



**GREEN
CROSS**
United
Kingdom

Sustainable Infrastructure

Programme Framework

SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMME FRAMEWORK

The Sustainable Infrastructure Programme Framework (hereafter SI π) establishes a clear objective:

Sustainable Infrastructure is defined as projects planned, designed, built, and dismantled in a manner that ensures economic, financial, social, environmental (including climate resilience), and institutional sustainability throughout their entire life cycle, with the ultimate purpose of generating a verified Positive Impact (π) that regenerates natural and social capital.

SI π enables developers, owners, and financial institutions to achieve this through rigorous methodology developed with:



SI π integrates complementary standards as stakeholder requirements demand:



Certification serves as evidence of performance, not the objective itself.

SI π is engineered for measurable value, moving beyond static certification to dynamic performance management.

IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS IN INFRASTRUCTURE SUSTAINABILITY

1. THE GAP BETWEEN COMMITMENT AND CREDIBLE DELIVERY

- Your **£500M infrastructure project** has sustainability commitments.
- The **community** still **opposes** it. **Investors** question the ESG **claims**.
- **The result: Project Finance that is both complex and expensive.**

WHY?

- Because sustainability ratings without **independent verification** are promises, not performance.
- Because community engagement without **technical accountability** is consultation, not consent.
- Because green finance requires **demonstrated positive impact**, not reported intentions.



"If major infrastructure projects are not sustainable, they should not get the green light."

António Guterres, UN Secretary-General

2. THE IMPLEMENTATION GAP

This **isn't isolated failure**—it's systemic. **80%** of global corporations have **sustainability strategies**. Only **16%** are **genuinely on track to deliver**¹.

The 84% fail not from lack of commitment, but from lacking measurable frameworks, independent verification, and technical accountability.

Slπ closes this gap by providing what's systematically missing:


- **A measurable roadmap:** 73 standardised credits to guide from aspiration to performance.
- **Independent validation:** Independent verification and Third-party certification that stakeholders trust.
- **Traceable accountability:** Castling² methodology transforming promises into auditable reality.

SIP OVERVIEW: APPROACH, APPLICATION & LIFECYCLE

3. STRUCTURED FRAMEWORK: COMPLEX DECISIONS

Measuring the full range of social, environmental, and economic impacts is challenging amidst complex and changing variables. SIP provides a structured framework to **assess progress, identify trade-offs, and align priorities** against a common goal.

What constitutes the best solution is often project-specific; the framework offers guiding questions for decisions at both **project and system-wide levels**.



Whether using **self-assessment or pursuing third-party verification**, SIP delivers:


- **Accountability** against consistent sustainability criteria.
- **Incentivisation** of higher achievement in project performance.
- **Recognition** of organisational commitment through procurement.
- **Public attention** to positive infrastructure outcomes.
- **Strengthened** collaboration amongst project teams and agencies.
- **Demonstration** of good governance to voters, taxpayers, and stakeholders.

The framework applies across six core sectors and integrates across the complete project lifecycle: **Planning, Design, Construction, Operation, and End-of-Life**.

THREE AXES OF VERIFIED PERFORMANCE

4. HOW SIπ TRANSFORMS INFRASTRUCTURE PERFORMANCE

The SIπ is a voluntary framework guides infrastructure assets from conventional practice, through sustainability, to restorative impact—where projects actively regenerate natural and social capital. **This is what we call Positive Impact (π).**



5. THE THREE VALUE AXES

- I. **Proactive Risk Management:** Systematic identification and mitigation of social and environmental risks from planning phase. Reduces conflict probability, increases execution predictability, prevents budget overruns.
- II. **Favorable Financing Profile:** Projects with managed risks and verified credentials align with institutional investor and development bank criteria for climate adaptation and mitigation. This contributes to more competitive financing conditions.
- III. **Independent Certification:** Green Cross UK guides dossier preparation and verifies submission readiness. Independent accredited certifier (ISI, etc.) performs conflict-of-interest check and awards formal certification. This provides verifiable evidence base facilitating dialogue with authorities, communities, and investors. Final coherence between performance and communication is independently certified.

FRAMEWORK ARCHITECTURE & SECTOR SCOPE

6. SECTORS, CATEGORIES, CREDITS, AND POINTS

The SIπ framework integrates 64 Envision credits developed by ISI (Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure) and Harvard with 9 additional Castling credits created by Green Cross UK, **totaling 73 credits across 6 categories** worth 1,100 points.

