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Why focus on ESG in the food & agriculture sector?

The food system faces urgent transformation to meet the needs of the world’s growing population and to create healthy, sustainable, equitable and accessible food solutions.

This is a huge opportunity to effect meaningful change at planetary scale. Naturally, ESG investors are increasingly turning their interest to agriculture as a key climate change portfolio lever.

Sources: (1) EDGAR-FOOD, part of EU’s Emissions Database of Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR), Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, (2019), (2, 3) World Bank Open Data. Figure includes Agri activities and the processing of foods, (4) US SIF Foundation, (5) United Nations assessment (6) WRI

F&A sector produces around $\frac{1}{3}$ of all GHG emissions (1)

12% livestock & manure

2% residues & org. soils

2% paddy rice

1% fertiliser prod./application

3% other

2.5b

1/3 of all humans either employed or reliant on the global F&A sector (2)

Why focus on ESG in the food & agriculture sector?

Environmental opportunity

Social impact

Big business

Top 5 sustainable investor target

Megatrends

70% more food needed by 2050 produced on just 5% more arable land (5, 6)

Sources: (1) EDGAR-FOOD, part of EU’s Emissions Database of Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR), Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, (2019), (2, 3) World Bank Open Data. Figure includes Agri activities and the processing of foods, (4) US SIF Foundation, (5) United Nations assessment (6) WRI

Key megatrends and policy shifts

Ag & food industry integration

- Reduce nutrient loss
- Organic farming & sustainable farming models
- Food waste reduction & sustainable diets
- Reduction of chemical pesticides

EU Green Deal 2030 ambitions

- Improved soil health
- Zero waste & circular economy
- EU Green Deal 2030 ambitions
- Cutting environmental footprint of US farmers in half by 2050
- Increase agricultural production by 40%

USDA Ag Innovation agenda

- US SIF Foundation, (5) United Nations assessment (6) WRI

Total Institutional ESG investments

US$17 trill

$2.4 trill

Devoted to sustainable agriculture (4)
Purpose of this report

The difference between ESG laggards and leaders increasingly defines the basic conditions for business success. From who gets access to capital and the best talent, to reputational gain and reduced risk of litigation and volatility.

What goes into leading ESG practices matters. This initiative is a joint work with leading Food & Agriculture companies to explore the opportunities and challenges that shape leading ESG performance.

The report aims to provide new ways of thinking around three key ESG issues:
1) Defining ESG leadership
2) Understanding and aligning on enterprise risk and ESG materiality
3) Addressing the ESG data challenge

Report Approach. WBCSD and TSC constituted a forum of participating companies in the Agriculture and Food value chain with a focus on agricultural input suppliers, products and commodities and processor-wholesaler distributors. Participants responded to detailed questionnaires and participated in individual company interviews and group workshops. The results have been compiled by WBCSD and TSC into the following report and insights.

The views and opinions expressed herein are those of WBCSD and TSC, founded on insight shared by interviewee respondents and do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of any individual participating organization or participant.
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Fundamental questions

1. What does ESG leadership look like?
   1. Simplicity of focus is key to top ESG performance
   2. An aligned workflow is the starting point of the ESG journey
   3. Benchmarking ESG performance requires a common assessment framework

2. How aligned is ESG materiality with enterprise risk?
   The Food & Ag sector is less aligned between risk and materiality than other sectors

3. How can we better manage materiality?
   1. ESG materiality needs to be both strategic and operational
   2. Materiality needs to support peer, industry and standards benchmarking
   3. The materiality assessment needs to become more dynamic
   4. The Stakeholder perspective is increasingly important

4. How do we address the ESG data challenge?
   1. The ESG data challenge can be broken down into manageable work streams
   2. Simple, transparent and clear metrics are needed
   3. ESG leadership increasingly equals data management excellence
1. What does ESG leadership look like?

A simple question, but assessing one’s own ESG maturity was considered challenging for three primary reasons:

1) The origins of the ESG function vary across companies (e.g., CSR, public affairs or sustainability compliance) leading to inconsistent definitions and approaches

2) Alignment is needed on ‘standard’ parameters to measure ESG maturity vs. ‘gut feel’

3) These ‘standard’ parameters to measure maturity should be both inward focused (e.g., coordination, processes and governance) and outward focused (e.g., thought leadership, sectorial benchmarks, partnerships and peer to peer collaboration)

How do you assess the maturity of your ESG management approach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% considered their companies leaders in ESG management, but with many caveats.

