

Transcript of 'A Taskforce for Nature'

Season 2, Episode 6, Transforming Tomorrow

[Theme music]

Paul: Hello and welcome to Transforming Tomorrow, the podcast from the Pentland Centre for Sustainability in Business here at Lancaster University Management School. I'm Paul Turner.

Jan: And I'm Professor Jan Bebbington.

Paul: It's been a while, Jan, since we've discussed the task force. I feel we need to talk about task forces today.

Jan: Well, I think you're in for a treat then. But also it's not been so long since we talked about biodiversity and nature. So we are going to talk about the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures, TNFD.

Paul: And I shall refer to it as TNFD throughout this episode because frankly, the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures is getting a bit of a mouthful.

Now, you recall in the last episode we spoke with Tim Lamont. A lot of discussion there about companies and their effects on nature and how they can help nature and nature restoration.

Jan: It is indeed. And the task force has something different again. And, um, our guest will undoubtedly take us through its elements. So it, it has some element of restoration in it, but it's much broader. And as a task force, it, it kind of, you know, the label's there.

So a group of people got together to try to promote and to describe a particular approach to dealing with nature and biodiversity. So it's a pretty new task force and it's pretty exciting, but I'm not the person who ought to be telling us about it. Our guest is the expert.

Paul: Yes. Let's find out what that task force is, who is involved and what it does, by welcoming Dr Neytullah Ciftci, who is a postdoctoral Research Associate in Business and Biodiversity at the Pentland Centre for Sustainability in Business.

Normally we have to give a totally different place that he's a part of, and he happens to be a member. But no Neo, you are part of the Pentland Centre.

Uh, Neo tell us a little bit about yourself and your background.

Neo: As I said, I work here at the Pentland Centre with Jan Bebbington. My background, including my Master and PhD degrees and also my research interests, all about accounting and finance. I can say like, uh, my current research interests is all about biodiversity, with Jan Bebbington.

So what I am doing at the Pentland Centre? So we are working on some projects, one of them, for example, uh, looking at biodiversity scenario analysis with ICAEW. It stands for Institute for...

Paul: ...Chartered Accountants in England, Wales...

Neo: ...Chartered Accounts in England and Wales, that's right. [laughs]

Jan: See, we've got, we've got Paul drawn into our world. He knows all the acronyms there.

Neo: Yes.

Paul: Yes, my, my life is so much better now I know all the intricacies of accounting. [Jan laughs]

Yeah. Sorry, Neo you go on.

Neo: Thank you. It's ICAEW. So we are working, uh, with them to look at companies' biodiversity scenario practices to understand at which stage they are and uh, what they're doing right now.

And also, uh, we, we produced a scenario guidance to provide them some help with, uh, or scenario guidance as well.

In another study, we are looking at the antecedents of TNFD, which, what we are doing there, we are trying to understand where this TNFD comes from. Also, try to look at how many, for example, the percentage of the TNFD coming from the existing reporting, for example, sustain reporting or, uh, other CSR reportings as well, to help companies to build their capability beyond what they already have and, uh, what they don't know regarding TNFD.

So, yeah, that's all what I'm doing. And we also work on some nature restoration projects as well with Lancaster Environment Centre as well.

Paul: Before I let Jan ask the next question, you have my utmost sympathies 'cause it sounds like you work with Jan even more often than I do, so, yes.
[laughs]

Jan: Well, he seems to be quite happy. I'm certainly delighted by that. And it's really nice that we have the ability within the Pentland Centre to appoint postdoc research associates to really develop new areas of work where there's virtually nobody doing any work. And it's maybe a bit too early to get research funding to do it.

So it's very much a developmental role to allow us to advance, um, the, the theory and the ideas, but also to support practice at a very early stage.

Paul: And obviously it ties in a lot with what you do. Neo's areas of expertise similar to yours in, in a good overlap there. Hence the connection with the Pentland Centre and bringing Neo in.

Jan: It is indeed. And I mean, Neo's spoken a little bit and we've, we keep on teasing our, our listeners about the Taskforce for Nature-related Financial Disclosures. So now is probably the time just to maybe say, what is it all about?

Paul: Yeah. Having been corrected before we started this episode, Jan it's the Taskforce *on* Nature-related Financial Disclosures. And, and as you are working on it, I'd expect you to know that!

Jan: [laughs] I'm just gonna go TNFD 'cause then we, we know what we mean, but we don't have to get it wrong.

Paul: Yes. For when we say TNFD throughout the rest of this episode, [whispers] that's what we mean.

