

Main points

- Unfortunate watering down of the <u>EFRAG</u> proposal (November 2022)
- Weak position on double materiality, due to the postponement of reporting on community impacts
- Incoherence with science (delaying crucial env reporting when scientist identify an env emergency), policy (EU claims to want to be leader in environmental action & finance), and international (Kunming-Montreal Pact and Nagoya Protocol) and EU law (CSRD and SFRD).
- The COM allows in its DA a tailor-made reporting when it introduces a **materiality assessment criterion**, which reduces the scope of **mandatory disclosure** (it makes some disclosures voluntary regardless of their **materiality**).
- This way the COM ended up supporting a wait-and-see approach, instead of setting the basis for reliable
 and comparable information, as necessary to address greenwashing (companies can now omit entire
 disclosures or specific details within a simple disclosure...if they do not consider it material...according to their
 own assessment methodology).





Where is the regulatory coherence ...within the EU regulatory framework itself?

- Art 19A/1 CSRD requires information to be inserted in the management report which now the companies can decide themselves whether it is relevant to report.
- According to SFDR, key climate (E1) and social (S1) metrics should have mandatory reporting
 - Biodiversity is certainly one of them, since 35-54% of the financial assets held by financial institutions are highly/very-highly dependent on ecosystem services
 - How can risks be assessed and financial stability managed without this information being available?





Where is the Just Transition?

Reporting on non-employee workers not required

- This exclusion promotes precarious working, in contrast with the European Pillar of Social Rights and the fact that inclusive growth is acknowledged by the EU as a requirement for competitiveness.
- If we do not manage to have a Just Transition, we might not have a Transition at all!





Lost opportunity?

The **Kunming-Montreal Pact**

- One of the main outcomes of the **COP15 Biodiversity** conference in Montreal
- Outlines 23 targets for action that should evolve from voluntary to mandatory (as it was the case with TCFT)

The COM proposal ignores these international responsibilities!



Lost opportunity? (cont.)

Target 14

- Requires signatories to ensure full integration of developments in biodiversity and nature-based reporting into policies
- By 2030, biodiversity reporting should be treated similarly to emissions-based scope 1, 2 and 3 reporting

Target 15

- Especially relevant for financial institutions
- First step towards mandatory nature-based reporting
- Requires signatories to implement Access & Benefit Sharing (ABS) (<u>Nagoya Protocol</u>) regulation (EU Regulation 511/2014 applies to all use of genetic material)
 - Compliance with this Protocol is difficult to monitor due to lack of information
 - The DA proposed is a loss opportunity for compulsory reporting of ABS, which would support the application of the protocol and EU regulation.





Lost opportunity? (cont.)

Target 18 requires the rollback of biodiversity harmful subsidies (identified by 2025, reduced at least \$500 b/y by 2030)

Target 19 incentivise the implementation of national biodiversity financing strategies to mobilise at least \$200 b/y by 2030

New financial incentives should be created for biodiversity finance to address the investment gap of \$700 b/y, according to the EIB Report

Difficult to understand how this can be done when information is not available!



Is there a concern about interoperability?

Not moving boldly might express a concern about interoperability...

The ISSB plans to research incremental enhancements that complement their S2 Climate standards, and this includes natural ecosystem, biodiversity and human capital aspects of the just transition.