“We’re leading relative to what I see generally in our industry, but ESG management still lacks maturity relative to financial management.”
While data types are myriad and there are over 1490 possible ESG metrics to report against, ESG leaders stressed simplicity of focus as a key ESG design criteria vs. boiling the ocean.

Challenge: focus the organization on a few, simple metrics across the ESG initiative.

Solution: CEO set out the key factors and KPIs that mattered to the Board and asked the team for laser focus on these.

Result: with this top-level mandate, the company was able to quickly gain the buy-in from identified functions and focus the program reporting to < 20 metrics.

Overview of key executive ESG focus areas and KPIs. (Disguised participant example)

Note from the CEO.
Team let's focus on a few key things that will move the needle please. Some thoughts below...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most relevant dimensions</th>
<th>Ambition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational eco-efficiency</td>
<td>Reach +XX% eco-efficiency and -XX% in direct emissions by 20XX, <strong>carbon neutrality</strong> by 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental reporting</td>
<td>Maintain distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate strategy</td>
<td>Complete new <strong>climate change strategy</strong> also through <strong>offset projects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse <strong>circular economy</strong> from disposable plastic elimination to 100% eco-friendly products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Move <strong>from XX% to XX%</strong> in employee engagement score by 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent attraction and retention</td>
<td>Target &lt;XX% churn of younger employees by 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor practice</td>
<td>Maintain distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain management</td>
<td>Integrate <strong>ESG objectives in supply chain strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>Maintain distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate citizenship</td>
<td>Maintain <strong>distinctiveness</strong> through nation-wide <strong>digital empowerment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate governance</td>
<td>Integrate <strong>ESG targets</strong> in corporate remuneration policies and <strong>improve BoD policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy protection</td>
<td>Maintain distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk and crisis management</td>
<td>Further complement <strong>sensitivity analysis</strong> with risk indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Reinforce <strong>cybersecurity practices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation management</td>
<td>Expand offering portfolio with <strong>new ESG services</strong> and scale-up <strong>start-up funding and incubation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does ESG leadership look like?

**Insight. An aligned workflow is the starting point of the ESG journey**

An aligned workflow across the organization was considered critical. This illustrative workflow covers the six main steps and summarizes some of the processes within each.

However, there were familiar challenges and open questions across each step of the workflow.

“An aligned workflow allows us to effectively design, plan and execute a coordinated ESG agenda.”

### Challenges & considerations

- Mega trends
- The new competition for ‘good’
- Adaptive evolution of the narrative

- Fragmentation & proliferation of standards landscape
- Lack of standards alignment
- Lack transparency on how they measure

- Too infrequently updated (annual)
- Issues/trends in constant state of flux
- Investors demand real-time views

- Small sample size
- Manual and time-consuming
- Self-referential

- Data in disparate systems and silos
- ESG ratings data collection is whole company, multi-BU efforts
- Frequency of reporting (internally and externally) – is once a year good enough?

### Open questions

- How can we fine-tune & track our narrative?
- How do we drive better ESG literacy across the Org?
- Do we need to move from static annual to dynamic?
- How do we become more data driven vs. ‘gut’ instinct?
- How can we do this at scale?

- Most tools are investor focused
- The methodology is controversial
- It needs to be near real time

- Real time scanning of business and stakeholder environment for controversy signals

- Controversy Monitoring

- Website
- Press
- Portals
- Investor community
What does ESG leadership look like?

Insight. Benchmarking ESG performance requires a common assessment framework

Findings were then extrapolated into an ESG Maturity Assessment Framework for a more objective set of comparable measures and progress.
2. How aligned is ESG materiality with enterprise risk?

70% have some to significant alignment between ESG and enterprise risk processes.

How aligned are your ESG and ERM processes?

- No integration (0%)
- Minor alignment (30%)
- Somewhat aligned (40%)
- Significant alignment (30%)
- Fully aligned (0%)

But finding a clear line between the primary motivations for ESG and the most important risk areas is difficult.

ESG motivations ≠ the most important company risks

Responses contain a mix of activities and focus areas and have been loosely grouped by their primary ESG relation.

