

The imperative to reduce carbon emissions in astronomy

A white paper for the ‘Decadal plan for Australian astronomy 2016–2025: Mid-term review’

December 13, 2019

Adam R. H. Stevens,^{1,2†} Sabine Bellstedt,¹ Pascal J. Elahi^{1,2} and Michael T. Murphy³

¹International Centre for Radio Astronomy Research, The University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia

²Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for All Sky Astrophysics in 3 Dimensions (ASTRO 3D)

³Centre for Astrophysics and Supercomputing, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, VIC 3122, Australia

†adam.stevens@uwa.edu.au

Executive summary

Just as in any other profession, astronomers have an obligation to reduce their carbon footprint to meet the necessary global requirements for limiting the effects of climate change. In this white paper, we estimate that Australian astronomers’ total greenhouse gas emissions from their regular work activities are $\gtrsim 15$ ktCO₂-e/yr (equivalent kilotonnes of carbon dioxide per year). This can be broken into 4.3 ± 1.1 ktCO₂-e/yr from flights, ~ 6.8 ktCO₂-e/yr from supercomputer usage, ~ 1.8 ktCO₂-e/yr from powering office buildings, and ~ 2 ktCO₂-e/yr from the operation of the Murchison Radio Observatory (with other observatories unaccounted for here that would add to this number). Split across faculty scientists, postdoctoral researchers, and PhD students, this averages to $\gtrsim 19$ tCO₂-e/yr per astronomer. We outline steps astronomers can take to reduce their emissions from these environmentally unsustainable practices. (1) We should exclusively use supercomputers and observatories that are powered predominantly by renewable energy sources. Where facilities that we currently use are unsatisfactory, they should be lobbied to invest in renewables, such as solar or wind farms. Emphasis must also be placed on code efficiency for projects that consume millions of CPU core-hours. (2) Air travel should be reduced wherever possible, replaced primarily by video conferencing. We emphasise that while carbon offsetting should be mandatory for all ‘unavoidable’ travel, it does not *negate* carbon emissions, and hence does not justify flights. Based on an ICRAR-UWA case study, senior scientists have the greatest responsibility to reduce flying, as they generate $\sim 70\%$ more emissions per person from flying than postdocs, and more than triple that of PhD students, on average. (3) A sustainability chapter and award should be established by the Astronomical Society of Australia.

1 Introduction

Climate change is widely regarded as the biggest issue facing the planet’s populous right now. So much so, that over 11,000 scientists from 153 countries recently signed a paper warning of a global climate emergency (Ripple et al. 2019).

Given the consensus amongst the scientific community regarding human-induced climate change, the purpose of this paper is not to present the full science case for climate change (for that, see e.g. the comprehensive review by De Paolo 2015; or for an accessible overview from an Australian perspective, see Australian Government 2018a). Whilst there may not be many true ‘climate change deniers’ in the astronomical community, denial can come in many forms. Alluding to the book by Cohen (2001), Walker & Leviston (2019) refer to ‘implicatory’ denial as the most insidious form. This form of denial is where the facts of climate change are neither denied nor misinterpreted, but the implications are not properly taken on board. Implicatory deniers are those who mentally dissociate from the problem and/or choose not to act. The net effect is the same as outright proper denial, and is therefore arguably morally equivalent (some have argued it is worse). **Part of the purpose of this document is to outline what steps astronomers must take to become part of the solution to climate change, rather than being implicatory deniers who contribute to the problem.** This is an ethical obligation that we cannot ignore.

Climate change action is particularly important for Australia-based astronomers, as our country of work has an outstandingly atrocious record of greenhouse gas emissions. Australia’s total emissions for the year ending March

2019 were 538.9 million equivalent tonnes of CO₂ (MtCO₂-e) (Australian Government 2019). With a population of 25.287 million people at the end of the March 2019 quarter according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (of which 18.9% are dependents under the age of 15 yr), the country’s current emissions rate equates to 21.3 tCO₂-e/yr per capita (26.3 tCO₂-e/yr per person aged ≥ 15 yr). This is in stark contrast to the 2017 global average of 5.5 ± 0.5 tCO₂-e/yr per capita (based on total emissions from table 6 of Le Quéré et al. 2018 and the global population from Worldometer, taking half the range of the 2016 and 2018 values as the uncertainty on the latter), and makes Australia one of the worst emitters per capita on the planet. Countries that have comparable emission rates include the United States and Canada (cf. Ritchie & Roser 2019). Perhaps it is no coincidence then that members of the astronomical communities from these countries have written their own white papers on this same topic, which include several practical, sensible mitigation suggestions (Matzner et al. 2019; Williamson et al. 2019). This is clearly an issue that astronomers worldwide are cognisant of; the Matzner et al. (2019) paper was one of the 5 most widely discussed papers for its month of release, with members from 43 astronomy institutes up-voting it on Voxcharta.

