

Wilbraham, Susan ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8512-0041> , Jones, Emma ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0172-4484> , Priestley, Michael ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7071-7336> and Simpson, James (2025) Staff wellbeing and the impact of remote and hybrid working. Written evidence for Lords Select Committee on Home-based Working Volume HBW008. UK Parliament.

Downloaded from: <https://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/8812/>

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
- a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

Summary of submission

This submission draws upon empirical evidence from a recent [national study on the impact of the university built environment on wellbeing](#), together with the authors' wider research expertise, to address the questions posed. The focus of the submission is on how remote and hybrid working can meet the basic physical and psychological needs of workers' and its impacts upon the physical and mental wellbeing of those individuals.

The submission particularly emphasises the following:

1. Remote and hybrid working can provide significant benefits for workers, enhancing their physical and psychological health through increased autonomy and the ability to adjust their environment to meet their individual needs. This can also enhance productivity and economic contribution.
2. However, while remote and hybrid working can offer meaningful improvements in wellbeing, inclusion, and productivity, these benefits are far from uniformly distributed. Structural inequalities can profoundly shape who is able to benefit from such arrangements.
3. Remote and hybrid working's impacts on wellbeing cannot be considered without also understanding the physical workplace environment; poor conditions in the workplace will make remote and hybrid working more beneficial.
4. There is a need for employers to balance the provision of appropriate in-person and digital facilities to facilitate flexible and equitable approaches. Having an open and ongoing dialogue across a workplace is key to this.
5. Employers supporting hybrid and remote working need to proactively identify and implement ways in which to foster a strong positive

workplace culture and belongingness for workers to mitigate potentially negative consequences.

Overall, the submission emphasises that institutional and policy responses must be grounded in equity, flexibility, and responsiveness to the varied lived experiences of workers. It proposes a range of responses which the government could undertake to facilitate this, whilst recognising the intersections with wider societal and economic issues. The proposals include:

- Educating employers and providing evidence-informed recommendations.
- Considering the introduction of a statutory duty upon employers to proactively manage psychosocial risks associated with remote and hybrid working.
- Progressing the enshrinement of the 'right to disconnect' within UK law.
- Providing specific guidance under the Equality Act 2010
- Updating the [Health and Safety Executive guidance on home working](#) to fully consider worker wellbeing.

Introduction:

Dr Sue Wilbraham (University of Cumbria), Dr Emma Jones (University of Sheffield), Dr Michael Priestley (Durham University), and Dr James Simpson (University of Sheffield) are researchers, working in their individual capacity, in collaboration on a study exploring the impact built environment has on the wellbeing of staff and students in Higher Education. The study data, including a national survey and focus groups has not yet been published; findings will be presented in a report for Student Minds and published in peer reviewed academic journals. Our research expands

on the principles of good practice described in the [University Mental Health Charter](#) section on Physical Environment.

Workers and employers

1. What are the challenges and opportunities of remote and hybrid working for workers? To what extent do these vary depending on the worker's characteristics, such as their job role, gender, race, age, disability, income, educational background, carer/parental status and living situation?

Drawing on emerging data from our [national study on the impact of the university built environment on wellbeing](#), supplemented by expertise in professional workplaces and digital wellbeing ([Jones](#)), productivity and mental health ([Priestley](#)), disability inclusion in Higher Education ([Wilbraham](#)), and spatial/material environmental design for wellbeing ([Simpson](#)), we identify a range of environmental, social and personal factors that shape workers' experiences of remote and hybrid working. Crucially, these experiences vary substantially depending on workers' personal and structural characteristics.

Our collective research highlights that the physical conditions of working environments can be central to how workers experience and perceive remote and hybrid working. For instance, home-based work allows individuals a greater degree of autonomy over environmental variables such as temperature, lighting, and noise. This autonomy can be particularly beneficial for workers with sensory sensitivities, chronic health conditions, or those who experience discomfort in standardised office environments. Individuals are better able to regulate thermal comfort and adjust attire to suit fluctuating conditions and personal preferences, such as wearing looser or adaptive clothing, which is particularly important for disabled people or those managing energy-limiting conditions. However, these advantages are not evenly distributed. Individuals with lower incomes, those living in shared or temporary accommodation, or those without access to modern housing infrastructure may experience difficulty maintaining appropriate

sensory and thermal comfort, for example, due to inadequate insulation and the financial burden of heating or cooling.