Yeah. So yes, I, I, go on Neo tell us what is it? What is the TNFD?

Neo: Well, the TNFD is a new nature reporting framework. Actually it's just launched in September 2023. It's quite new. So what is TNFD?

So, TNFD aims to provide companies and financial institutions with, uh, risk management and disclosure framework to identify assets, manage and disclose their nature-related issues, concerns.

So the basic that TNFD helps businesses to understand, uh, their impacts and dependencies, as well as their risk and opportunities. Like in a simple way we can say that TNFD helps organisations to understand how they impact nature, and how nature impact them.

Jan: One of the very interesting things about the TNFD is a focus on dependencies. For many years, we've had reporting frameworks and companies have been really aware of their impact on nature or their impact on restoring nature, as we'd seen in the previous, um, podcast.

But the TNFD, uh, starts to reflect the reality that we're living in, which, which Henrik Österblom talked about when he was on the podcast in the last series talking about the Anthropocene. And that is that companies are also critically dependent upon a well-functioning ecosystem.

And that's why it's a risk framework, 'cause it's a risk to your business continuity, as well as the risk that you present to the natural world. And, and that is like the, the really special and novel thing about, um TNFD and there's other, there's one other task force that does a similar thing, which I'm sure we'll come on to.

Paul: Well, let's come onto it now. And it is a task force we mentioned last season on, about a year ago, actually, when we were speaking to Duncan Pollard, when we spoke about the Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures.

So I guess my question is how do they fit together? Do they fit together? How will they interact?

Neo: So this is a good question actually. So the TNFD official launch in October 2021, and just after six months in, in March, 2022, it's just, uh, launched first beta version just in six months. I mean, this very quick, and uh, very short time period.

But how TNFD did this one? It comes to your question. Because TNFD heavily builds on TCFD framework. TCFD stands for, as you said, Taskforce on, uh, Climate-related Financial Disclosures, which look at the climate related reporting.

So in TCFD, we have four main pillars, governance, strategic risk management, and uh, targets and metrics. TNFD builds exactly on the same pillars. That's why TNFD is kind of developed a little bit faster than other global, uh disclosures.

Jan: So how can companies affect nature then, in their operations?

Neo: So this also good question. Thank you very much for the question.

So companies can affect nature in many ways. Like, as you know, some industries are highly depends on nature, like energy industries, chemicals, pharmacy, agriculture.

So companies in these industries they're, they affect nature heavily. Imagine a clothing factory located in, nearby a river. This clothing factory, to produce, uh, clothes, they use a lot of water. So, uh, they leave less water for the plants, animals, and agriculture purposes there.

So if this company doesn't handle the waste properly, they could leak some harmful chemicals to the soil and water as well. So also this clothing company rely on cotton, you know, the cotton needs, lots of pesticides to grow, which can harm insects and, uh, pollute the environment as well.

And also, uh, you know, some companies, especially in Europe, they produce their products in uh, in another company for some cheap labour purposes. So, uh, even though they produce their products in another country, they still affect nature through their supply chain.

That's why I like TNFD here, because TNFD also take care of supply chain as well, not just companies, its own operation in their own country.

Paul: That's something that I was just about to ask you then Neo, 'cause we often talk about the direct effects of what you are doing.

But then within a supply chain and how far up and down the supply chain you go. And there's things that we talk about when it comes to carbon, such as scope one emissions, scope two emissions, scope three emissions, covering, you know, stuff that you do directly within your operations, indirectly within your operations and then far, far down.

So is it similar with this? That the effects when it comes to the company's effects on nature that you have to analyse stuff far, far away from where your core base is?

Neo: Yeah, that's right, you need to analyse all of this, and you are also responsible from your supply chains activities. You need to report them as well. You need to build some strategies for your supply chain to decide how you govern, govern your supply chains. And also how, what kind of strategies you are going to develop on them and, uh, kind of what requirements you are going to ask them to do to be maybe nature positive.

Jan: And Neo's example of the, the clothing manufacturer and the dying and the water is a really good one, because it's also where the dependencies come in. And so we've seen, um, you know, well I was gonna say recently, but at any time you read the newspaper, there's, there's quite severe floods somewhere.

So if you've got a factory and you're using a water resource and it's by a river and the, uh, there's increasing flood risk, perhaps 'cause of climate change or maybe deforestation from further up the watershed, then, then that's your critical dependency. To have a, a water system that you can access that isn't going to be in, in a state of, of flux.

