinois, Chicago (UIC) [10]; University of Cape Town (UCT) South Africa [11] Norwegian University of Technology and Science (NTNU) [12]; De Montfort University, UK [13]; USA [14]; etc.

The Cuajimalpa campus of the Autonomous Metropolitan University (UAM) is located in Mexico City conducted a study for achieving sustainability goal by computing the CF of the campus. The primary contributors to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were commuting via vehicles, which constituted 51%, and electricity usage, which accounted for 24%. This study serves as a reference point for setting mitigation goals for the institution and designing a comprehensive plan that includes assessing the emissions of the other four UAM campuses [15].

Another study published on Carbon footprint assessment at Universitas Pertamina from the scope of Electricity, Transportation, and Waste Generation being the main contributors in generating greenhouse gas emissions. The findings of this study indicated that the electricity sector accounted for the majority (92.3%) of CO₂ emissions at the university, with per capita emissions reaching approximately 0.52 MTCO₂ annually. This study emphasizes the need for an early and ongoing carbon footprint reduction plan at educational institutions [16].

So far the study of carbon footprint measurement of BITS Pilani, Pilani campus, situated in the semi-arid region of north-west India has been taken. Results show a total of 16500 tCO₂eq. of GHG emissions. 50% of GHG emissions are from scope 2 electricity generation and 48.9 % GHG emissions are from scope 3 sources. The rest 1.1 % emissions are the scope 1 GHG emissions from the petrol and diesel burned at BITS Pilani owned facilities like diesel-electric generator sets and vehicles [17].

A study on Carbon Footprint in an Educational Institution in India focusing on the carbon footprint of Sri Ramakrishna Engineering College in Coimbatore, India. The study calculated the carbon footprint of the institution's campus from January 2018 to December 2019. The majority of

carbon emissions come from other indirect sources, such as imported electricity, which accounts for approximately 27.89% of total carbon emissions [18].

The lack of comprehensive studies on carbon footprints in Indian universities is attributed to several factors, including the novelty of carbon footprint measurement in India, competing priorities, limited awareness, and insufficient institutional support for sustainability initiatives. Hence, Himachal Pradesh University has taken the initiative as an attempt to fill the research gap. This study compares the carbon footprint of Himachal Pradesh University produced during the COVID-19 lockdown in March onwards 2020, to that produced during the same period in years 2021-2022, and 2022-2023. Understanding environmental implications, creating accountability, and directing sustainability initiatives all depend on university research on carbon footprints. It equips students with useful problem-solving abilities and elevates universities to the position of sustainability leaders, fostering teamwork for a more sustainable future.

The present study is conducted to measure the carbon footprint of an HPU Shimla with the following objectives; to identify major sources and activities which emit CO₂ and other greenhouse gases and reduce emissions over time; to manage the carbon footprint of the H.P. University Campus.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This section addresses the following topics: 1. Study Area 2. Justification for using Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Standard as a research methodology for conducting the study 3. Data collection.

2.1 Study Area

The Himachal Pradesh University was founded on July 22, 1970. It is located in Summerhill, Shimla district of Himachal Pradesh, India. The University campus occupies an area of 200 acres and has been designed to possess a distinctive architectural style.

Himachal Pradesh University, Summer Hill, Shimla homes Teaching Departments, properly-prepared Laboratories, Seminar Halls, and a Science Instrumentation Centre. It has 12 multi-storied buildings, which include Ambedkar Bhawan, Law Block, Science Blocks, Netaji

Subash Chandra Bhawan, Multi-school Swami Vivekanand Bhawan, Gandhi Bhawan, and Main Library.

The University has 14 Hostels, a Faculty House, and an Auditorium that seats 800 persons. It additionally has residential colonies for coaching and non-coaching personnel. The University additionally has a playground, a put-up office, a bank, ATM, cyber cafes, eateries, and shops. It has its very own fleet of buses and is properly related through avenues and rail.

2.2 GHG Protocol

The methodology used in this study's GHG accounting and reporting adheres to the rules and guidelines outlined in the "greenhouse gas corporate accounting and reporting standards" (GHG Protocol) developed by World Resources Institute (WRI) and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) developed in 2011, which specifies guidelines for measuring GHG emissions inside organisations covered by the Kyoto Protocol. This is the most widely used and accepted methodology for conducting corporate carbon footprints [19].

In terms of carbon dioxide equivalents, CF measures the amount of greenhouse gas emissions that an activity, or the accumulation of emissions over the course of a good or service's life cycle, directly or indirectly contributes to. Although the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) lists 18 greenhouse gases with varying global warming potentials, only carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulphur hexafluoride (SF_6) are taken into account for the carbon accounting under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change [UNFCCC] and its Kyoto Protocol [20].