Where stakeholder needs require, this programme connects seamlessly with established standards including **GRI, LEED, SBTi, TNFD, and relevant ISO protocols**. Independent third-party certification includes **conflict-of-interest** verification to ensure assessment integrity.

					
Energy	Water	Waste	Transportation	Landscape	Information
Distribution	Treatment	Solid waste	Airports	Public Realm	Telecom
Hydroelectric	Distribution	Recycling	Roads / Highways	Parks	Cables
Coal	Capture / Storage	Hazardous	Bikes / Pedestrians	Ecosystem Services	Internet
Natural Gas	Stormwater	Waste	Railways	Natural Infrastructure	Phones
Wind	Flood Control	Collection & Transfer	Transit	Environmental Remediation	Data Centers
Solar	Nutrient Management		Ports		Sensors
Biomass			Waterways		

SIπ defines **what to measure and why it matters**. When paired with digital infrastructure – like digital twins – , this framework validates that positive impact is **continuous rather than static**—transforming certification from a one-time achievement into ongoing performance verification.

Cross-sector comparison becomes possible when different infrastructure types are evaluated against identical rigorous criteria. An energy generation project and a transport hub, despite different operational profiles, face the same sustainability benchmarks.

This standardization allows stakeholders to assess relative commitment and achievement across sectors, facilitating informed capital allocation and identifying transferable best practices across infrastructure domains.

IMPACT CATEGORY STRUCTURE AND METRICS

7. SIX IMPACT CATEGORIES · EACH WITH SPECIFIC INTENT AND METRICS

The framework's 73 credits cover six sustainability dimensions.

QUALITY OF LIFE (14 credits):



- Subcategories: Wellbeing, Mobility, Community.
- Addresses community health, safety, and wellbeing, including mobility, pollution, and equity. Proactive social impact management reduces community conflict risk.

LEADERSHIP (12 credits):



- Subcategories: Collaboration, Planning, Economy.
- Evaluates collaboration approaches, planning quality, and governance structures that enable sustainable management throughout the project lifecycle. Strong performance here facilitates productive dialogue with third parties including regulators and communities

RESOURCE ALLOCATION (14 credits):



- Subcategories: Materials, Energy, Water.
- Measures efficiency in materials, energy, and water consumption. Credits assess recycled content percentages, consumption reduction targets, and renewable energy adoption. Improved resource efficiency directly strengthens project economics.

NATURAL WORLD (14 credits):



- Subcategories: Siting, Conservation, Ecology.
- Focuses on ecosystem protection and biodiversity enhancement. Credits cover preserved land percentages, water management approaches, and habitat restoration. Proactive environmental risk management prevents regulatory conflicts and costly remediation.

CLIMATE & RESILIENCE (10 credits):



- Subcategories: Emissions, Resilience.
- Addresses both emissions reduction and adaptation to climate-related risks. Carbon & Envir. footprints and climate vulnerability assessments align projects with climate finance criteria increasingly required by institutional investors and development banks.

CASTLING (9 credits):



- Subcategories: Communication, Compliance Pledges.
- Verifies coherence between public communications and technical evidence, ensuring reports and stakeholder dialogue align with verified credits while managing colour-washing risk.

HOW CREDITS WORK: THE ANATOMY OF A CRITERION

8. RENEWABLE ENERGY EXAMPLE – FROM INTENT TO VERIFICATION

Each of the 73 credits follows a structured evaluation methodology ensuring consistency across diverse infrastructure types.

The renewable energy credit (LR 2.3) exemplifies this approach:



RESOURCE ALLOCATION: ENERGY

RA2.3 Use Renewable Energy

24
POINTS

INTENT

Meet operational energy needs through renewable energy sources.

METRIC

Extent to which renewable energy sources are incorporated.

LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT				
IMPROVED	ENHANCED	SUPERIOR	CONSERVING	RESTORATIVE
A	A	A	A	A
(5) At Least 5%	(10) At Least 15%	(15) At Least 30%	(20) At Least 50%	(24) Net Positive
(A) The project meets: 5% of energy needs (electricity and fuel) from renewable sources.	(A) The project meets: 15% of energy needs (electricity and fuel) from renewable sources.	(A) The project meets: 30% of energy needs (electricity and fuel) from renewable sources.	(A) The project meets: 50% of energy needs (electricity and fuel) from renewable sources.	(A) The project generates a net positive amount of renewable energy.