Lighting conditions are also a factor influencing wellbeing. While access to natural light was valued by many in our national study, it can be less available to those in dense urban settings, lower-quality housing, or multigenerational households where working spaces may be repurposed living areas. Similarly, noise management can be highly context-dependent. For individuals living alone or with access to private space, home working offers a reprieve from the distractions of shared offices. In contrast, workers with young children, at-home caring responsibilities, or living in high-density housing can experience elevated stress and difficulty focusing due to the physical environment being used and social dynamics of the space. Ergonomic disparities are also strongly linked to income and job status. Some workers are able to invest in high-quality home office setups, an option inherently more accessible to those in senior or professional roles with higher incomes. Conversely, early career staff, or individuals on precarious contracts can often lack the financial means or spatial flexibility to create comfortable working environments. These material inequalities, in turn, shape how sustainable or desirable home working is perceived as over the longer term.

Personal needs, such as access to medication, rest breaks, and control over nutrition, can be especially important for disabled workers, older employees, and those managing long-term health conditions. Home working can enable individuals in these groups to better align their professional and personal routines, including the integration of rest, meals, and healthcare into their day. These adaptations are not merely about convenience but enable fuller participation in the workplace and potentially enhance productivity for individuals who might otherwise struggle with rigid, on-campus expectations. Caring responsibilities further shaped workers' experiences, with gendered dimensions potentially heightening how this is experienced. Women are often more likely to hold primary

caregiving roles and as such home working has the potential to allow them to meet both professional and domestic obligations. However, this dual burden can often result in blurred boundaries, particularly where employer expectations for online availability and presenteeism might not be adjusted accordingly to reflect at home pressures. Workers with childcare or eldercare duties can potentially experience less uninterrupted time for focused work, reinforcing inequalities in productivity and experience of homeworking. Such factors underscore the importance of embedding flexibility in both practice and expectation.

Cultural norms and workplace expectations surrounding visibility also vary in impact across social identities. The expectation to have cameras on during meetings can be experienced differently across groups. While some might value the enhanced sense of connection and realism, discomfort with exposing home environments to colleagues can be present. The use of blurred or virtual backgrounds is one way this can be navigated, allowing the potential to maintain privacy while meeting implicit expectations of professionalism.

Travel emerged as another key point in our nationwide study. Here, those with limited access to public transport, or with health conditions or impairments (including energy limiting conditions and cognitive differences), can benefit greatly from reduced commuting demands. For these individuals, the shift to remote or hybrid working has the potential to reduce physical strain, travel costs, and time burdens. Travel-related benefits of home working also intersect with broader concerns about environmental sustainability, with reduced commuting lowering carbon emissions, which aligns with national sustainability goals. However, this benefit should not be assumed to be experienced equally across sectors or geographic regions, where digital and transport infrastructure and housing quality vary significantly.

The social dimensions of work, encompassing collaboration, mentorship, and belonging, can be impacted by home working. Some workers

(particularly those in more junior roles) benefit significantly from informal learning through observation and social interaction. Similarly, remote working can exacerbate feelings of isolation or marginalisation, particularly in workplaces where informal networks are central to professional advancement. In such contexts, digital communication alone may be insufficient to foster inclusivity or psychological safety.

Home environment is only part of the equation in understanding the experience of hybrid or home working; the benefits of hybrid or home working may be greater where the physical workplace environment is not conducive to productivity. Factors noted above may not be optimal in the workplace, for example temperature, light, cleanliness, and accessibility may be poor. The physical characteristics of workplace estates can influence how remote and hybrid working arrangements are implemented. For example, in universities, older buildings, particularly those with listed status, may lack accessibility or be ill-suited to retrofitting, making them less adaptable to contemporary occupational health standards. In such cases, remote working can act as a compensatory mechanism for workers unable to access quality on-campus environments.