And maybe not so much with cotton, but particularly with you know, food and forestry and agriculture, the dependencies on, um, functional soils, on pollinators, on all of those services that people get from nature would also fall within the ambit of the TNFD.

So, Neo and I, um, have been keeping a close eye on those people who are starting to report under this framework, and we're just past the anniversary of the launch of the final version of the standard.

So what have you found in that area, Neo? Uh, is this a, is this a, a standard that people are using? Um, and we'll come on to questions about, you know, how good their reporting is after that.

Neo: Uh, that's a quite good question. [laughs] Like, as I said before, TNFD four pillars, governance, strategy, risk management, and uh, target and metrics. So these four pillars help companies to assess how their governance structures, manage nature related risks. How their strategies incorporate nature into business decisions. How they manage risk, and how they track performance through specific nature related, uh, metrics.

So in my experience, many companies are still in the early stage of, uh, understanding and implementing this disclosure. So there is significant, there is a significant variation across industries, with some companies making good progress, such as like companies in energy industry and others are lagging, such as, uh, seafood companies.

But as I said, this is like early stage, so we should give some time to companies to better understand the TNFD recommendations and increase their in-house capability to disclose better TNFD report.

Paul: Yeah, it's hard to say, I guess, when it has only been in place for such a short time, how good these companies are, 'cause they've got to get used to it.

But can you tell how seriously they're taking it? Are you able to judge after this amount of time whether they realise this is something they actually do need to be doing, even if they're not necessarily fully there yet in being able to do it?

Neo: So, uh, thanks for the question. We had, uh, I did read some, uh, TNFD reports and I can say that, uh, the companies are doing good. I mean, uh, these are new reporting and some aspects of this reporting is quite new, like as Jan said, dependencies and also targets and metrics as well.

Based on the availability of the data, availability of the data, I think they're doing great. By looking at the first reports, we cannot make any judgment because first reports are usually like just they're reporting what they know, but probably in like two, three years, they will be better in reporting TNFD.

Jan: And is this a, a popular activity? Um, how many, how many companies have you found that are producing TNFD reports?

Neo: Oh, this is, uh tricky. [laughs] We have so far, 74 companies reported TNFD. We know all of these. But I can say these are all in English language.

There are other companies reporting in, for example, Japanese language or Spanish language as well. With them, I think we have over a hundred TNFD reports, but in English, so we can only, uh, examine the English one, we have 74 reports.

Paul: Is there anything in common across the type of companies that are filing these reports or indeed the ones that are required to file these reports, and whether that's the size of the company, whether that's the type of industry that they're in, what are the commonalities between them?

Neo: One fourth of the reports coming from Japan. This is like an interesting, it may sound an interesting commonality.

But if we think that the Japanese government has a programme since 2009 to promote, to promote biodiversity conservation activities and report on them. So this doesn't look interesting uh, if we think about this.

So also some Japanese companies, the influential ones, they're reporting TNFD reports earlier than others compared to their peers in the world. So this also lead Japanese companies to follow these influential companies.

There are also some interesting patterns there, for example, the highly dependent industries like uh, food companies. So far we have five food companies, they just have TNFD report. This is quite less, even though they're highly dependent on nature it seems, they're lagging behind in the process.

So also, uh, some other countries like Brazil, Hong Kong, New Zealand, Singapore, Switzerland, UK, EU countries, TCFD is mandated in, mandated in these countries. So it seems these countries also leading on TNFD reporting as well. There could be a spillover effect here, maybe these companies in these countries, they may affect TNFD. They become mandatory as, uh, like TCFD soon as well...

Paul: ...do, just to interrupt, do you think that, that there's a relation there because maybe the same departments, the same people within these companies are taking responsibility for TNFD who've taken responsibility for TCFD reporting, and maybe therefore it's easier for them to double up almost?

Neo: Yeah, that's right. That's why some companies are producing TCFD and TNFD, uh, reporting, climate and nature reporting. They're integrating this reporting, and actually this is the one recommendation from TNFD. They recommend to produce climate and nature scenarios.

Jan: And I think what's really interesting about those patterns that we observed, is that, um, you asked Paul whether, you know, how, is this required?

So at the moment, TNFD isn't formally required by anyone anywhere. Um, but it's quite interesting that the places where TCFD has been formally required, we're seeing a bit of an uptick in the reporting.

And that's not to say that it may, it might not be formally required at some stage, uh, in the future. But what we think more likely to happen is that you'll get that climate nature reporting and so it actually almost will bunny hop over and become something quite different.

So it might be that TNFD is a moment in time, which is a bridge between no reporting, and a certain type of reporting.