DESCRIPTION

While reducing energy use is the primary goal, a net-zero energy society will require significant investment in renewable energy sources. When appropriate, renewable energy can be generated on site to help reduce the need for fossil fuel sources. However, it is important to note that large-scale off-site renewable energy sources, such as wind farms, large hydroelectric facilities, or solar arrays, are often more efficient. It can be challenging to demonstrate a direct connection to these sources and ensure that their energy generation is not double-counted by other projects. Project teams should evaluate the feasibility of renewable energy, including nontraditional energy sources, to effectively increase the portion of operational energy that comes from renewable sources.

PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

Improved - Conserving: Levels in this credit are distinguished by the percentage of total energy use from renewable sources. Unlike energy consumption in buildings, which are almost always dominated by electricity, infrastructure operational energy use can include both electricity and fuel consumption. For this credit, project teams should consider both electricity and fuel consumption in their calculations.

Renewable energy can be sourced from on-site generation, purchased in fuels, or purchased from the grid through a direct purchase agreement (e.g., renewable energy power purchase agreement). For purchased renewable energy from the grid, the electricity service provider sources power from a renewable energy source and sells that power directly to the project. Renewable energy sources must be in the same power grid as the project in this type of transaction. Project teams cannot attribute latent renewable energy within the grid to the project without a purchase agreement.

Projects may only count Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) purchased or under contract at the time of assessment. Nonbinding commitments for future REC purchases cannot be counted toward achievement in this credit. Purchased RECs must be annualized over the life of the project. For example, if a project with a 20-year life purchases RECs for 100% of its energy consumption for one year, this would translate to 5% of its overall energy consumption.

On-site generation put back onto the grid is accounted for in determining percentage of electricity used. For example, in a case with 100 kWh of electricity used on site, 20 kWh of renewables purchased from the grid, 10 kWh of renewables generated and used on site, and 5 kWh of renewables returned to the grid, the result is a level of 35% renewables attained.

APPLICABILITY: This credit is applicable to all projects that consume energy (fuel or electricity) during their operation. Projects that do not include operational energy may apply to have this credit deemed not applicable with supporting documentation. In rare cases, where the amount of operational energy use is insignificant in comparison to the scale of the project, teams may apply to have this credit deemed not applicable with supporting documentation. However, the reviewer may exercise his/her discretion in determining what constitutes an insignificant quantity of operational energy use in the context of the project.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTATION GUIDANCE

A. To what extent does the project meet electricity or fuel needs from renewable sources?

1. Documentation of the anticipated annual output of all renewable sources, direct renewable electricity purchases, or exports to the grid, and the resulting overall percentage of renewable energy

- **Intent:** Meet operational energy needs through renewable sources
- **Metric:** Extent to which renewable energy sources are incorporated
- **Levels Of Achievement:** Five progressive thresholds from Improved (demonstrating consideration of renewables in design) through Enhanced (5% renewable energy), Superior (30%), Conserving (50%), to Restorative (achieving net positive renewable energy generation)
- **Evaluation Criteria:** Specific documentation requirements at each level—from procurement strategy evidence to operational percentage calculations

The **Description** section details implementation pathways, distinguishing between direct purchase agreements, unbundled renewable energy certificates, and on-site generation. **Performance Improvement** guidance establishes documentation standards. Evaluation Criteria specify exactly what evidence reviewers require to award points.

This rigorous structure applies universally—whether assessing stakeholder collaboration, water conservation, or climate resilience—creating comparable, verifiable performance metrics across all infrastructure sectors.

RENEWABLE ENERGY EXAMPLE – FROM INTENT TO VERIFICATION



RESOURCE ALLOCATION: ENERGY

RA2.3 Use Renewable Energy

24

POINTS

INTENT

Meet operational energy needs through renewable energy sources.

METRIC

Extent to which renewable energy sources are incorporated.

LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT

IMPROVED	ENHANCED	SUPERIOR	CONSERVING	RESTORATIVE
A	A	A	A	A
(5) At Least 5%	(10) At Least 15%	(15) At Least 30%	(20) At Least 50%	(24) Net Positive
(A) The project meets: 5% of energy needs (electricity and fuel) from renewable sources.	(A) The project meets: 15% of energy needs (electricity and fuel) from renewable sources.	(A) The project meets: 30% of energy needs (electricity and fuel) from renewable sources.	(A) The project meets: 50% of energy needs (electricity and fuel) from renewable sources.	(A) The project generates a net positive amount of renewable energy.