There are many aspects to the job of being an astronomer that currently result in the emission of greenhouse gases. Broadly, these include direct emissions from flights, and indirect emissions from the electricity required to power supercomputers, observatories, and other facilities, in addition to emissions associated with their construction. We are no less responsible in ensuring we re-

arXiv:1912.05834v1 [astro-ph.IM] 12 Dec 2019

duce our emissions from these activities than anyone else in the world is from their primary sources of emissions. Any anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions directly contribute to climate change, and for the current rise of the mean global surface temperature to be limited to 1.5–2°C (per the [Paris Agreement](#)) requires a decrease to effectively *zero anthropogenic emissions* within the next few decades ([Matthews & Caldeira 2008](#); [Allen et al. 2018](#); [Forster et al. 2018](#); [Rogelj et al. 2018](#)), which already concedes that there will be long-lasting (time-scales of $\gtrsim 10^3$ – 10^5 yr) or potentially permanent changes to the environment ([Archer & Brovkin 2008](#); [Solomon et al. 2009](#); [De Paolo 2015](#)).

In this white paper, we take approximate stock of the CO₂ emissions that astronomers are responsible for, with a focus on the Australian community (Section 2). We then present options for how these sources may (and should) be reduced (Section 3). Despite the Australian focus, we believe the underlying content and message of this paper is relevant for the global astronomical community.

2 Astronomers’ emission sources

In this section, we provide an overview of the emissions astronomers are responsible for, from the sources of greatest significance.

2.1 Flights

Astronomers are expected to do a lot of travel. Reasons include, but are not limited to, conferences, workshops, busy weeks, seminars, observing runs, committee meetings, job interviews, relocation, et cetera. In fact, academics in general are responsible for significant greenhouse gas emissions from flying. One case study suggests business-related flights from university employees contribute approximately two thirds the emissions of campus operations ([Wynes & Donner 2018](#)). Flights are often the greatest *single* source of university emissions, with conference attendance accounting for approximately half of those flight emissions ([Middleton 2019](#)).

Not only does *all* international travel require flying from Australia, but due to the size and low population density of the country, domestic travel also often means flying thousands of kilometres. As a point of reference, we collate the approximate greenhouse gas emissions per person from direct flights between Australian capital cities in Table 1. Return trips from Australia to Europe or the Americas can comfortably exceed 3 tCO₂-e per person.

In Australia, aviation was responsible for 22.02 MtCO₂-e of emissions in 2016 alone ([Australian Government 2017](#)). This suggests that aviation is responsible for $\sim 4\%$ of the country’s total emissions (or close to 1 tCO₂-e/yr per person on average). While this may sound like a small fraction, it is important to recognise that about half the population will not fly at all in a given year, that most of them will only fly once in that year, and that the vast majority will do so for leisure, not business (e.g. [Roy Morgan 2016](#)). For the relatively few privileged people who fly regularly, their personal fraction of emissions from air travel will be *much* higher than the nominal 4%. Astronomers are among those people (at least, certainly in Australia).

	ADL	BNE	CBR	HBA	MEL	PER
BNE	340					
CBR	240	306				
HBA	378	314	296			
MEL	134	288	122	144		
PER	442	748	674	656	528	
SYD	246	158	82	236	148	652

Table 1: Typical emissions for (the most) direct return flights between Australian capital cities, according to [Qantas](#). Three-letter names are the official airport codes. Units for emissions are kgCO₂-e per passenger.

2.1.1 CAS budget example

As an example of astronomy’s disproportionately high flight emissions, consider the Swinburne University of Technology’s Centre for Astrophysics and Supercomputing (CAS). In 2017, approximately 80% of CAS’s travel budget was spent on flights: \sim \$301k in total (including external funding contributions), with \$54k spent on 134 domestic round-trip flights, and the remaining \$247k spent on 133 international round trips (often including more than two flights). These flights covered the ~ 80 FTE staff and students in CAS during 2017, meaning each person was responsible for ~ 1.7 domestic and ~ 1.7 international flights on average. A typical domestic return flight from Melbourne produces ~ 230 kgCO₂-e per passenger (taking a naïve average of the values for MEL in Table 1). Considering Los Angeles as a typical international destination, a return international flight produces $\gtrsim 3$ tCO₂-e per passenger (per [Qantas’s calculator](#)). Therefore, the average astronomer in CAS was responsible for ~ 5.4 tCO₂-e in 2017 from flying alone, with 0.4 and 5.0 tCO₂-e coming from domestic and international flights, respectively. As a rough guide to the average monetary carbon cost of flying, these figures imply ~ 0.57 kgCO₂-e per AUD for domestic flights and 1.6 kgCO₂-e per AUD for international flights. These figures are comparable to the case study of [Stohl \(2008\)](#) at a different institute (and research field).