Paul: I guess this goes to both of you, 'cause you both do the work together, do you think there's some kind of influence of investors in this kind of thing?

We've talked in the past about responsible investing, about people wanting to invest in companies that show they're doing well in terms of sustainability activity.

Therefore, are there gonna be certain markets around the world that this will take off in more, because maybe there's more green investing, responsible investing in those markets.

Jan: Um, it could be. And what's interesting about these task force, uh, reporting requirements, is it's not purely for companies, it's also for investors as well.

So some banks have been very early, um, uh, generators of reports of this nature, so that would help it join up. And I suppose, maybe returning back to the Japanese point, you know, the Japanese government has given a really strong steer and, and, um, I think Neo and I disagree slightly on whether or not the high incidence of Japanese companies are remarkable.

It's not remarkable when you know they've been through a process to produce them. But what remark, what is remarkable is the Japanese government has innovated in that way.

So between governments, um, investors and stock exchanges and companies own, um, motivations for doing it, we're seeing these three forms come together to really encourage, in particular industries, in particular places, this kind of work.

Paul: Do you agree Neo? Where do you disagree with Jan? [Jan and Neo laugh]

I'm, I'm always keen to find out where people don't agree with Jan. 'Cause you know, I don't agree with Jan on lots of things. Particularly, benchmarking, I dunno if you ever spoke to Jan about benchmarking.

Neo: Maybe we can pass this question!

[Everyone laughs]

Paul: OK, what aspects of it do you think of maybe slightly differently to Jan then?

Jan: We, we are gazing at each other. And, um, I'm trying not to look threatening, but I fear I might be!

Paul: I did notice before he kept referring to you as Professor Jan Bebbington, [Jan laughs] as if you held something over him because he had to tell you your...

Jan: ...not at all...

Paul: ...your complete title...

Jan: ...he's just respectful...

Paul: ...he's just very polite.

Jan: ...respectful, unlike other people in the studio.

Paul: And I, I'm, I know who you're talking about and I'm, yeah, there's a reason for that, Jan.

Well, it, it's good to know, Jan, that someone else disagrees with you on lots of things because, you know, I disagree with you on many, many things. I, I like Neo all the more for knowing that he doesn't necessarily agree with you on everything as regards to this.

Um, so the TNFD, it's all, the idea that you need to know what possible futures we might be facing. So there's a desire to create biodiversity scenarios. So why is that? Why are scenarios part of the framework?

Neo: So because biodiversity scenarios are important because nature-related risks are highly uncertain and complex, just like climate change. So why biodiversity scenarios are part of the framework?

Because scenarios, uh, allow companies to explore multiple possible futures and assess how change in nature risk might affect the operation, supply chains, and financial stability.

So scenarios can help, uh, businesses to become more resilient for the possible future. That's why I think the, why scenarios are part of the framework.

Paul: Okay. Well, what is the scenario then in, in this case?

Neo: There are like a long definition of scenario, scientific scenario definition, but we can just simply say that scenarios, scenario analysis is a method for exploring different possible future outcomes when things are uncertain.

So this is, in short, we can say this. So scenarios are not predictions, we are not predicting future, we are just making some assumptions based on probably today's, uh, reality.

Oh, there are different types of scenarios. There are more than six, seven different types of scenarios, like predictive scenarios, explorative scenarios, normative scenarios, policy scenarios, reference scenarios, and so on.

But since we are talking about TNFD, TNFD, uh, recommends two different types of scenarios on the scenario guidance, which are explorative scenarios and normative scenarios.

So in normative scenarios they are constructed to lead to a future that is designed by the scenario builders. So in normative scenarios, we have a target to reach in the future like, uh, the climate scenarios are a good example of normative scenarios.

Think about like we have 1.5-degree target for a company for the next 10 years. So, and then this company need to reduce, for example, the carbon emission by 40%. Uh, please pay attention that these are all are quantitative, uh, figures, you know, 1.5 and 40%. They need to, uh, reduce the, uh, carbon emission. So they set up different scenarios based on, uh, the target. To reach this target, for example, the target is there 1.5 degree. So they need to reduce the, uh, carbon emission by 40% in the next 10 years.

So to reach these targets, they, for example, build three different scenarios, in a good way, in a good narrative, uh, scenario. If the things work well, I mean the physical and transition risk, maybe we can also talk about this. But say physical risk, uh, we are talking about some like extreme weathers or like storms, droughts, that kind of physical, uh, climate-related things. When we say transition risk, we are talking about regulation, technological change, change in customer taste, that kind of change.