DESCRIPTION

While reducing energy use is the primary goal, a net-zero energy society will require significant investment in renewable energy sources. When appropriate, renewable energy can be generated on site to help reduce the need for fossil fuel sources. However, it is important to note that large-scale off-site renewable energy sources, such as wind farms, large hydroelectric facilities, or solar arrays, are often more efficient. It can be challenging to demonstrate a direct connection to these sources and ensure that their energy generation is not double-counted by other projects. Project teams should evaluate the feasibility of renewable energy, including nontraditional energy sources, to effectively increase the portion of operational energy that comes from renewable sources.

PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

Improved – Conserving: Levels in this credit are distinguished by the percentage of total energy use from renewable sources. Unlike energy consumption in buildings, which are almost always dominated by electricity, infrastructure operational energy use can include both electricity and fuel consumption. For this credit, project teams should consider both electricity and fuel consumption in their calculations.

Renewable energy can be sourced from on-site generation, purchased in fuels, or purchased from the grid through a direct purchase agreement (e.g., renewable energy power purchase agreement). For purchased renewable energy from the grid, the electricity service provider sources power from a renewable energy source and sells that power directly to the project. Renewable energy sources must be in the same power grid as the project in this type of transaction. Project teams cannot attribute latent renewable energy within the grid to the project without a purchase agreement.

Projects may only count Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) purchased or under contract at the time of assessment. Nonbinding commitments for future REC purchases cannot be counted toward achievement in this credit. Purchased RECs must be annualized over the life of the project. For example, if a project with a 20-year life purchases RECs for 100% of its energy consumption for one year, this would translate to 5% of its overall energy consumption.

On-site generation put back onto the grid is accounted for in determining percentage of electricity used. For example, in a case with 100 kWh of electricity used on site, 20 kWh of renewables purchased from the grid, 10 kWh of renewables generated and used on site, and 5 kWh of renewables returned to the grid, the result is a level of 35% renewables attained.

Applicability: This credit is applicable to all projects that consume energy (fuel or electricity) during their operation. Projects that do not include operational energy may apply to have this credit deemed not applicable with supporting documentation. In rare cases, where the amount of operational energy use is insignificant in comparison to the scale of the project, teams may apply to have this credit deemed not applicable with supporting documentation. However, the reviewer may exercise his/her discretion in determining what constitutes an insignificant quantity of operational energy use in the context of the project.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTATION GUIDANCE

A. To what extent does the project meet electricity or fuel needs from renewable sources?

1. Documentation of the anticipated annual output of all renewable sources, direct renewable electricity purchases, or exports to the grid, and the resulting overall percentage of renewable energy

DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND CARBON CREDIT INTEGRATION

9. DIGITAL INTEGRATION & KPI | OKR MONITORING

The SIπ establishes Key Performance Indicators (KPI) and Objectives and Key Results (OKR) monitorable through digital infrastructure layers including IoT sensors, AI analytics, real-time dashboards, among others.

This integration enables:

- **Continuous** performance validation against established baselines.
- **Predictive** maintenance aligned with sustainability targets.
- **Transparent** reporting to investors and regulators.
- **Automated verification** of Castling credit coherence, as communication claims can be cross-referenced against real-time operational data.

Digitalisation transforms static certification into dynamic performance management, where achievement is continuously demonstrated rather than periodically claimed.

10. CARBON CREDIT INSETTING WITH VERIFIED INTEGRITY



The verified baseline and continuous monitoring architecture enable development of carbon credit insetting programmes with rigorous accountability—both Nature-Based Solutions (**NBS**) and Technology-Based Solutions (**TBS**) for carbon removal and emissions reduction


Unlike voluntary offset markets prone to over-crediting, SIπ-based insetting ties credit generation directly to measured, independently audited performance improvements within infrastructure operations.

This approach ensures credits represent real, additional emissions reductions traceable to specific infrastructure interventions rather than baseline projections or avoided theoretical emissions.

PROGRESSIVE RECOGNITION STRUCTURE

11. FROM ENVISION VERIFICATION TO POSITIVE IMPACT (Π)

The SIπ framework establishes a progressive recognition structure with distinct milestones. Projects may engage at different lifecycle stages through two certification pathways:



Envision Verification

Green Cross UK guides dossier preparation prior to independent certification by the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure (ISI). Certification levels are awarded based on total points: Verified (20%), Silver (30%), Gold (40%), Platinum (50%+).

Green Cross UK Roadmap Pledge

Projects adopting the SIπ framework receive our formal roadmap commitment, acknowledging their structured pathway toward enhanced sustainability performance.

Green Cross UK Verified

As projects advance along the roadmap and attain higher Envision categories (Superior, Conserving), they become Green Cross Verified, confirming alignment with our methodological rigour and ethical governance principles.