Primary ESG motivation
- Strategy & Business planning
- Investor engagement
- Climate transition
- Compliance
- Stakeholder Mgmt
- Strategic resiliency
- Consumer preference
- Society welfare
- Employee welfare
- Physical / climate risk

Most important risks identified
- Climate transition 100%
- GHG emissions 100%
- Worker welfare
- Land use/degradation
- Supply chain risk
- Stakeholder activism
- Other
- Natural disaster/extreme weather
- ESG litigation
- Community welfare

"The original focus on sustainability and ESG was compliance. Now we have realized compliance is not enough because we cannot tell the whole perspective of our story. ESG starts to be much more of a concern for the business as a whole."
Despite some progress from 2018, the Food & Agri sector continues to lag behind other sectors in alignment between enterprise risk and ESG factors, limiting effective cross-functional alignment.

Reasons include the challenges associated with different assessment time frames; the lack of common language and standards; and challenges to understand the dynamics and complexity of the Food & Agri system.

“We don’t yet have a sector agreed methodology to evaluate ESG risk from a financial perspective.”

“We for us the big difference is that ESG materiality assessment builds in the stakeholder perspective. Risk and ESG processes need not be 100% aligned, but should be set up in such a way that they inform each other.”

Climate change is the great aligner between risk and sustainability; everything else, not so much

Material topics mentioned in companies’ sustainability disclosures and risk disclosures (2020 reporting schedule).

Source: WBCSD - Material topics mentioned in company’s sustainability disclosures and risk disclosures in 2020 reporting schedule (Managing global risks: six lessons on enterprise risk management from over 250 companies, January 2022).
3. How can we better manage materiality?

“There needs to be a balance between being dynamic at an operational level and setting a clear, stable purpose at a strategic level.”
How can we better manage materiality?

Insight. ESG materiality needs to be both strategic and operational

The time horizon is a critical factor in the approach to ESG materiality. Materiality assessments are historically performed at a point in time and naturally reflect perspectives of that moment. This works well for strategic target setting but makes it difficult to stay on top of the many volatile and unpredictable factors that shape and impact those materiality topics. As an example, few materiality Q4 2019 assessments included the impact of a global pandemic.

The key is to strike a balance and clear connections between:

1. **Strategic materiality**: set a clear, stable targets that guide the business for the materiality period

2. **Operational materiality**: enable an agile, proactive and more real-time assessment of trends and events across topics and stakeholders shifting within the materiality update period

“We need to focus on the things that materially make the biggest difference, and then be agile enough to respond to these new insights that come through. To have this 360 24/7 view of our landscape and ecosystem, we need to have the right systems and data in place.”

“Watching the trend is important, but we should be careful not to rapidly change our materiality topics – a stable view on these enables you to build impact over time.”

---

**Illustrative dynamic ESG horizon scanning model (TSC ESG system)**

- **ESG Mission control**
  - Monthly QTR

- **Strategic materiality compass**
  - Illustrative dynamic ESG horizon scanning model (TSC ESG system)

- **Operational materiality review**

- Each segment contains 100’s of key words and synonyms that review all source signals in real time across multiple languages
Insight. Materiality needs to support peer, industry and standards benchmarking

ESG leaders agreed that every company has a unique materiality signature that evolves over time, but stressed that there were many commonalities across companies in the same sector. Hence the focus is to maintain a wide materiality lens that maps: universal standards to sector, common themes, categories and topical focus, or, in the words of one participant, “An apples to oranges comparison”.

Map the selected standards to identify overlaps and complementary aspects - then organize "one view" to inform your materiality landscape and drive alignment and coordination across the organization.

How can we better manage materiality?

How can we better manage materiality?

Materiality Benchmark

Benchmarking a peer group and sector for topics chosen, emphasis given, changes in position or new inclusions allows an external 'sense check' of the materiality assessment.

How can we better manage materiality?
How can we better manage materiality?

**Insight. The materiality assessment needs to become more dynamic**

Linked to the strategic vs. operational materiality distinction previously discussed, ESG leaders stressed the importance of maintaining an active watch over operational and events-driven materiality topics. This might be government policy shifts, key customer scandals, or topic convergence (i.e. climate + environmental justice + social issues).

While every company and industry has a unique materiality signature that evolves over time, the refresh latency of the materiality assessment (i.e. semi-annual) is considered an obstacle to this.