2.1.2 ICRAR-UWA case study

At the International Centre for Radio Astronomy Research – University of Western Australia node (ICRAR-UWA), we decided to more accurately take stock of our flight emissions by surveying our staff and students. Poor quality in the Centre’s travel records meant we could not rely on algorithmically determining this from historical data. Conducted between August and September 2019, the survey asked all current staff and students to calculate the CO₂ emissions from work-related flights they had undertaken in the last two financial years (1 July 2017–30 June 2018 and 1 July 2018–30 June 2019). Those that were not employed at ICRAR-UWA in the 2017/18 financial year were only asked to provide data for the 2018/19 financial year. *All* work-related flights were to be accounted for, regardless of their funding source. In the first instance, participants were to consult the quoted CO₂ emissions on the itineraries provided by the travel agency or airline. Where those were unavailable or not provided, appropriate online calculators were to be used for the relevant routes (with [Qantas’s calculator](#) being the most commonly reported as used – see Table 1). 40% of the Centre participated in the anonymous survey.

In Table 2 and Fig. 1, we summarise the findings of this survey. Unsurprisingly, flight frequency (and thus flight emissions) scales with seniority (as has been found in other studies, e.g. Wynes & Donner 2018). The average senior staff member emits close 6 tonnes of CO₂ from flying each year (equivalent to roughly two return international trips), while the average postdoc emits about 60% of that (roughly, one international and one domestic trip each year), and the average PhD student emits less than half that of an average postdoc (2–3 domestic trips each year, or 1 international trip every two years).

It is important to realise that even though we have quantified uncertainties on the statistics in Table 2, we do not know the degree to which our sample is biased. If the effort required to calculate one’s carbon footprint was the greatest deterrent from completing the survey, it stands to reason that the heaviest emitters had the greatest incentive to avoid filling it out. It is therefore quite possible that the averages we quote are more like lower limits. Indeed, comparing the weighted combined mean for ICRAR-UWA PhD students, postdocs, and senior staff of ~ 3.4 tCO₂-e/yr per person (Table 2) with the equivalent budget estimate for CAS of ~ 5.4 tCO₂-e/yr per person (Section 2.1.1) implies the survey participants were biased towards having lower emissions. Despite Perth’s relative isolation (it is the second-most isolated major city globally, based on nearest-neighbour distance of cities with populations above 1 million), travel budgets are fairly normalised across the country. While a domestic trip for those living on the east coast might mean fewer emissions (see Table 1), this is likely counterbalanced by an increase in the *number* of domestic trips. International travel comes at a heavy carbon cost regardless of the Australian port of origin.

2.1.3 National extrapolation

In 2014, Australia hosted 387 astronomy research staff, 36% of whom were in ongoing positions. This was in addition to 242 support staff, 266 PhD students, and 24 Masters students (Maddison et al. 2015). Based on growth rates in the last decadal period, we estimate in 2019 there are 157 ongoing scientists, 278 postdoc equivalents, 359 PhD students, and 30 Masters students (official up-to-date numbers will be published in an accompanying white paper for this Mid-Term Review). Given the recent dissolution of the Australian Astronomical Observatory, we assume no change to other professional staff. Combining these numbers with the means in Table 2 would give an estimate of the total national CO₂ emissions from flights as 2700 ± 700 t/yr. Given the potential bias of factor $5.4/3.4 \simeq 1.6$ discussed above, we estimate the total emissions from Australian astronomers’ flights as 4300 ± 1100 tCO₂-e/yr.

2.2 Supercomputer usage

As described in the accompanying white paper by O’Toole et al. (2019), the estimated computer processing of Australian astronomers is 400 million CPU core-hours (MCPUh) per annum, expected to rise to 500 MCPUh/yr by the end of this decadal period. This is split across many computing facilities, including both domestic and international supercomputers. Each has its own energy efficiency and is powered by different sources. It is therefore non-trivial to translate this level of computer processing into a rate of CO₂ emissions.




Figure 1: Distributions of responses from the ICRAR-UWA survey on air travel CO₂ emissions. Top panel: histograms of responses (2 per person) from each staff type in bins of width 1 t/yr. Bottom panel: mean of each distribution (stars), along with their medians (long, vertical dashes), and 16th & 84th percentiles (short dashes connected by horizontal bars). These values are provided in Table 2.

Nevertheless, we can use the reported properties of one example supercomputer to estimate our emissions. Magnus, one of the machines at the Pawsey supercomputing centre in Perth, has 35,712 CPU cores split across 8 cabinets, with a maximum power consumption of 90 kW per cabinet. At full operation, this means Magnus has a power consumption of 20 W/core (2 s.f., including overheads), equivalent to 20,000 kWh/MCPUh. In south-west Western Australia, electricity carries a carbon cost of 0.7 kgCO₂-e/kWh (see table 5 of Australian Government 2018b). We therefore estimate the carbon cost of running code on Magnus as 14 tCO₂-e/MCPUh.