Positive Impact (Π) Certification

The highest recognition, awarded when projects not only achieve top-tier Envision performance but also maintain and compensate their carbon, water, and/or environmental footprints through verified inseting programmes.

This status confirms the project actively regenerates natural and social capital—moving beyond "less harm" to net positive contribution.

CERTIFICATION PROCESS AND STAKEHOLDER ROLES

12. DELIVERING VERIFIED IMPACT: A COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

To deliver Positive Impact (π), we operate through a model of shared responsibility involving project owners, suppliers, and Green Cross UK. Green Cross UK acts as an independent strategic partner managing technical integrity and potential conflicts of interest, ensuring sustainability represents verified performance rather than static promise.

Roles and Responsibilities:

- Project Owners: Define sustainability objectives, allocate resources, implement framework requirements.
- Suppliers and Contractors: Execute work to specified standards, provide technical documentation.
- Green Cross UK: Guide dossier preparation, verify submission readiness, coordinate independent certification.

Five-Stage Certification Pathway

1. Diagnosis and Baseline Assessment

- Establishes sustainability baseline using Harvard methodology, following institutional framework definition and ASV¹ model estimation.

2. Training

- Project team and supplier training across framework categories.

3. Execution and Dossier Preparation

- Whilst the project team executes work, required technical evidence is collected (plans, calculations, contracts, communications).

4. Internal Verification

- Green Cross UK conducts comprehensive dossier review, verifying submission readiness.

5. External Certification

- Green Cross UK coordinates dossier delivery to independent accredited certifier (e.g., ISI). Verification at $\geq 95\%$ design or construction completion.

Commitment Model:


Our funding derives from verified Positive Impact (π), measured through transparent, auditable processes. Outcome-based, not time-based.

PROJECT PORTFOLIO



La Guardia (USA) **Sustainable Architecture**

Envision Platinum + LEED v4 Gold



Qingdao Metro (CHN) **Sustainable Transport**

25% reduction in embodied carbon through recycled materials and optimized design



Hidalgo State (MEX) **Energy Transition**

A master-planned development of 7,500 off-grid single-family residences



500 MW (PER) **Energy Storage System**

70% renewable penetration: peak shaving load shifting for projected annual savings of \$10m



FDN (GTM) **Natural Capital**

2.5 million Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) delivering verified local community impacts and biodiversity conservation



IPSE (COL) **Hybrid Microgrids**

Replacing diesel generation with 70% renewables for 150,000 off-grid users

VERIFIED PERFORMANCE: LAGUARDIA AIRPORT TERMINAL B



"These infrastructures are essential for our decarbonisation objectives."

Rick Cotton, Executive Director, Port Authority of New York & New Jersey.

- Site: Terminal B, LaGuardia Airport, New York City, USA.
- Project Type: Redevelopment.
- Investment: **\$4 billion.**
- Certifications: **Envision Platinum + LEED v4 Gold**

Axis 1: Socioenvironmental Risk Management

- Local hiring programmes addressed community priorities. Result: no significant conflicts during construction.
- Waste management: nearly 100% debris recycled. Water efficiency: 43% potable water savings.

Axis 2: Third-party credibility

- First project completing Envision v3 post-construction review while maintaining Platinum.
- Additional LEED v4 Gold certification. Collaborative dossier preparation followed by independent ISI audit verifying all claims against evidence.

Axis 3: Sustainable financing profile

- 18% reduction in energy costs. Baggage system consumes 37% less energy.
- Reflective roofing, natural light controls, and solar water heaters. Contributes to Port Authority's Net Zero 2050 commitment.
- Prix Versailles UNESCO and 5-star Skytrax rating.

ADAPTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY

13. ADAPTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY

The SIπ framework recognises that **public sector, private sector, and alliance-delivered infrastructure** pursue distinct objectives. SIπ tailors its approach to each delivery model—from public accountability and community engagement through private efficiency and investor requirements to collaborative risk-sharing in alliances.