The GHG Protocol requires emissions to be reported against the three different "scopes" described below:

Scope 1: Scope 1 emissions are defined as direct emissions from sources under an organization's ownership or control. These emissions come from the burning of fossil fuels in the organization's boilers, furnaces, turbines, and other machinery, including kerosene and LPG (Liquified Petroleum Gas).

Scope 2: Indirect emissions associated with the generation of purchased electricity that the company consumed. Scope 2 accounts for the emissions produced during the generation of grid electricity. (*Explained with reference to thermal and hydropower plant*).

Scope 3: All other indirect emissions as a consequence of the activities of the company that occur from sources neither owned nor controlled by the company (*not mentioned in this study*).

2.3 Data Collection

Two types of data were collected namely activity data and EFs.

The different emission factors utilized to calculate the carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide emission in tonnes (Table 1).

Activity data was collected for fixed sources i.e. LPG and kerosene and mobile sources i.e. petrol and diesel under scope 1 and for electricity consumption under scope 2 activities within defined organisational boundaries for 3 financial years i.e. 2020-2021, 2021-2022, 2022-2023 (Table 2).

Table 1. Emission factors for different gases (Fuel Type)

Gases	EF for LPG (kgCO ₂ e/ tonne fuel)	EF for Kerosene (kgCO ₂ e/ litre fuel)	EF for Diesel (kgCO ₂ e/ litre fuel)	EF for Petrol (kgCO ₂ e/ litre fuel)
CO ₂	2984.63	2.519376	2.676492	2.2717926
N ₂ O	0.00473	0.000021024	0.000021672	0.0000196692
CH ₄	0.2365	0.0003504	0.0003612	0.00032782

Table 2. Parameters and activity source data used to calculate CF of the HPU campus Shimla

Activity	Parameter	Source
LPG Consumption (on site)	LPG consumption annually (kg)	Invoices [Chief Warned Office, DSW, HPU, Shimla]
Kerosene Consumption (on site)	Kerosene consumption annually (L)	Invoices [Store purchasing office, HPU Shimla]
Transportation- (University owned vehicle)	Petrol consumption annually (L) Diesel consumption annually (L)	Running chart [Pool office, HPU, Shimla]
Electricity Consumption (on site)	Electricity consumption annually (kWh)	Electricity bills [Estate office, HPU, Shimla]

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following steps were followed to determine the GHG emissions related to each category:

1. Determine the energy consumption related to each activity source. The amount of activity that contributes to greenhouse gas emissions is measured by activity data or source (either directly or indirectly).
2. Find the updated GHG emissions factor associated with each activity source, defined in terms of CO_2 /per unit of measurement (activity data for a certain source) and are unique to each source. Here fuel-based methodology has been used therefore fuel type emission factors has been used to calculate CF.
3. To find the quantity in each category, multiply consumption by the corresponding emission factor and global warming potential (GWP) add them together to get CF in kg and to obtain CF in tonnes the result was divided by 1000 [21].

The formula can be expressed as [22].

$$CF (tCO_2e) = \sum g A \times Fg \times GWPg$$

$A =$ Activity data

$Fg =$ Emission factors of GHG

$GWPg =$ Global warming potential (N_2O and CH_4)

3.1 After Estimating the CF for each Activity for Three Consecutive Years Following Conclusions were made

3.1.1 Analysis of CF in 3 consecutive years

The calculations represents the aggregated CF for emissions from petrol, diesel, kerosene, and LPG under Scope 1 for 3 consecutive years. The analysis revealed that the highest CF, accounting to 359.94 tCO₂e, was recorded during the

operational year of 2022-2023. In contrast, the CF during the year 2020-2021, which coincided with a lockdown period, was considerably lower, measuring only 156.6 tCO₂e. The impact of the lockdown was evident as most infrastructures and activities were inactive during that period. To visually represent the findings, Fig. 1 illustrates the total annual CF estimates. It was found that there was a percentage increase of 135% from the period 2020-2021 to 2022-2023. Based on this limited study it can be concluded that the CF associated with working or studying from home, represents the environmentally friendly scenario. This is because it only includes the basic activities necessary for teaching and learning outside of a campus setting, such as using certain devices or energy consumption. Although this case of reduced CF during the lockdown period is contrasted by a study conducted at Bournemouth University, in Bournemouth and Poole, Dorset, UK, for the lockdown period of April–June 2020 [23]. Their study concluded that campuses will still consume huge quantities of utilities due to upkeep, while staff and students working/studying from home will contribute significant additional GHG emissions. Studies conducted at HPU Shimla reveals that even during lockdown periods, carbon footprint (CF) persists. It does not reduce to zero, resulting in additional carbon emissions due to online educational activities.