In universities and other educational settings, the interaction between staff and student needs adds another layer of complexity. Staff often need quiet, private environments for marking, research, and student support, while students require accessible and engaging learning environments tailored to suit their individual and collective needs. Hybrid working can relieve spatial pressures but may also create disparities in who can access vital pedagogical resources, particularly impacting students who benefit from face-to-face interaction.

Overall, while remote and hybrid working can offer meaningful improvements in wellbeing, inclusion, and productivity, these benefits are far from uniformly distributed. Structural inequalities can profoundly shape who is able to benefit from such arrangements. Without a clear understanding of these intersectional dynamics, remote working risks

reinforcing existing disparities rather than addressing them. As such, institutional and policy responses must be grounded in equity, flexibility, and responsiveness to the varied lived experiences of workers.

2. What is the impact of remote and hybrid working on individual physical and mental health? How does this impact and the steps taken to manage it compared to traditional site-based work?

In our national study, many workers described their workplace built environment as uncondusive to their basic psychological needs. In these instances, remote and hybrid working was identified as a mechanism to positively impact on both mental and physical health. Specifically, our findings underscore how remote and hybrid working has the potential to provide greater control over the work environment, significantly enhancing the ability to control and tailor environmental factors to suit individual preferences and needs. Within an office setting, particularly shared settings, workers reported having limited influence over elements such as ambient noise, lighting, temperature, and organization of their workstation. By contrast, remote workers typically enjoyed greater autonomy over the sensory environment including appropriate lighting, ventilation, noise, temperature, decor, furnishings and ergonomics. Our work found this agency over the environment to positively impact on facets of mental health, such as happiness, capacity to work and study, sense of purpose, restoration, and sense of physical and psychological safety. In addition, many participants described benefits of home working for their physical health, such as greater accessibility to kitchen facilities to maintain a healthy diet; control over temperature to prevent physical illness; and personalised furniture, ergonomics, and lighting to prevent chronic pain. For a number of our workers in our study, the ability to work in a hybrid manner promoted autonomy (identified as a basic psychological need) and therefore impacted positively upon their mental health. However, on occasion, participants described feeling effectively forced to work hybrid or

remotely due to a lack of appropriate provision on campus. This diminished autonomy, impacting negatively upon mental health.

Physical activity may be impacted by remote working; being onsite may encourage physical activity as employees move around the workplace, furthermore onsite facilities such as access to gyms or availability of green spaces may motivate workers to undertake exercise. Alternatively, remote working may support employees to undertake exercise and fitness activities by increasing their availability (having more time and more flexibility due to removal of commuting time).

To date, provision of specific initiatives to support the physical and mental health of remote and hybrid workers is relatively limited. During the Covid-19 pandemic period a number of temporary initiatives were put in place by employers (for example, online yoga sessions and digital coffee mornings). However, many of these have since been removed. Whilst wider digitalisation of workplaces has meant that a number of generic health-focused provisions are online (for example, Employee Assistance Plan resources), these are often not tailored specifically to the needs of remote and hybrid workers. Given the need for hybrid and remote working to be implemented in ways which foster equity, flexibility, and responsiveness to the varied lived experiences of workers (see our response to question 1), it is vital that employers are equipped and encouraged to implement appropriate digital initiatives and support.

3. What are the challenges and opportunities of remote and hybrid working for employers, including concerning recruitment and retention, the potential for collaboration and creativity, management, worker attitudes and expectations, and use of office space?

The data from our national study identified negative cycles of home working on occasions. There was evidence of a diminished sense of belonging and

social connection where colleagues were working largely off campus. Concerns were also raised about the wider culture of the university workplace where remote and hybrid working reduced opportunities for formal and informal interactions and social connections. Having few colleagues physically present could engender feelings of isolation, potentially reducing collaboration and creativity, whilst further disincentivising office working and reproducing the cycle for other colleagues. Workers also highlighted worries about the viability of employers maintaining important facilities and services such as healthy affordable catering and public transport routes, with reduced in-person attendance.