ESG Leaders challenged the practicality of conducting materiality assessments at a greater frequency (cost + time + management distraction) but acknowledged external stakeholders’ increasing appetite for this, particularly within the investment community. The trend will be towards more automated horizon scanning technology to dynamically map materiality topics and the stakeholder sentiment at scale.

*Stakeholder sentiment: by topic, geography and stakeholder category towards company, peer group and overall narrative*
**Insight. The stakeholder perspective is increasingly important**

Stakeholder capitalism is the buzz word, pushed by The Business Roundtable Statement on the Purpose of a Corporation. ["We commit to […] deliver value to all of stakeholders"], The World Economic Forum in Davos. [Urging the move to the model of “stakeholder capitalism"], and of course Larry Fink, head of BlackRock, the world’s largest asset manager ["committed to embracing purpose and serving all stakeholders."].

However, ESG leaders generally agree their existing processes needed to involve more stakeholders, more frequently, both to align the company strategy to stakeholder expectations and as a key requirement in preparing the sustainability report.

This will be a tech-driven change and fortunately solutions are emerging.

"Stakeholder engagement should be less art and a lot more science."

“To understand what and how much of a story to tell to investors, looking at (framework) materiality metrics is not enough. To really understand the ESG factors that impact the organisation, we need to hear from our stakeholders which topics are relevant to them.”

**How can we better manage materiality?**

**Material topic pulse**

**Global stakeholder pulse**

**Benchmarking & gap analysis regarding stakeholder engagement**

- Assess peers and best practices regarding stakeholder engagement
- Identify gaps vs peers/best practices and establish what is needed to close the gaps

**Identification & prioritization of stakeholder groups**

- Identify full list of internal and external stakeholder groups
- Define prioritization criteria
- Analyze and prioritize stakeholder groups

**Design stakeholder engagement plan**

- What to ask? – based on specific objectives of engagement with different stakeholder groups
- How to ask? – defining methods and communication issues

**Perform stakeholder engagement**

- Use existing stakeholder engagement performed by the company
- Develop ad-hoc engagement activities, implemented specifically for the purpose of the report
- Document the process

**Collect, analyze information**

- Collect & analyze information on key topics and concerns raised by stakeholders
- Share the results with internal functions, to assess any company actions needed and how to revert back to stakeholders

**GRI Process and common challenges**

GRI 102-40. Sustainability Reporting Process for Stakeholder Engagement

- Small sample size
- Selection bias - speaking to those you know and those that will speak to you back
- Typically, a ‘black box’ process so difficult to benchmark the number, breadth and process of engagement over top peer group
- A very data and consultation driven process which many companies struggle with and need to outsource
- Very manual, time consuming and expensive (face-to-face, focus groups, interview, calls, townhalls, online, phone and App surveys)
- Many companies lack robust stakeholder management systems and default to CRM systems, often inadequate for the task.
4. How do we solve the ESG data challenge?

The lack of and need to capture ESG data ranks #1 in capability building challenges and risk mitigation strategies.

“As an input company, our biggest data struggle is to understand how many farmers got access to our products and, once our products have been applied, what the impact of our product has been on soil, both positively and negatively.”

“As a food producer, our biggest data struggle is to understand the nutritional performance of our products.”

Data needs and issues permeate nearly every aspect of effective ESG management.

ESG capabilities and risk strategies comparison

**Data need and issues**

- Low
- High

**ESG capability challenges**

- Lack of data: 100%
- Understanding & awareness of ESG factors: 60%
- Capabilities to identify / assess risks: 5%
- Effective governance: 5%
- Management focus: 5%
- Coherent ESG performance: 5%
- Lack of ESG metrics: 5%
- Financing of ESG solutions: 5%
- Systems & infrastructure: 5%
- Investor engagement: 5%
- ESG vision & culture: 5%

**Risk mitigation strategies**

- Data capture: 100%
- Stakeholder communication: 4%
- Systems & platforms: 4%
- Enhanced reporting: 4%
- New metrics & performance KPIs: 4%
- Conduct internal analysis: 4%
- External specialist support: 4%
- Training/technical support: 4%

% responses
How do we solve the ESG data challenge?