3.1.2 Analysis of CF for scope 1 emissions

In our study, it was determined that among the emission sources falling under Scope 1, the highest Carbon Footprint (CF) was associated with the consumption of kerosene, totaling 342.26 tCO₂e even though kerosene is used only during four months of the year: November, December, January, and February. Therefore, It was mandated to reduce the consumption of kerosene at campus and adopt other sustainable measures such as HVAC systems. This finding is graphically presented in Fig. 2, which illustrates

the respective tons of CF attributed to each emission source.

Study revealed that the CF linked to diesel consumption is the smallest, making up just 5% of the total emissions. This is despite diesel having the highest emission factor among all four fuels. This outcome is due to the limited usage of diesel, with only five vehicles running on it within the university.

CF measured for petrol consumption at the university campus is 32% of total activity sources. However, This emission can be lowered

by replacing petrol vehicles with ones that use fuel with lower emission factors, such as electric or natural gas vehicles, but the absence of infrastructure in Himachal Pradesh University Shimla, as well as the expenditure required, should be considered.

For LPG the CF is the second lowest over three consecutive years i.e. 148.30 t CO₂e. It is suggested to explore the possibility of replacing LPG with natural gas, as its EF is 12.5% lower than that for LP gas combustion(DOF) [Diario Oficial de la Federación], and potentially offers better prices in the market.




Fig. 1. Total annual carbon footprint (CO₂e) for 3 consecutive years in tons




Fig. 2. Carbon footprint (CO₂e) of each activity source in tons

3.1.3 Analysis of electricity CF

Himachal Pradesh state mostly depends on hydroelectric power, for the generation of electricity. The hydropower plant is a sustainable and renewable source of energy. Most of the electricity consumption at University campus is from hydropower and a little is from solar panels installed at university campus. Therefore, Himachal Pradesh University Shimla is considered to be free from pollution from electricity generation.

The study calculated the scope 2 indirect emissions by assuming electricity generation from a thermal power plant with an emission factor of 0.85 kg per kWh obtained from Central Electricity Authority (Indian government) [24]. The study offers a comparison of greenhouse gas emissions if electricity generation comes from a thermal power plant instead of a hydropower plant, aiming to provide insights into the importance of adopting renewable energy resources.

The findings indicate that the cumulative carbon footprint attributed to electricity consumption from the thermal power plant over the course of three years would have amounted to 2735.526 tCO₂e. It would have been accounted for 41% of CF during the year 2022-2023 and 21% during the lockdown period of 2020-2021.

4. CONCLUSION

Various methods exist for computing carbon footprint (CF), as indicated by empirical data on methodologies prevalent in higher education institutions. Among these methods, the GHG protocol stands out as a widely recognized and established approach for CF calculation. This study delves into the managerial implications of calculating the carbon footprint of a university using the GHG protocol and data spanning three consecutive years. In a managerial context, the research aims to provide insights into the carbon emissions generated by the university during comparable operational periods in subsequent academic years, with a particular focus on the implications of the COVID-19 lockdown. The findings highlight significant variations in the total carbon footprint over the observed period, particularly concerning different scopes. Notably, the highest carbon footprint was documented during the regular operational year, indicating the substantial impact of routine activities. This has direct managerial implications, suggesting the

need for institutions to explore sustainable practices in day-to-day operations to mitigate environmental impact. The contrast in carbon footprint during the lockdown period, being notably lower, underscores the managerial potential for reducing emissions through operational adjustments and resource optimization. A crucial managerial insight revealed by the study is that, even during periods of nearly full closure of university campuses, the carbon footprint did not approach zero. This indicates an ongoing energy demand to maintain capital assets and infrastructure, irrespective of utilization. For management, this implies a continuous need for energy-efficient strategies and investments in sustainable infrastructure to minimize environmental impact. The study accentuates the managerial significance of energy consumption and its direct correlation to the carbon footprint. It emphasizes the imperative for educational institutions to adopt and promote sustainable energy practices. In a managerial context, this underscores the importance of strategic planning, resource allocation, and policy development that align with sustainability goals. As institutions strive for environmental responsibility, integrating these findings into managerial decisions can contribute to a more sustainable and resilient future for higher education institutions.

In conclusion, the carbon footprint of a university, as demonstrated by this study, is shaped by a range of factors. Notably, HPU Shimla was observed to be free from electricity-related pollution due to its sourcing of electricity from a hydropower plant, which has an almost negligible carbon footprint highlighting the application of sustainable energy practices. Exploring alternatives to LPG, such as natural gas, and promoting the use of lower-emission vehicles can further reduce the university's carbon footprint. However, careful consideration of infrastructure requirements and associated costs is crucial in implementing these measures. By addressing these aspects, universities can play a vital role in mitigating carbon emissions and contributing to a more sustainable future. The university can drastically lower its carbon footprint and help climate change mitigation by implementing energy efficiency measures, using renewable energy sources, and supporting sustainable practices.