In addition, high levels of remote and hybrid working can create challenges for employers to optimally use available space whilst aligning with worker expectations for in-person working. Hybrid workers may expect their in-person workplace provision to remain the same, despite using it in a reduced capacity. Our data identified tensions where employers convert seldom used private office space for other purposes, as this can further reduce its suitability for workers' basic physical and psychological needs, thus entrenching remote and hybrid working patterns. One response by employers to enable a reduction in physical workspace may be the introduction of hotdesking. However, our research clearly shows that employer use of hotdesking can exacerbate worker stress, reduce privacy, and remove a sense of employee belonging. In our national study, concerns were consistently raised about the use of hotdesking. Workers may find open-plan offices or crowded spaces overstimulating, whether due to noise, lighting, or frequent interruptions, while others might feel under-stimulated and require a more dynamic setting. By providing workers with the option to be flexible and to tailor their working settings, remote and hybrid approaches can help mitigate these issues, although such benefits depend on individual resources and living arrangements.

Our research (and that of others) indicates significant opportunities and benefits of remote and hybrid working for employers. By fostering inclusivity, acknowledging and accommodating individual needs it can facilitate greater worker productivity and enhanced mental health in a way which benefits employers. Therefore, there is a need for employers to balance the provision of appropriate in-person and digital facilities to facilitate flexible and equitable approaches.

4. To what extent do the challenges and opportunities of remote and hybrid working vary depending on the nature of the employer, for example its size, sector, organisational capabilities, and geographical location?

The challenges and opportunities of remote and hybrid working do vary depending on the nature of the employer. For example, our national study found that the opportunities of remote and hybrid working may be enhanced in higher education organisations. Participants in our study reported that because academic roles are flexible and require long periods of independent scholarly activity without interruption, hybrid and remote working is well attuned to the needs of this work, providing staff are able to fulfil the pedagogical benefits of in-person learning. To be productive, staff should be able to work 'offline' while they concentrate on tasks; 'focus time' may give space to work without being expected to respond immediately to emails, phone calls, or instant messages such as Teams chat.

These opportunities were greater in institutions that may be less physically accessible for in-person working. For example, remote working was reported to be particularly beneficial to productivity in large universities with disparate teams across multiple campuses, whilst having minimal impact on belonging and social connection. For space constrained organisations, remote working may help to reduce demands on rooming or facilities which are overcrowded. Workplaces in buildings which cannot

easily be adapted or improved due to listed status present additional challenges. Older buildings may be less accessible, low quality, or poorly maintained; these create challenges for employers in providing work spaces that are conducive to working. Differential needs of workers are more difficult to accommodate where the workspace is inflexible.

These examples illustrate that employers characteristics such as size, location, and finances impact on the resources they have to ensure that their workplace provision meets workers basic physical and psychological needs, impacting on the challenges and opportunities of remote and hybrid working.

5. How can employer and worker needs be balanced within the context of remote and hybrid working, to ensure mutually beneficial employment arrangements?

Employers must provide an appropriate working environment for those who wish to work in-person, whilst allowing workers the autonomy to choose hybrid and remote forms where appropriate and compatible with their role and responsibilities. This is particularly important for staff with disabilities, where the opportunity to work at home to increase productivity and reduce the impact of impairments, must be balanced with ensuring they feel valued and included in the workplace.

Having an open and ongoing dialogue across a workplace is key to the success of this approach, empowering workers to make choices which not only benefit their wellbeing, but also enhance productivity and motivation. Employing co-creation approaches when developing policies, initiatives and wider approaches is a valuable way to foster this form of dialogue.

6. What is your view on why some employers have implemented back-to-office mandates, while others continue to support hybrid or remote working?

Back to office working may be encouraged in order to increase workplace vibrancy and improve social connectedness. There may be concerns over the perceptions of key stakeholders (for example, in universities where students and visitors are greeted with a largely empty campus). There may also be aspects of employers wishing to reassert pre-pandemic forms of organisational control and oversight and impose (potentially harmful) traditional cultural norms of working. For example, a number of firms in the legal profession are now mandating specific levels of in-person attendance within their offices, or offering financial incentives to promote voluntary compliance with such requirements. Similarly, in the built environment design professions (architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, planning) in-person working has been promoted with an emphasis on the need for collaborative working which is seen as key to successful design practice. This appears to be largely a return to pre-pandemic cultural norms, despite a large body of evidence demonstrating that such norms are harmful to worker wellbeing, particularly amongst those workers with specific demographics characteristics (for example, those workers who identify as female, disabled and/or from a minoritised ethnic background).