Insight. The ESG data challenge can be broken down into manageable work streams

Across the principal ESG capability challenges and risk mitigation strategies reviewed, nearly all linked to issues with the definition, capture and harmonization of data into meaningful internal reporting and external disclosure.

Reasoning from first-principles thinking, ‘data’ can be broken down into four sub challenges: 1) data and data flow, 2) metrics, 3) tools and systems and 4) digital skill sets.

“Without data and performance standards it is hard to know what to pinpoint and what to track. KPIs are all over the place.”

“To capture real understanding on something that is constantly shifting, it takes a lot of old legacy systems to pull together the data, to manage it and measure it through different lenses.”
How do we solve the ESG data challenge?

Insight. Simple, transparent and clear metrics are needed... But don't expect this any time soon

Agricultural Products Industry Standards and Sources (32)

The proliferation and lack of alignment between more than 2,000+ reporting frameworks, requirements, methodologies and protocols with over 1,424 potential ESG performance indicators were considered nearly unworkable. In addition, participants were further challenged to manage 32+ sector specific standards.

While most manage ESG disclosure under GRI, SASB, IIRC, TCFD, and CDP or a blended approach which may be facilitated by the development of the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB), the nuance of materiality, the lack of clarity and transparency on methodologies and metrics used were common sources of frustration.

Primary ESG capability challenges

% responses
Lack of data 100%
Understanding & awareness of ESG factors 5%
Capabilities to identify / assess risks 18
Effective governance
Management focus
Coherent ESG performance
Lack of ESG metrics
Financing of ESG solutions
Systems & infrastructure
Investor engagement
ESG vision & culture

Metrics are a common area of frustration and an area that requires more work.

The proliferation and lack of alignment between more than 2,000+ reporting frameworks, requirements, methodologies and protocols with over 1,424 potential ESG performance indicators were considered nearly unworkable. In addition, participants were further challenged to manage 32+ sector specific standards.

Acronym soup!
Reporting frameworks, requirements, methodologies and protocols

100% - Lack of data
5% - Understanding & awareness of ESG factors
18% - Effective governance
Management focus
Coherent ESG performance
Lack of ESG metrics
Financing of ESG solutions
Systems & infrastructure
Investor engagement
ESG vision & culture

Metrics madness!
Insight. ESG leadership increasingly equals data management excellence

A number of factors drive the data challenge including disparate systems and silos of data that complicate robust ESG data collection across the organization.

With the high external demand for different data points and types, the challenge is to build a robust yet simple enough data workflow able to answer 4 questions: 1) what data and why? 2) who owns it?, 3) how do we control it?, and 4) how should it flow into reporting?

Findings were extrapolated into a good practice ESG data flow framework.

Anatomy of an ESG data flow

2. Data Definition and Ownership

- Data Source owner Definition and Responsibility allocation
  - Clear allocation and definition of ownership and responsibilities
  - Formal procedures to ensure sufficient knowledge-sharing data collection

Procurement
- Supplier due diligence
- Supplier check data
- Product responsibility
- Scope 2 emissions

HR
- Staff diversity
- Workforce Temps
- Contact, complaints & whistle blower
- Incentives, remuneration
- Minority / female (leadership) representation
- Accessible healthcare
- Employee training and development

Ops & Facilities
- Scope 1 & 2 emissions
- Fixed efficiency data
- Hasilicious waste
- Carbon intensity
- Renewable energy consumption
- Carbon data

IT & Data
- Definability
- Cyber security/ breaches

Front Office
- Client, counterparty & transactional risk

Finance
- Climate-related financial risks
- Pricing, forecasting and forecasting data
- Financial reporting and capital allocation
- Insurance under insurance contracts
- Impairment of assets
- Tax transparency
- Green revenue

Strategy
- Competitive intel
- Market demand intel
- Customer ESG preference shift

Internal Audit & Risk
- Anti-corruption
- ESG disclosure risk

Health & Safety
- Critical incidents
- Accident data

Communications
- Competitor intel
- Contingency signals
- Peer, sector and Geo benchmarks
- External communications (news, social, trade journals, Benchmark, academics, keypeeps)

CRM (Cust)
- Customer engagement
- Human rights
- NGO action data

Investor relations
- Rating, standards & protocols data
- Contingency metrics
- Issuer data
- Disclosure rating

Leadership & Governance
- Exec compensation
- Business ethics /reg
- Competitive behaviour
- Succession planning