It is important to note, however, that the carbon footprint calculations reported here are based on the available data and the specific technique

used. Further study and constant monitoring will be required to refine and update these estimations, allowing for a more thorough understanding of the university's carbon footprint and facilitating informed decision-making for sustainable practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to extend their appreciation for the collaboration and support provided by the personnel of the Pool office, DSW office, and Store Purchasing office at Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, in facilitating the collection of data.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Awanthi MG, Champa MN. Carbon footprint of an organization: A Tool for Monitoring Impacts on Global Warming, *Procedia Engineering*. 2018;212:729-735.
2. Lindwall C. What are the effects of climate change?, *Natural Resources Defense Council*; 2022. Available:<https://www.nrdc.org/stories/what-are-effects-climate-change>.
3. Julia R. The science of climate change explained: Facts, Evidence and Proof, *The New York Times*; 2021. Available:<https://www.nytimes.com/article/climate-change-global-warming-faq.html>
4. Kulkarni SD. A bottom-up approach to evaluate the carbon footprints of a higher educational institute in India for sustainable existence, *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2019;231(23).
5. Tardi C. What is the kyoto protocol? Definition, History, Timeline, and Status, *Investopedia*; 2023. Available:<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/k/kyoto.asp#:~:text=The%20Kyoto%20Protocol%20was%20an,amount%20of%20their%20CO2%20emissions>
6. Val KV, María DB. Carbon footprint assessment tool for universities: CO2UNV, *Sustainable Production and Consumption*. 2022;29:791-804.
7. Val kV, Maria DB. Carbon footprint in Higher Education Institutions: A literature review and prospects for future research, *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*. 2021;23:2523–2542.
8. Banai CK, Thomas LT. Quantitative analysis of factors affecting greenhouse gas emissions at institutions of higher education, *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2013;48:29–38.
9. Townsend J, John B. Exploring the applications of carbon footprinting towards sustainability at a UK university: Reporting and decision making, *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2015;164-176.
10. Banai CK, Thomas LT, Thomas AB, Alona B. A greenhouse gas inventory as a measure of sustainability for an Urban Public Research University, *Environmental Practice*. 2010;12(01):35–47.
11. Letete TM, Mungwe NW, Guma M, Marquard A. Carbon footprint of the University of Cape Town, *Journal of Energy in Southern Africa*. 2011;22(2):2-12.
12. Larsen HN, Pettersen J, Solli C, Hertwich EG. Investigating the Carbon Footprint of a University, *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2013;48:39-47.
13. Meida LO, Brockway P, Letten K, Davies J, Fleming P. Measuring carbon performance in a UK University through a consumption-based carbon footprint: De Montfort University case study, *The Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2013;56:185-198.
14. Thurston M, Eckelman M. Assessing greenhouse gas emissions from university purchases, *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*. 2011; 12(3):225-235.
15. Flores RM, Ramírez RQ, Ortiz I. The carbon footprint of a public university campus in Mexico City, *Carbon Management*. 2019;10(5):501-511.
16. Ridhosari B, Rahman A. Carbon footprint assessment at Universitas Pertamina from the scope of electricity, transportation, and waste generation: Toward a green campus and promotion of environmental sustainability, *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2020;246:119172.
17. Sangwan KS, Bhakar V, Arora V, Solanki P. Measuring carbon footprint of an Indian university using life cycle assessment, *Procedia CIRP*. 2028;69:475-480.
18. Rahul R, Selvakumar j, Kumar RP, Krishnaprabha P. A Study of Carbon Footprint in an Educational Institution in India, *IEEE-HYDCON 2013*2655; 2020.
19. GHG Protocol. The greenhouse gas protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard, *World Resources*

- Institute/World Business Council Sustainable Development; 2004.
Available:<https://ghgprotocol.org/sites/default/files/standards/ghg-protocol-revised.pdf>
20. WBCSD, WRI. The greenhouse gas protocol, World Resources Institute; World Business Council for Sustainable Development, Geneva, Switzerland; Washington, DC; 2004.
Available:<https://www.wbcsd.org/Programs/Climate-and-Energy/Climate/Resources/A-corporate-reporting-and-accounting-standard-revised-edition>
21. Malik TK, Shrivastava P. Calculation of carbon footprints in semi urban areas of Jammu, J&K (India), Environment Conservation Journal. 2019;20(3):33-38.
22. Samara F, Ibrahim S, Yousuf ME, Armour E. Carbon Footprint at a United Arab Emirates University: GHG Protocol, MDPI, Sustainability. 2022;14(5):2522.
23. Filimonau V, Archer D, Bellamy L, Smith N, Wintrip R. The carbon footprint of a UK University during the COVID-19 lockdown, Sci Total Environ. 2020;20:756:143964.
24. Government of India Ministry of Power, Central Electricity Authority; 2023.
Available:<https://cea.nic.in/cdm-co2-baseline-database/?lang=en>

© 2023 Bhardwaj and Attri; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/110120>