Productivity and wider consequences

7. What is the impact of remote and hybrid working on individual, organisational and national productivity and resilience? How can the productivity impact of remote and hybrid working be more accurately measured and defined so that meaningful comparisons can be made between different organisations?

Our national study suggests remote and hybrid working can enhance individual and organisational productivity. In the context of higher education, it is important to note however that the university calendar impacts the type of work being undertaken and therefore that individual metrics of productivity would fluctuate throughout the year, for example,

research activity could be expected to increase in periods with less teaching or assessment.

Productivity should also be balanced against health and wellbeing, for example considering stress and burnout where workload demands are excessive. Metrics might include sickness absence data and worker retention.

8. What, if anything, is the impact of remote and hybrid working on the UK's economic growth and international competitiveness?

Remote and hybrid working is supportive of international collaborations and partnerships with external private and third sector organisations, particularly where meetings may take place outside of office hours. Within higher education, international working relationships are an important aspect of increasing research impact and building international student recruitment, to benefit the UK's economic growth and international competitiveness. Similar benefits already exist within other professions and sectors.

9. Are there any other wider consequences of remote and hybrid working that you would identify, at the local, regional and national level? In particular, is there an impact on regional disparities within the UK, unemployment, development of skills, habits of socialising, or the environment?

Digital poverty and poor connectivity are unequally distributed nationally and decrease opportunities to take up employment on a remote or hybrid working basis.

Employers implementing systems to facilitate hybrid and remote working may inadvertently recreate existing harmful cultural workplace norms, for example, expectations related to work-life balance or replacing physical presenteeism with digital presenteeism. It is also important to note that

such systems are likely to collect increasing amounts of data on individual workers. Such data must be used transparently and in accordance with the GDPR.

There is also a need to upskill workers in relation to a range of digital skills, from email etiquette to Cloud computing. This includes a need for workers to understand and comply with the General Data Protection Regulation and also to be aware of potential cyber-security issues.

Employers supporting hybrid and remote working need to proactively identify and implement ways in which to foster a strong positive workplace culture and belongingness for workers to mitigate potentially negative consequences. This can involve upskilling senior leadership, management and HR functions in relation to appropriate forms of digital culture-building and inclusion.

Cross-cutting issues

10. To what extent do the individual, organisational, and wider socioeconomic effects of remote and hybrid working vary depending on whether work is carried out in a fully remote or hybrid manner?

Given the opportunities of in-person working for productivity, social connectedness, and physical health, our findings indicate that fully remote working may have more significant impacts upon individual mental health than hybrid working. However this is context dependent. Hybrid working offers flexibility and choice to combine private space with opportunities for social connection and collaboration.

11. What data is available on the prevalence and effects of remote and hybrid working? Are there any gaps in the available data?

While a significant body of research emerged from the pivot to remote working required in the UK (and elsewhere) during the Covid-19 global pandemic, gaps remain. It cannot be assumed that the impacts of enforced remote working in a time of crisis are commensurate with those that emerge where hybrid and remote working are offered as a choice on a longer-term basis.

With regard to higher education institutions, there are gaps in the available data on the prevalence of remote and hybrid working in this context due to the flexibility of work. Our national study of university built environment reveals that the prevalence and effects of remote and hybrid working are contextual and dependent on several factors including

- Personal preference.
- Desire for social connectedness and interaction.
- Quality of work space at home, and at work, and suitability for the nature of work. This includes temperature, light, soundscape, safety, facilities.
- Health and wellbeing; it may be easier to manage wellbeing at home, particularly for those with impairments and long term health conditions.

12. How do the prevalence and effects of remote and hybrid working in the UK compare internationally? Are there lessons that can be drawn from other countries and is there anything unique about the UK?

