

Statement: If tomorrow, we decide to ban collaboration with the fossil industry, what are the intended and unintended effects for the short and long term:

Effects mentioned

Effects for society and external stakeholders:

- *Society:* By banning collaborations the UvA is setting an example for others, it can influence other universities to do the same as other parties feel strengthened to make sustainable choices too.
- *Society:* Banning collaborations is the wrong signal to society because it signals to only blame the fossil fuel industry. End users should change too. Other views are that by banning collaborations you are creating awareness in society for climate destruction.
- *Society:* It slows down the energy transition as research accelerates the energy transition
- *Government:* It can open the discussion with the government about funding.
- *Fossil companies:* There might be unfair exclusion of unicorn companies (which are companies in the fossil fuel industry that are perfect).
- *Fossil companies:* It revokes the social license to operate from fossil fuel companies. The note here was that the question of how big this effect actually is of revoking the social license to operate as banning a company like Shell will only have a small effect on both society and the company as it is a very small percentage of the budget that is going to the UvA. In addition, Shell will continue as is whether or not collaborations are banned.
- *Fossil companies:* The companies that are banned will lose knowledge.
- *Fossil companies:* The fossil industry no longer has access to publicly funded R&D.
- *Other companies:* It sends the message to other potential collaborators if you want to collaborate with us you have to be more sustainable.

Effects for the UvA

- *Values:* The University of Amsterdam acts in line with its values.
- *Sustainability:* The University of Amsterdam acts in line with the Paris agreement. The UvA is not working with parties that promote doubts about climate change.
- *Sustainability:* The UvA loses influence in the development of fossil fuel industry policy for sustainability. It means we are losing ties with the fossil industry and the possibility to impact them.
- *Employees:* Clarity is created within the UvA on collaborating with fossil fuel industry.
- *Employees:* Co-workers will leave the UvA to continue their fossil industry collaborations elsewhere. There might be an increase in polarization within the UvA about the topic.
- Knowledge is lost from the UvA and going to other places.
- It is a sign that democratic activity in UvA increases.
- *UvA as unreliable partner:* It scares of potential collaborators who might be afraid to get banned next, making the UvA an unreliable partner.
- *Funding:* It will result in a concern of where to get funding from and a search for alternative sustainable funds. The need to find new partners can also lead to a boost of new creativity. That the funding will eventually be replaced with sustainable funding is also mentioned as an effect.
- *Boundaries of collaborating with third parties:* A related concern is that the question arising from such a ban is what do we think of other industries, which ties into a concern for cancel

culture; what is the next ban? There might also be unfair inclusion of other companies in other industries beyond the fossil fuel industry that are also unsustainable such as Tata Steel.

Effects for research:

- Collaborations might shift to other less rigorous partners and domains. Research will shift internally to fossil companies which might result in a poorer quality of research.
- Researchers might miss opportunities for innovation as research opportunities are discovered through collaborations with companies
- In terms of academic freedom, both an increase and decrease of academic freedom were mentioned as effects of a ban.

Statement: If tomorrow, we decide against a ban collaboration with the fossil industry and continue as we do now, what are the intended and unintended effects for the short and long term?

Effects for society and external stakeholders:

- *Society:* The energy transition is accelerated by scaling up and innovation.
- *Employees:* Employee spots are created. Relevant scientists at the UvA are trained and educated with regards to the fossil industry and its transition.
- *Fossil companies:* Fossil companies are engaged in a culture shift towards more sustainability.
- *Fossil companies:* Fossil parties continue as is (the status quo is maintained)

Effects for UvA

- *Sustainability:* The UvA can develop techniques to contribute to the energy transition or play another role.
- *Funding:* Research funding continues, even though the amount of funding is little as mentioned by some.
- There is also clarity for the UvA as a whole
- *UvA as reliable partner:* The UvA remains a reliable partner
- Knowledge will remain in UvA, research results can continue to be obtained.
- *Reputation:* Continuing collaboration may result in a reputation damage. Integrity of university is at stake given greenwashing. And UvA can lose its position as a more environmentally friendly university compared to universities that do not collaborate with fossil fuel companies.
- Polarization within UvA as some are in favor of a ban.
- Student numbers may decrease.
- *Values:* UvA operates out of line with its values. It shows that the UvA agrees with the practices of Shell regarding human rights violations.
- UvA can stay close to companies that are needed for the energy transition. The society is still highly dependent on fossil fuels; we should help them in the transition.
- We miss the opportunity to develop a better ethical framework.

Effects for research:

- Fossil fuel sponsorship might lead to a subconscious influence on researchers, decreasing creativity and independence.
- Academic freedom either increased or decreased