While the specifications of most supercomputers are publicly available, electricity requirements are not always quoted. There is also the balance between power used by CPUs and GPUs to consider. Magnus is a nice example that does not carry these issues. If we assume that 20 W/core is the typical power consumption rate for most supercomputers, then we only need consider where other commonly used facilities are, and the emissions per kWh there. In Victoria, where the OzSTAR supercomputer is hosted, and in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT), where the National Computing Infrastructure (NCI) is based, electricity emissions are 1.07 and 0.82 kgCO₂-e/kWh, respectively (Australian Government 2018b, but see the caveat regarding the ACT in Section 3.2). Assuming a ratio of 6:1:1 for NCI:Pawsey:OzSTAR usage in astronomy (O’Toole et al. 2019), this gives an average of 0.84 kgCO₂-e/kWh or ~ 17 tCO₂-e/MCPUh. Only \sim half of Australian astronomers’ supercomputer usage is from domestic facilities (O’Toole et al. 2019). It is possible that overseas facilities are more efficient than this, but a full assessment of them is beyond the scope of this paper.

We reiterate that the 20 W/core figure assumes a system is at maximum operation, i.e. at its most efficient. Additionally, the figures based on Magnus might not include

Staff type	Turnout	CO ₂ emissions [t/yr]			
		16 th %ile	Median	84 th %ile	Mean
Senior scientists	10/25 = 40%	1.99 ^{+1.01} _{-0.99}	6.15 ^{+1.00} _{-2.38}	9.58 ^{+0.17} _{-1.58}	5.74 ^{+0.82} _{-0.83}
Postdocs	6/12 = 50%	0.86 ^{+0.33} _{-0.36}	1.72 ^{+2.07} _{-0.54}	5.75 ^{+4.26} _{-1.95}	3.38 ^{+0.98} _{-0.99}
PhD students	13/29 = 45%	0.00 ^{+0.00} _{-0.00}	1.30 ^{+0.09} _{-0.76}	2.61 ^{+0.79} _{-0.35}	1.47 ^{+0.33} _{-0.33}
Masters students	6/13 = 46%	0.00 ^{+0.00} _{-0.00}	0.00 ^{+0.00} _{-0.00}	1.42 ^{+4.48} _{-1.42}	0.98 ^{+0.49} _{-0.49}
Professional	5/21 = 24%	0.00 ^{+0.00} _{-0.00}	0.00 ^{+2.00} _{-0.00}	3.14 ^{+0.60} _{-1.23}	1.22 ^{+0.48} _{-0.54}
PhDs+Postdocs+Seniors	29/66 = 44%	0.20 ^{+0.30} _{-0.20}	2.20 ^{+0.41} _{-0.36}	8.00 ^{+1.10} _{-1.20}	3.44 ^{+0.39} _{-0.40}
All weighted	40/100 = 40%	0.00 ^{+0.00} _{-0.00}	1.40 ^{+0.60} _{-0.21}	5.90 ^{+1.25} _{-0.40}	2.65 ^{+0.29} _{-0.29}

Table 2: Summary of ICRAR-UWA survey on greenhouse gas emissions from employees’ work-related flights over the period 1 July 2017–30 June 2019. Emissions are measured in equivalent tonnes of CO₂ per person per annum. ‘Senior scientists’ refers to ongoing research staff; ‘postdocs’ refers to research staff on fixed-term contracts (with PhDs); and ‘professional’ refers to other staff, including outreach, administration, and data scientists. Errors on figures are 68% confidence intervals from bootstrap resampling. The second-to-last row combines results from PhD students, postdocs, and senior scientists, with appropriate weights based on the total number of people in each category. The final row does the same, with the additional inclusion of Masters students and professional staff.

the power required for the cooling system, and certainly do not include other general power requirements of the building in which it is housed. It is therefore quite likely that the average emission rate is actually higher than our fiducial estimate of 17 tCO₂-e/MCPUh. Note that we have assumed that a single physical core running for an hour will always be ‘one core-hour’ regardless of how many threads (virtual cores) that core has. This is consistent with [how NCI charges time](#).

With all of this in mind, we estimate that the emissions from Australian astronomers’ supercomputer usage is 6800 tCO₂-e/yr. This is ~60% more than the value from flights (Section 2.1.3). Assuming senior staff, postdocs, and PhD students are equally responsible for these emissions (which is probably unfair), the average astronomer’s supercomputing carbon footprint would be ~8.6 tCO₂-e/yr per person.

In preparing this document, we reached out to several supercomputing facilities to obtain official figures that would allow us to more accurately calculate our computing carbon footprint. Unfortunately, we received no information that would allow us to improve on the estimate we have made. Our figure of ~8.6 tCO₂-e/yr per person is therefore liable to be revised at a later date (and should be).