Scope	Public sector	Private sector	Alliance
Collaboration and Cooperation:			
Practices, Tools and Standards: Climate Change, Energy Transition, Water, Waste, Carbon Credits, Green Jobs, and Sustainability.	Y	Y	---
Volunteering, Commitment and Community Participation Programme.	---	Y	Y
Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and National Adaptation Committees (NACs) Initiatives.	Y	---	---
Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Initiatives.	---	Y	---
ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) Reports.	Y	Y	---
Shared value:			
Community Wellness and Environmental Resilience.	Y	---	---
Business benefits. Leadership and competitiveness.	---	Y	---
Risk Governance.	Y	Y	---
Management and Approach to Social and Environmental Footprints.	Y	Y	---
Institutional Capacity Building.	---	---	Y
Ecosystem for Growth and Development.	---	---	Y
Sustainability:			
G+UK Verification Shielded.	Y	Y	---
Open Innovation: Customized Solutions.	---	---	Y
Project Development and Reclamation: Carbon Credits (Nature-Based and Technology-Based Solutions), Biodiversity, and Ecosystem Services.	Y	Y	---
Green, Climate and Sustainability Funds.	Y	Y	---
Public-Private Dialogue.	---	---	Y


Y: YES.

G+UK: GREEN CROSS UK

FRAMEWORK DISTINCTIVENESS

14. STRATEGIC VALUE

- The framework converts sustainability from aspirational narrative into measurable, certifiable asset value under globally recognized standards. The Castling methodology verifies that project communication is substantiated by technical evidence, providing a solid foundation for dialogue with regulatory authorities and community stakeholders.
- Project alignment with global frameworks including Envision, LEED, SBTi, and TNFD demonstrates commitment to internationally recognized best practices.




15. NPO-TO-NPO COLLABORATION

- SIπ represents a distinctive collaboration model: two independent not-for-profit organizations (Green Cross from UK and Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure from USA) working in coordination rather than competition.
- This NGO-to-NGO Anglo-American collaboration (UK and USA) ensures framework integrity since neither party profits from certification volume, eliminating commercial pressure to dilute standards or accelerate approvals.

16. ABOUT GREEN CROSS UK

- Green Cross UK is the national organization of Green Cross International, founded by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1993. With consultative status at the United Nations, our mission facilitates dialogue between today's decision-makers and those without direct representation—future communities and ecosystems whose interests are affected by infrastructure decisions made now.

GETTING STARTED



Slπ not only asks, 'Are we doing the project right?' but also, 'Are we doing the right project?'

17. TAKE THE FIRST STEP: PRE-ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT

Request our confidential, no-obligation toolkit to:

- Benchmark your project against the 6 Slπ categories
- Identify gaps and opportunities for improvement
- Gain clear insights to inform your sustainability strategy

Contact for Technical Teams:

We evaluate your project, establish baseline conditions, and identify achievable certification level.

E: joinus@green-cross.org.uk (subject: Slπ)

W: green-cross.org.uk/sustainable-infrastructure-programme

C: [Virtual Calendar](#)

Green Cross United Kingdom

7 Bell Yard, London, WC2A 2JR, United Kingdom

+44 (0) 330 818 7382

Member of Green Cross International | Founded by Mikhail Gorbachev, 1993



LET'S DO SOMETHING INCREDIBLE TOGETHER FOR SOCIETY
AND THE PLANET, STARTING BY STAYING IN TOUCH:

JOINUS@GREEN-CROSS.ORG.UK

Copyright Notice: All rights reserved. All material appearing herein ("content") is protected by copyright under the laws of the United Kingdom and is the property of Green Cross United Kingdom (GCUK) or the party credited as the provider of said content. You may not copy, reproduce, distribute, publish, display, perform, modify, create derivative works from, transmit, or in any way exploit such content, nor may you distribute any portion of this content over any network, including a local area network, sell or offer it for sale, or use such content to build any type of database. You may not alter or remove any copyright or other notice from copies of the content of this GCUK document. Copying or storing any content, except as provided above, is expressly prohibited without the prior written permission of GCUK or the copyright holder identified in the copyright notice of the individual content. For permission to use the content, please contact joinus@green-cross.org.uk.

Disclaimer: This summary of terms is provided for discussion purposes only. Nothing contained herein is intended to constitute or evidence a binding offer or agreement between the parties other than as expressly set forth herein. This document rather forms the general basis for discussion relating to the proposed transaction and the general framework upon which the parties are prepared to continue negotiations and due diligence. No obligation shall arise between the parties unless and until all necessary consents and approvals have been obtained and mutually satisfactory definitive written agreements have been prepared and executed.

Green Cross International Network: We invite you to verify whether a Green Cross National Organization (GCNO) exists in your country. Should one exist, we encourage you to contact them to express your interest in participating in this programme or initiative. If Green Cross United Kingdom identifies a GCNO in the vicinity of an interested party, it will reach out to facilitate a coordinated and joint response.

You can find more information at: <https://www.gcint.org/webpage.aspx#OurNetwork>