Government affairs / policy
- Legal regulatory, product
- Regulatory-relationships

Legal & Compliance
- Board composition
- Legal advice
- Liability risk data
- Green and impact washing risk

3. Controls Framework

- Metrics definition and data transparency
  - Metric definitions, standard protocols and measurements
  - Definitions: descriptions of relevant data
  - Alignment of assumptions, projections, measurements

4. Consolidation & reporting

- Consolidation and Reporting Scope
  - Consistent scope of consolidation and reporting period with key financial figures
  - Specification of consolidation groups

1. What data and why?

Assurance
Standards
Scorecards
NGOs
Partners
Raters
Investors
Media
Employees

Sustainability/ ESG committee

GRC/ ERM System

ESG data Lake

Internal Control Systems
- Formal and operational control systems for key non-financial metrics
- Controls process to ensure: quantity, quality, rate, completeness, accessibility, discoverability and discipline

Company disclosure

- External data sources
- Internal data sources

Stakeholder verification data

Board Report

Controversy monitoring

Central enterprise process

Website
Press
Investment community
Rating agencies
Annual Report
Proxy research providers

19
The fundamentals

Organizations need to be ready to respond to rapid change across market and consumer behaviors, the risk landscape, regulatory demands and stakeholder expectations.

Organizations should be prepared to demonstrate improving ESG leadership and agile performance management by:

1) Driving support for a common ESG Maturity Assessment Framework
2) Defining clear ESG workflows and management process
3) Building greater alignment between sustainability and risk management activities through strategic objective setting and risk assessment
4) Shifting to more frequent materiality assessments that support consistent strategy and also agile operational performance
5) Embracing technology and data across the ESG work flow and the performance metrics

Where to now?

What critical tech developments do you need to support future ESG management?

% responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% responses</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connect legacy systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big data analytics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI/ machine learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified risk &amp; ESG platforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote auditing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockchain traceability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About WBCSD

WORLD BUSINESS COUNCIL FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

www.wbcsd.org

WBCSD is the premier global, CEO-led community of over 200 of the world’s leading sustainable businesses working collectively to accelerate the system transformations needed for a net zero, nature positive, and more equitable future.

We do this by engaging executives and sustainability leaders from business and elsewhere to share practical insights on the obstacles and opportunities we currently face in tackling the integrated climate, nature and inequality sustainability challenge; by co-developing “how-to” CEO-guides from these insights; by providing science-based target guidance including standards and protocols; and by developing tools and platforms to help leading businesses in sustainability drive integrated actions to tackle climate, nature and inequality challenges across sectors and geographical regions.

Our member companies come from all business sectors and all major economies, representing a combined revenue of more than USD $8.5 trillion and 19 million employees. Our global network of almost 70 national business councils gives our members unparalleled reach across the globe. Since 1995, WBCSD has been uniquely positioned to work with member companies along and across value chains to deliver impactful business solutions to the most challenging sustainability issues. Together, we are the leading voice of business for sustainability, united by our vision of a world in which 9+ billion people are living well, within planetary boundaries, by mid-century.

Follow us on Twitter and LinkedIn

Related programs projects and support:

• Guidance for Applying Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) to Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG)-related Risks: https://www.wbcsd.org/bn68
• An enhanced assessment of risks impacting the food and agriculture sector: https://www.wbcsd.org/DRAFoodAg
• WBCSD Redefining Value: https://www.wbcsd.org/Programs/Redefining-Value
• WBCSD Food & Nature: https://www.wbcsd.org/Programs/Food-and-Nature

About TSC.ai

THE STAKEHOLDER COMPANY

www.tsc.ai

TSC is a global leader in AI driven ESG software and data. We work with many of the largest corporations on the planet in more than 104 countries.

Our 4th generation AI systems focus on providing the big picture mapping of ESG materiality factors and the complex networks of stakeholders and their positions and influence to map who and what matters, where and most importantly why.

Follow us on LinkedIn

Related resources:

• The ESG Playbook: https://tsc.ai/esg-playbook/
• Or for high resolution images of these models or to assess your own ESG Maturity, email esg@tsc.ai

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed herein are those of WBCSD and TSC, founded on insight shared by interviewee respondents. They do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of any individual participating organization or participant.
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