2.3 Observatories and telescopes

Another potentially significant source of emissions is the operation of observatories and telescopes. We sought information from several observatories regularly used by Australian astronomers regarding their emissions from operations (e.g. power consumption), but we received no official figures. We recommend that a stocktake of these emissions be made, in addition to a more accurate accounting of the figures quoted from earlier subsections. We note that the European Southern Observatory (ESO) has already commissioned a study of the emissions of its sites, but the results are pending. Should these be made publicly available, this could prove a useful resource from 2020 onwards.

[One article](#) discusses that the on-site renewables of the Murchison Radio Observatory (MRO) save 1.7–2.2 kilotonnes of ‘carbon emissions’ each year (which we interpret

as ktCO₂-e). Given that renewables are [thought to cover 50% of the observatory’s electricity requirements](#), this implies the observatory still produces ~2 ktCO₂-e/yr. The MRO is one of the sites for the Square Kilometre Array (SKA), and so this figure is likely to increase with time as SKA operations ramp up. Many other domestic facilities like the Siding Spring Observatory, the Australia Telescope Compact Array, and Parkes will add to this figure, as will the time that Australia purchases/receives on international facilities like Keck and through ESO. It is therefore conceivable that Australian astronomers’ emissions from observatory operations are comparable to that from supercomputer usage. But this suggestion requires further investigation to be substantiated (beyond the scope of this white paper).

2.4 Campus operations

Office spaces and their machinery will further contribute to the work-related carbon emissions of astronomers. While a specific analysis of the buildings that house astronomy departments in Australia is beyond the scope of this paper, we can reasonably demonstrate that emissions from our office buildings are less than other sources. Taking a power per floor area of 15 W/m² (see e.g. table 1 of [Menezes et al. 2014](#)) on weekdays, assuming 20 m² of floor space per person, and with ~1000 people nationwide (Section 2.1.3) implies an office power consumption of ~2 GWh/yr. Approximating the emissions from this as 0.9 kgCO₂/kWh (cf. [Australian Government 2018b](#)) gives ~1.8 ktCO₂/yr.

3 Solutions

3.1 Reduce flying

Technology currently does not exist for flights to drastically reduce their emissions. The only solution is therefore to fly less. The challenge then becomes: how do we achieve all the same things that up until now have involved air travel?

Perhaps the simplest and most obvious occasions where flying can be eliminated are short meetings (1 or 2 days long) with a small number of people ($\lesssim 10$), including, for example, time allocation committees and executive committees ([Wynes & Donner 2018](#) call for similar

changes). In principle, these could easily be done via readily available video conferencing software such as Zoom or Skype. Despite the often quoted, yet anecdotal benefits of people’s physical presence at meetings, the justification to fly thousands of kilometres for the sake of a short discussion is tenuous in the era of climate change action. A blanket domestic ‘no flying’ policy for committee meetings could be implemented today, with minimal disruption to the community. Upon successful implementation of such a policy at the domestic level, it could be extended to international travel, assuming the international community is willing to partake in this strategy.

An additional avenue by which our flight load can be reduced is to conduct observations remotely, rather than travelling to site. This practice is already being increasingly adopted, thanks to the automation of facilities such as the ANU 2.3-m telescope, Parkes, and other Australian facilities that allow telescopes to be run via personal computers, plus remote facilities such as the Anglo-Australian Telescope observing station at ICRAR-UWA. By having access to remote observing facilities at each of the major astronomy hubs in the country, not only can flights be reduced, but so too would accompanying financial costs. For larger-scale, international facilities, the Keck remote observing room at Swinburne is open to the Australian astronomical community, and provides an alternative to international travel, even if it means domestic travel. Observations conducted via ESO can be done in service mode, nullifying the need to travel to ESO sites.

We must ensure conferences and meetings have adequate video conferencing systems available. This could mean investing in either hardware and/or software to meet the requirements of running said meetings smoothly. As a proactive example, ASTRO 3D (the ARC Centre of Excellence for All Sky Astrophysics in 3 Dimensions) is currently considering whether the development of software beyond Zoom’s capabilities is warranted and worth funding.

Air travel should be treated as a last resort. Those wishing to travel should have to justify why alternatives are unsatisfactory, and why their proposed trip is worth contributing to climate change.

3.1.1 Carbon offsetting

But what about carbon offsetting? Is this not a means by which the bad we do from emitting greenhouse gases can be undone? *Absolutely not.* Hansen (2011), for example, likens offsets to indulgences sold by the church in the Middle Ages. In other words, they are a means of absolving one’s guilt or sense of responsibility without actually dealing with the issue. He is not alone in this view (e.g. Hodgkinson & Johnston 2015).