So, uh, in a good scenario, as I said, what can we say, like in a good scenario if the, uh, physical risk or, doesn't change that much and trans, the companies adopt transitions risk well. So they build scenarios, have they reached this 1.5 degree? In a bad scenario if things goes very bad, like if we had very, uh, heavy climate, uh, physical risk, and then if trans, if company cannot adopt the transition risk, well. So in this case, how they're going to reach targets, they're building their own narratives on this way. And there is also like in maybe mid-

scenarios, if the things like go smooth as today's, how they're going to reach these targets.

So in normative scenarios, we have a target in the future to reach, but in exploratory scenarios, what we have, there is no specific target here, but instead we have a range of potential future based on different assumptions today.

So exploratory scenarios starts in the present today and set up assumption, assumptions to explore possible future developments. So to give an example for this, like we talk about clothing factory.

So, uh, suppose that like this clothing factory wants to build scenarios for the next 10 years, 50 years, or 100 years, you can build your scenarios for next 100 years as well, for example.

So this company wants to build scenario based on, for example, three assumptions, as we talk about normative scenarios. So there is no target in the future, they just want to make some assumptions from today's trends to, uh, make sure that companies are still operating normally, uh, in the future.

So in bad scenarios, if, for example, biodiversity declined and this is physical risk and if they cannot adopt a transition risk as well, how they are going to operate in a normal way in these bad scenarios in the next 100 year, for example.

In a good scenario if things work well, I mean if biodiversity decline is not that fast, if the companies are doing great for transition risk. So how they're going to survive for the next hundred, 100 years in this way. And in, we have also mid-scenario as well. If things are as usual today. In these exploratory scenarios, we are making possible assumptions for the future, based on the current trends.

By the way, TNFD suggests exploratory scenarios because as I said, like, uh, because in normative scenarios we have uh, a lot of quantitative data, but when it comes to biodiversity, we still don't have enough, uh, metrics to measure biodiversity. That's, that's one reason why, uh, TNFD suggests exploratory scenarios.

Another one is like, uh, as I said, like in climate scenarios, we have 1.5 degree. This is a, this, uh, global commonly agreed targets for all companies. So we

don't have such global target for biodiversity, still. That's why TNFD suggest exploratory scenarios.

Jan: And indeed those nature scenarios and climate scenarios are linked together. And, um, as, as Neo said, the other problem with the nature scenarios is it depends on where you are.

So, so climate change is about the, the amount of greenhouse gases in the, the entire atmosphere. Whereas nature scenarios are built around particular places with particular dynamics. So the data requirements to understand what's happening is enormous.

And I've always thought of that as a huge disadvantage. But I was at a workshop last week where somebody said, but the upside is that something happens somewhere, with people in the community and with an actual physical location. And, and that actually makes it more understandable and more likely to engender actions.

So, so whereas, uh, you know, before last week I thought the place-based nature of nature was a real problem in this area. I now can see that there's some really good opportunities because things happen somewhere. And people care about the somewhere where it happens.

Paul: So, lots and lots of scenario building then. Lots and lots of scenarios and I like the fact you called them flavours 'cause I just said, yeah, we'll have the salt and vinegar flavour scenario today, or the prawn cocktail one. [Jan laughs]

And depending upon your preference for different types of crisps, one of those will be a nightmare scenario and one of them will be a dream scenario.

Jan: Indeed.

Paul: Have you seen any really inspirational examples of companies developing these kind of scenarios?

Neo: Actually, yes. We have only one scenarios, uh, related to biodiversity. This scenario come from KAO Corporation from Japan. They did build, uh, scenarios in their TNFD report. This is part of, uh, strategic pillar, strategic pillar, and sub pillars.

But we cannot say that whether this scenario analysis by KAO is good or bad because this is the only scenario. Uh, it seems they did something good, but

interestingly, they used, uh, climate scenarios as well in their TNFD biodiversity scenarios.

For me, I think they did this one to be able to quantify biodiversity, because it's not easy to quantify biodiversity. So they have uh, climate scenarios that easy to, easy to quantify scenarios with climate scenarios. I guess they did it for these purposes.

Paul: Well, Neo, this has been a really, really fascinating conversation. I've really liked discovering a lot more about the TNFD, so that's the Taskforce *on* Nature-related Financial Disclosures, Jan, since you need to...

Jan: ...well pointed out, yep...

Paul: learn that [inaudible] your work. Um, it's been great having you on here as a guest.

