

March 13, 2023

Email to: VP, Human Resources Global Health Markets & Head of HR North America - Elsevier

*In accordance with a company policy pertaining to all my communications regarding climate change, please be aware that I am not acting on behalf of or representing either Elsevier or RELX.*

Hi Alison,

I hope you're well and had a nice weekend. Regarding the Final Written Warning, I've been asked to revisit conversations I've had over the past few years to better understand Elsevier's positions on climate and the business. While these interactions have showcased many positive efforts for which I'm grateful, they've also enhanced a concern I shared in 2021, that "there's a knowledge gap at RELX as it pertains to our business and to climate science that needs to be addressed so the company can make informed choices about how to best act responsibly."

The scientific consensus we have is that new fossil fuel projects beyond 2021 remove the realistic pathways to global mid-century net zero and the associated 1.5-degree warming target. Despite our admirable dedication to a growth in renewable energy, offering products and services that facilitate fossil fuel expansion after 2021 signifies our company is overlooking this consensus and several environmental and human rights pledges. Leadership is correctly emphasizing that an energy transition is a process, but the science indicates a safe transition—as well as the SDGs and other stated goals—requires that the expansion we're presently informing needs to already have stopped. (Per company policy, I will need to obtain your consent to share a document concerning journal support for fossil fuel expansion). I've been informed that leadership's position is that, while journal scopes are evolving, if we stopped publishing papers facilitating expansion, they will go somewhere else. These conversations indicate our extensive sustainability efforts are being undermined by the beliefs that we only have up to 7 journals that talk about fossil fuels, expansion is required to meet energy needs, our oil major customers are enabling a transition, and supporting expansion doesn't render any business messaging misleading. It also remains unclear why the need to cease expansion is being framed as an unrealistic call to immediately discontinue using fossil fuels, and why our company holds that the expansion we still support is "in line with the scale of action deemed necessary by science."

Genuine efforts have been made by employees over the past few years to invite the company to explain these and other positions which generate observations of word-deed misalignment. (Per company policy, I will need to obtain your consent to share a document concerning these efforts). As employees have communicated, our company has every right to inform fossil fuel expansion but also that it's unclear why the ethics code allows for our messaging, memberships, and pledges to suggest we don't support this activity while still engaging in it. The rationale offered for not adequately addressing misalignment was the suggestion that doing so won't impact climate change. To help clarify, the final two questions in the latter document were submitted to Compliance through my manager a few months ago; I'm wondering if HR could please assist us in having them answered. While most pressing is an end to activity that negates our many sustainability efforts, I feel it's important that employees be allowed to understand what is and is not permitted under our standards of conduct to best ensure we're acting in accordance with them.

Please let me know if I have your consent to share those two documents and thanks for your time and assistance.

Best,

Kip

Kip Lyall  
Program Manager  
Illustration & Design  
Cambridge, MA 02139