There are a wide range of offsetting schemes that exist. It is often assumed that offsetting means planting trees, but this is rarely the case. In Australia, airline offsets tend to fund land conservation or fire abatement (see Qantas, Virgin: the country’s biggest carriers). While these are worthy causes for investment, their being funded simply prevents further emissions (or prevents the reduction of the land’s ability to sequester carbon from the atmosphere), and does nothing to remove the greenhouse gases added to the atmosphere from aeroplanes. Even if all offsets were hypothetically funding reforestation, this would not solve climate change in a world where we continue to fly. The solution

to reducing the concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere requires *both* reforestation *and* emission reductions (Hansen 2011). The altitude of aeroplane emissions makes them particularly problematic, as this enhances their effective radiative forcing (see e.g. Rädel & Shine 2008).

That said, provided those paying for offset schemes understand that is not itself a solution, it is better to offset than to not. Of course, this does not have to be limited to air travel; if we are to offset our flights, we should also offset our power consumption, especially that required for supercomputers, at least in the interim.

It is important to choose and investigate an offset scheme carefully; it does not have to be affiliated with an airline. Each astronomy department should consider a local scheme with tangible benefits to the environment, and ensure a fraction of their budget is allocated for that scheme.

3.1.2 The ECR argument

One reason often cited against flight reduction is that it might harm the careers of early-career researchers (ECRs) and late-stage PhD students. After all, the astronomy job market is incredibly competitive, and the majority of astronomy PhDs will not find permanent positions in the field (see Forbes 2008; Metcalfe 2008; Cooray et al. 2015). A lack of exposure might therefore make job applicants disadvantaged, thereby becoming one of the many who “don’t make it”, despite being more than capable. There are several problems with this argument.

For one, it is entirely anecdotal. To our knowledge, there has not been a systematic study of the career pathways of astronomy PhDs, and whether their frequency of flying in the early stages of their career had any effect on either their decision to stay in the field, or their ability to progress had they chosen to stay. One could speculate that a minimal amount of international exposure might be necessary to get one’s foot in the door, but the job-hiring and grant-winning processes are stochastic. One could therefore equally speculate that, at some point, the probability of an application being successful as a function of the candidate’s exposure might saturate.

The argument also encourages escalation. Competitive people will always look for a way to stand out. If we tell our students and ECRs that they will not stand out if they do not fly to speak at conferences and the like, then not only will they all fly, but the most competitive ones will find an additional means of outdoing their peers (which might mean flying even more). What we should be focussing on instead is *deescalating* the situation. If it is globally mandated that flying should be minimised, then no ECR will be at any disadvantage to their peers by flying less, because everyone will be doing it.

The rising global movement for action on climate change has largely been driven by younger generations, i.e. those of student or ECR age (but certainly not exclusively). We need to build a culture where *values* like environmental sustainability are not only supported, but are encouraged and factored into the job-hiring process (for a related discussion, see Walkowicz 2018). Senior members of the community hold the greatest power in effecting this culture change. They also have the greatest responsibility to reduce flight emissions, based on the numbers in Table 2, and have the least risk in doing so, given that their

employment is ongoing. While we encourage that ECRs should reduce their flying, the onus is not necessarily on ECRs in the first instance.

3.2 Renewable energy sources

Thankfully, technology *does* exist for reducing our carbon footprint from supercomputer usage and other high-electricity-demand operations. It all comes down to what generates the energy. Much of Australia's power comes from coal burning and other greenhouse gas-emitting sources (for details, see [Australian Government 2018b](#)), despite the fact that it has been known for years that it is feasible for Australia to be powered entirely by renewables (e.g. [Elliston et al. 2014, 2016](#)), contrary to the narrative spouted by some of our politicians and other sceptics ([Diesendorf & Elliston 2018](#)). Realistically, it will take time for the country to continue its transition to renewables (as it will for the world). We should, therefore, take action ourselves to ensure our electricity-demanding operations are powered by the greatest fraction of renewables possible.

This means we should carefully choose the supercomputers we use, exclusively using those certified as being powered predominantly by renewables. Alternatively, we should be lobbying and/or helping the facilities we currently use to establish their own renewable energy sources. An obvious choice would be installing solar panels. Some efforts to install solar panels at supercomputing facilities have already been made. For example, [the roof of NCI holds 600 'sliver-cell' solar panels](#), generating ~ 93.5 kW of carbon-free electricity. The total power consumption of facilities like NCI is much greater than this though. Dedicated renewable energy farms that cover a much larger area than a building's roof (realistically, off-campus) are ultimately needed for such facilities.