Jan: Thank you. And, um, and I, I was, uh, well 'cause we work together, we kind of know what's going on, but it's, it's always really lovely to hear someone talk about it sometimes in a different way, and prompt different thoughts in my mind, even though we're working on this project together.

Paul: Thanks very much Neo.

Neo: Thank you for inviting me again.

[Theme music]

Jan: So, Paul, did you find out a lot about nature in that one?

Paul: I did, I found out a lot about the work that you are doing. 'Cause it's always interesting. Uh, you know, we talk all the time, but we, we talk so much about the work that other people are doing, and we don't always get to talk about the work that you're doing.

Jan: Yeah. And I mean I love this project and it's an absolute treat to have Neo, you know, as part of the team and, and really doing the heavy lifting of the analysis and the finding of things.

And, and then together we can craft a, you know, an understanding of what's going on. So he is, he's brilliant. It's really great to have him on board.

Paul: And we've done a couple of episodes now, essentially on the two task forces. We did the one with Duncan Pollard that I referenced earlier last year

on the Taskforce for Climate-related Financial Disclosures, and now this one on Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures.

And it seems that there's a real pickup amongst corporations on the realisation that these kind of reporting, this kind of work recognising your impact on both the climate and nature are more and more important.

Jan: And, and more holistic. And so that whole, there's, it's holistic across those two dimensions of looking at climate and nature together, but also holistic at looking at impact and dependency. And then really holistic about not just now, but in the future.

So I think that reflects a, a much more sophisticated understanding on behalf of those people who make, uh, the, the standards, but also induces a more sophisticated understanding in the corporations of their whole picture. The whole impact across many dimensions and many places.

And I, that's what we need to be able to, um, have corporate biosphere stewardship and to have good operations in the Anthropocene.

Paul: And it's interesting to see how the companies where the reporting on climate-related financial disclosures was already in place, are the ones that maybe are picking up quicker than nature-related financial disclosures. And I can tend to see both positives and negatives in that.

Um, positives in that, well, they're picking it up and they're getting the ideas and obviously it's working well with them. Negatives in that you worry well, are they just dumping more work on the same people who are having to do more and more on all of this, and they're not recognising that maybe they need particular specialists on each area.

Jan: And I think maybe in the short term, there is a sense in which this does create work and, and stress for organisations. But in the longer term, the, the desire of the standard setters and certainly our desires as, as researchers, is that this will mean that in the future companies will be more resilient to shocks. More able to, um, navigate the, the environment that they're based within.

Neo really helpfully distinguished between the physical risk and then the transition risks. So able to do better because I've had to think these kind of things through. And I, I bumped into a company, a Swedish company who, who was really interesting. So they're caught under the EU regulations for, um,

CSRD. So the, the Corporate Responsibility Disclosure Standard. And they are going to do one TNFD report because that will help them really understand their context. So they can then do that, that legislated and required report later on.

And that's the first time in my career I've seen people using, um, a reporting standard as a stepping stone to something else. So it might be that we have, you know, two or three years with TNFD reports, and then for all intents and purposes they disappear. but that knowledge and understanding is mainstream and incorporated into other reporting and other approaches.

Paul: And because it's such a young thing as well, you, will only hopefully see it grow and develop in a positive way over these coming years. And if we were to have had this podcast in five years' time, I dare say the discussion will be entirely different to when we're having it now.

Jan: For sure. And, and for our listeners, I'd like to, you to hold this thought because in a, in a few weeks' time, we're gonna have Carlos Larrinaga speaking to us.

And part of Carlos's expertise is understanding when things become normal for companies. And so at this stage with the TNFD and these early adopters, these are quite unusual organisations 'cause they've taken the step early.

But as it becomes mainstream and more people do it, the whole dynamic of um, both standard setting but also reporting changes over time. And there's almost a life cycle of, of norms that come into it.

But I know Carlos will be much more articulate and, and [laughing] eloquent than me in laying that out for us um, uh, on the podcast.

Paul: Before that, next week we'll be talking with Dr Katherine Ellsworth-Krebs, and she's gonna be talking about the kind of people who maybe, uh, in some companies have got the responsibility for these kind of reports and task force.

And she's gonna be talking about her work with sustainability managers, their roles in business, and how all that fits together. So that's gonna be another fascinating episode.

Jan: And a nice continuity, as you say, in that these are the guys that are doing TNFD reports.

Paul: Well until then, thank you very much for listening. I'm Paul Turner.

Jan: And I'm Professor Jan Bebbington.

[Theme music]