In Australia, most states and territories have adopted changes to the Safe Work Australia's (Safe Work) model WHS Regulations 2023 (Cth) (WHS Regulations). These require employers to proactively manage psychosocial risks. The term 'psychosocial risks' refers to aspects of the workplace which increase stress and the risk of psychological harm. Given the potentially negative impacts upon wellbeing that some forms of remote and hybrid

working can entail (for example, where a worker is forced to work at home because their office environment does not meet their basic physical and psychological needs), we would argue that it would be appropriate for a similar duty to be adopted via legislation in the UK.

A number of jurisdictions, including multiple EU states and countries such as the Canadian province of Ontario, have introduced a 'right to disconnect' for workers. We would argue that this right should be enshrined in UK law, either by way of statutory duty or code of practice. The argument that this may be economically damaging for businesses is not empirically supported and fails to acknowledge the benefits in terms of productivity where workers are supported in physically and psychologically healthy approaches to their work.

13. What is the relationship between the experience of remote and hybrid working at an individual and organisational level and broader societal and economic factors?

The research conducted by ourselves (and others) demonstrates that individual and organisational experiences of remote and hybrid working are significantly influenced by broader societal and economic factors. Cuts in healthcare, public transport, and education can reduce access to physical workplace and impact employee health. Remote working may be more important where transport networks are poor.

Overall, our research shows that workers' experiences of remote working are likely to be better when housing quality is better; income bracket is therefore likely to be important. Those on lower incomes and/or in precarious roles are likely to experience greater challenges and fewer opportunities, reducing their productivity and economic value to their employer.

Policy recommendations

14. What is the appropriate role for the UK Government in addressing and researching the challenges and opportunities of remote and hybrid working, bearing in mind that they are evolving and impacted by technological change?

Our research (and that of others) demonstrates that wellbeing must be a key consideration when considering the challenges and opportunities of remote and hybrid working. Where operationalised poorly, these modes of working can have potentially negative impacts upon individuals' subjective wellbeing. At an organisational level, this is likely to increase attrition rates and decrease levels of productivity and motivation. This also has wider economic implications in terms of rates of sickness and economic inactivity.

Our research also demonstrates that discussions of hybrid and remote working cannot be separated from a wider consideration of the physical environment provided by employers within workplaces. Where workers' basic needs are not met within a physical workplace environment, they may feel compelled to work remotely or in a hybrid manner. This is particularly the case where workers have a disability. The lack of autonomy and choice this engenders is harmful to individuals, organisations and the economy as a whole.

We would argue there that the role of the UK government is to:

- Educate employers on the challenges and opportunities of hybrid and remote working and provide evidence-informed recommendations to assist employers in implementing appropriate strategies and approaches. This includes appropriate role modelling through the approach taken within governmental departments.
- Consider the introduction of a statutory duty upon employers to proactively manage psychosocial risks associated with remote and hybrid working to ensure employee wellbeing.
- Progress the enshrinement of the 'right to disconnect' within UK law.

- Ensure that where workers have accessibility needs, there is guidance on how the Equality Act 2010 applies to hybrid and remote working. This could be provided [alongside existing guidance on the Act](#) which is found on the .gov website.
- Update the [Health and Safety Executive guidance on home working](#) to fully consider worker wellbeing.

EDI implications

15. What, if any, are the key policy and/or legislative changes the UK Government should make in this area? Where remote and hybrid working is appropriate, what can the UK Government do to facilitate good practices in the workplace?

Placing a statutory duty on employers to proactively manage psychosocial risks would require them to take into account the wellbeing-related aspects of remote and hybrid working, as well as having wider benefits for workplace wellbeing.

Introducing a right to disconnect for workers would also benefit workplace wellbeing, enhancing productivity as a result.

16. To what extent can trends or policies on remote and hybrid working help the Government to address other policy objectives, such as boosting economic growth, tackling regional disparities, encouraging the economically inactive into employment, or net zero?

This response has emphasised the relevance of physical and psychological wellbeing in relation to remote and hybrid working. It is well-documented that workplace ill mental health can slow economic growth, costing the economy through increased rates of attrition, sickness and economic inactivity.

Remote and hybrid working also has a potential to reduce environmental impacts including carbon emissions through reduced travel, while acknowledging that data storage has an energy cost which needs to be managed.

24 April 2025