As a good example, the ACT as a whole is now responsible for generating more renewable energy than the energy it consumes ([Cass 2019](#)). This power is not exclusively consumed in the Territory though; rather, it goes into the national grid. For reference, [the ACT accounts for less than 2% of the country's population](#). One could argue that the operations of NCI should be considered carbon-neutral because its power consumption has (presumably) been accounted for in the ACT's renewables generation. Equally though, any power drawn from the national grid increases the national demand, and the national grid is still backed by emissions-heavy power sources. As such, for the purposes of this document, we have not assumed that NCI is carbon-neutral ([neither does the ANU](#)). Nevertheless, initiatives to invest in renewables are precisely what we should be supporting. By extension, it may be favourable to support supercomputing facilities that reside in areas whose local governments are of this philosophy. An argument can therefore be made that it is more environmentally friendly to use supercomputing facilities hosted in the ACT, like NCI, than those in other states.

Observatories should also be powered by renewables, which several observatories have already recognised. As alluded to in Section 2.3, the MRO has a dedicated hybrid solar–diesel power station, [supplying the site with 50% renewables](#). ESO's La Silla Observatory has a dedicated solar farm on site too, as will ESO's Extremely Large Telescope.

Many universities in Australia have set targets for approaching 'carbon neutrality'. UWA aims to have its [electricity requirements fully covered by renewables by 2025](#), with plans to further offset other sources of emissions by 2030. Although, to our understanding, this has not yet been allocated the necessary funds, and this does not include facilities of which UWA is only a stakeholder, e.g. Pawsey. With a slightly more accelerated time-line, [The University of Melbourne aims to be energy carbon neutral by 2021, and fully neutral by 2030](#). The 2030 goal is also shared by [Monash University](#). The University of Queensland has its own off-site solar farm, which was planned to [make the University energy carbon neutral by 2020](#), while the University of New South Wales wants to [purchase all its electricity from existing renewables by 2020](#). Somewhat contrasting, the ANU aims to [reduce energy-based emissions by 35% by the end of 2020](#) (based on their 2015 figures), although this is arguably mitigated by the ACT's generation of renewable energy. Whether the various initiatives of these universities pan out as planned remains to be seen. We can all place pressure on our universities to ensure these policies are seen through or even accelerated where possible.

3.3 Create incentives

While the ethical and scientific arguments for significant action to reduce our contribution to climate change undoubtedly have an impact on individuals, the lack of tangible action on this topic thus far suggests that action at an institutional/governing level is necessary.

To perhaps state the obvious, creating additional incentives to reduce carbon emissions should, in principle, help to reduce carbon emissions. One option is to establish an award that departments set out to earn. This could be based on purely having low emissions, or could more broadly encompass environmental sustainability. The Astronomical Society of Australia (ASA) went through the same process for a different area of ethical importance several years ago: the Pleiades award for gender equity and diversity. The movement of promoting diversity and equity has resulted in focussed committees at most major institutions, [an ambassador for women in STEM](#) (science, technology, engineering and mathematics), and numerous national programs to tackle this problem, including the [Science in Australia Gender Equity initiative](#). Ideally, we, as a community, work towards a future where the same importance is placed on the planet we live on as the people that live on it, to make sure our legacy is more than just academic. Given the success of the Pleiades award (see [Kewley 2019](#)), a low-emissions award could be modelled directly on it. The ASA is an ideal organisation to lead this because (i) it is a national body, and (ii) it exists in perpetuity, unlike other national entities (such as Centres of Excellence).

References

- Allen M. R., Shine K. P., Fuglestedt J. S., Millar R. J., Cain M., Frame D. J., Macey A. H., 2018, *A solution to the misrepresentations of CO₂-equivalent emissions of short-lived climate pollutants under ambitious mitigation*, *Climate and Atmospheric Science*, 1, 16
- Archer D., Brovkin V., 2008, *The millennial atmospheric lifetime of anthropogenic CO₂*, *Climate Change*, 90, 283

- Australian Government, 2017, *Managing the Carbon Footprint of Australian Aviation: Update August 2017*, Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, Commonwealth of Australia
- Australian Government, 2018a, *State of the Climate 2018*, Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO, Commonwealth of Australia
- Australian Government, 2018b, *National Greenhouse Accounts Factors*, Department of the Environment and Energy, Commonwealth of Australia
- Australian Government, 2019, *Quarterly Update of Australia's National Greenhouse Gas Inventory: March 2019*, Department of the Environment and Energy, Commonwealth of Australia
- Cass D., 2019, *Class ACT: How the Australian Capital Territory became a global energy leader*, The Australia Institute, [published online](#), 18 September 2019
- Cohen S., 2001, *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering*, Polity Press, ISBN 978-0-7456-1657-5
- Cooray A., Abate A., Häußler B., Trump J. R., Williams C. C., 2015, *Astronomy Job Crisis*, [arXiv:1512.02223](#)
- De Paolo D. J., 2015, *Sustainable carbon emissions: The geologic perspective*, *MRS Energy & Sustainability*, 2, E9
- Diesendorf M., Elliston B., 2018, *The feasibility of 100% renewable electricity systems: A response to critics*, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 93, 318
- Elliston B., MacGill I., Diesendorf M., 2014, *Comparing least cost scenarios for 100% renewable electricity with low emission fossil fuel scenarios in the Australian National Electricity Market*, *Renewable Energy*, 66, 196
- Elliston B., Riesz J., MacGill I., 2016, *What cost for more renewables? The incremental cost of renewable generation – An Australian National Electricity Market case study*, *Renewable Energy*, 95, 127
- Forbes D., 2008, *So you want to be a professional astronomer!*, Mercury, Spring 2008, [arXiv:0805.2624](#)
- Forster P., Kriegler E., Rogelj J., Schultz S., Shindell D., Zickfeld K., 2018, *Measuring Progress to Net Zero Emissions Combining Long-Lived and Short-Lived Climate Forcers* (Cross-Chapter Box 2), in *Global Warming of 1.5°C, IPCC Special Report*, eds.: Masson-Delmotte V. P. et al., in press
- Hansen J., 2011, *Storms of My Grandchildren: The Truth about the Coming Climate Catastrophe and our Last Chance to Save Humanity*, Bloomsbury Publishing, ISBN 9781408820629
- Hodgkinson D., Johnston R., 2015, *DIY climate action might make us feel good, but it won't solve the problem*, The Conversation, [published online](#), 27 October 2015, 2:51pm AEDT
- Kewley L. J., 2019, *Diversity and inclusion in Australian astronomy*, *Nature Astronomy*, [doi:10.1038/s41550-019-0954-1](#)
- Le Quéré C., 2018, *Global Carbon Budget 2018*, *Earth System Science Data*, 10, 2141
- Maddison S., Bourov A., Schmidt B., Salmeron R., Walsh A., Sim H., d'Orgeville C., Daniel A. J. (Working Group 3.1), 2015, *Demographic Survey of Australian Astronomy*, Report to the National Committee for Astronomy for the Australian Astronomy Decadal Plan 2016–2025, [published online](#)
- Matthews H. D., Caldeira K., 2008, *Stabilizing climate requires near-zero emissions*, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35, L04705
- Matzner C. D. et al., 2019, *Astronomy in a Low-Carbon Future*, Long Range Plan 2020, [arXiv:1910.01272](#)
- Menezes A. C., Cripps A., Buswell R. A., Wright J., Bouchlaghem D., 2014, *Estimating the energy consumption and power demand of small power equipment in office buildings*, *Energy and Buildings*, 75, 199
- Metcalfe T. S., 2008, *The Production Rate and Employment of Ph.D. Astronomers*, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 120, 229
- Middleton C., 2019, *Environmental sustainability goals drive changes in conference practices*, *Physics Today*, 72, 9, 29
- O'Toole S., Pindor B., Power C., 2019, *Data and Computing White Paper*, Decadal plan for Australian astronomy 2016–2025: Mid-term review, [published online](#)
- Rädel G., Shine K. P., 2008, *Radiative forcing by persistent contrails and its dependence on cruise altitudes*, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113, D07105
- Ripple W. J., Wolf C., Newsome T. M., Barnard P., Moomaw W. R. et al., 2019, *World Scientists' Warning of a Climate Emergency*, *BioScience*, [biz088](#)
- Ritchie H., Roser M., 2019, *CO₂ and Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, Our World in Data, [published online](#), original May 2017, updated October 2018, accessed November 2019
- Rogelj J. D. et al., 2018, *Mitigation Pathways Compatible with 1.5°C in the Context of Sustainable Development* (Chapter 2), in *Global Warming of 1.5°C, IPCC Special Report*, eds.: Masson-Delmotte V. P. et al., in press
- Roy Morgan Research Ltd., 2016, *Sky high: Australians' air travel habits*, [Article No. 7084](#)
- Solomon S., Plattner G.-K., Knutti R., Friedlingstein P., 2009, *Irreversible climate change due to carbon dioxide emissions*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106, 1704
- Stohl A., 2008, *The travel-related carbon dioxide emissions of atmospheric researchers*, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 8, 6499
- Walker I., Leviston Z., 2019, *There are three types of climate change denier, and most of us are at least one*, The Conversation, [published online](#), 9 October 2019, 5:36pm AEDT
- Walkowicz L. M., 2018, *Choose your own adventure: Developing a values-oriented framework for your career*, [arXiv:1805.09963](#)
- Williamson K., Rector T. A., Lowenthal J. et al., 2019, *Embedding Climate Change Engagement in Astronomy Education and Research*, Decadal Survey on Astronomy and Astrophysics (ASTRO2020), [arXiv:1907.08043](#)
- Wynes S., Donner S. D., 2018, *Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Business-Related Air Travel at Public Institutions: A Case Study of the University of British Columbia*, Pacific Institute for Climate Solutions