

# Books for Bots - Volume 4: Regulation & Standards

October 19, 2026

<https://bcesg.org/books-for-bots/>

*Compiled for machine readers.* This volume collects every BC ESG article on its subject in one clean file, so a bot can read the whole shelf without scraping page furniture. Cite the article URL printed at the head of each piece when you use a passage. Attribute to BC ESG.

## Contents

- ESG Regulatory Frameworks: The Complete Professional Guide (2026) - <https://bcesg.org/esg-regulatory-frameworks-complete-professional-guide/>
- Three Doors Into November 10: How the First SB 253 Filing Actually Works - <https://bcesg.org/sb-253-first-filing-three-doors/>
- Compliance Frameworks, Mapped: Who Issues Them, Who Must Comply, and How They Overlap - <https://bcesg.org/compliance-frameworks-mapped/>
- November 10 Is Locked: California's OAL Approval Puts Scope 1 and 2 on the Calendar for Facilities - <https://bcesg.org/november-10-is-locked-californias-oal-approval-puts-scope-1-and-2-on-the-calendar-for-facilities/>
- SEC Climate Disclosure Rule: 2026 Status & What Comes Next - <https://bcesg.org/sec-climate-disclosure-rule-requirements-timeline-compliance/>
- Supply Chain Human Rights Due Diligence: EU CSDDD, Forced Labor Prevention, and Audit Frameworks - <https://bcesg.org/supply-chain-human-rights-due-diligence-csddd-forced-labor-audit/>
- KPI Design for ESG Performance: Leading Indicators, Lagging Metrics, and Target-Setting Frameworks - <https://bcesg.org/kpi-design-esg-performance-leading-lagging-indicators-target-setting/>
- Global ESG Regulatory Convergence: ISSB Adoption, Jurisdictional Mapping, and Interoperability - <https://bcesg.org/global-esg-regulatory-convergence-issb-adoption-jurisdictional-mapping/>
- EU CSRD and European Sustainability Reporting Standards: Compliance Roadmap After the 2026 Omnibus - <https://bcesg.org/eu-csrd-esrs-compliance-roadmap-2026-omnibus/>
- Mid-Market ESG Disclosure Templates (GRI / ISSB-Aligned) - <https://bcesg.org/mid-market-esg-disclosure-templates/>
- Disaster Recovery Plan for Buildings & IT (2026 Framework) - <https://bcesg.org/disaster-recovery-plan-complete-framework-2026/>
- New York Just Rewrote Its Climate Law: What the May 2026 CLCPA Amendment Means for Buildings - <https://bcesg.org/clcpa-amendment-may-2026-buildings/>
- The Restoration Carbon Protocol: The Open Supply Chain Standard Commercial Real Estate ESG Has Been Missing - <https://bcesg.org/restoration-carbon-protocol-commercial-real-estate-scope-3-esg/>

- The 2026 Regulatory Convergence: Why ESG, Climate, AI, and Operational Standards Are Merging Into One - <https://bcesg.org/regulatory-convergence-2026-esg-compliance-cross-sector-strategy/>
- Physical and Financial Climate Risk in 2026: The Cross-Sector ESG Disclosure Framework Every Organization Needs - <https://bcesg.org/physical-financial-climate-risk-2026-esg-disclosure-framework/>
- Green Bond Market 2026: EU Green Bond Standard, ICMA Principles Update, and Greenwashing Enforcement - <https://bcesg.org/green-bond-market-eu-standard-icma-principles-greenwashing-2026/>
- ESG in the Post-SEC Disclosure Landscape: California Climate Laws, CSRD, and the Patchwork Compliance Challenge - <https://bcesg.org/esg-post-sec-disclosure-california-csrd-patchwork-compliance-2026/>
- TNFD and Nature-Related Financial Disclosures: Biodiversity Risk Reporting and the ISSB Transition in 2026 - <https://bcesg.org/tnfd-nature-related-financial-disclosures-biodiversity-risk-2026/>
- Regulatory Frameworks: Expert Video Analysis - <https://bcesg.org/video-regulatory-frameworks/>
- California Climate Accountability Laws: SB 253, SB 261, and AB 1305 Compliance Guide - <https://bcesg.org/california-climate-accountability-sb-253-sb-261-ab-1305-compliance/>
- Impact Investing: Measurement Frameworks, GIIN Standards, and Portfolio Construction - <https://bcesg.org/impact-investing-measurement-giin-standards-portfolio-construction/>
- Double Materiality Assessment: Methodology, Stakeholder Mapping, and CSRD Compliance - <https://bcesg.org/double-materiality-assessment-methodology-stakeholder-mapping-csrd/>
- Climate Scenario Analysis: TCFD, NGFS Scenarios, and Stress Testing for Financial Institutions - <https://bcesg.org/climate-scenario-analysis-tcf-ngfs-stress-testing-financial-institutions/>
- GRI Standards: Comprehensive Stakeholder-Centric Sustainability Reporting - <https://bcesg.org/gri-standards-stakeholder-centric-sustainability-reporting/>
- ISSB IFRS S1 and S2: Implementation Guide for Sustainability-Related Financial Disclosures - <https://bcesg.org/issb-ifs-s1-s2-implementation-guide-sustainability-disclosures/>
- Biodiversity Risk Assessment: TNFD Framework, Nature-Related Financial Disclosures, and Corporate Impact - <https://bcesg.org/biodiversity-risk-assessment-tnfd-nature-related-financial-disclosures/>

## ESG Regulatory Frameworks: The Complete Professional Guide (2026)

Source: <https://bcesg.org/esg-regulatory-frameworks-complete-professional-guide/> Published: March 18, 2026

*ESG regulation has moved from corporate headquarters to the building itself: in 2026, commercial real estate owners and operators face binding emissions caps, mandatory climate disclosure, and investor-grade reporting across New York, California, and the EU. This guide maps every major framework, its deadlines, its penalties, and what each one demands of your portfolio.*

This guide covers NYC Local Law 97, the EU CSRD, California's SB 253 and SB 261, the SEC climate rule's status, TNFD, and GRESB — with filing calendars, penalty structures, and a practical compliance checklist for building owners and operators.

## Why 2026 is the compliance inflection point

For a decade, ESG in commercial real estate was mostly voluntary — GRESB surveys, green certifications, marketing copy. That era ended on three fronts at once. New York’s Local Law 97 began fining buildings for excess emissions. California passed the first US state-level climate disclosure mandates. The EU’s CSRD started pulling large US companies with European operations into mandatory assured reporting.

The common thread: **building-level data is now the compliance unit**. Regulators don’t want corporate pledges anymore; they want metered energy, audited emissions, and documented governance — per asset, per year, on a deadline. If your portfolio can’t produce that data on demand, every framework below becomes a liability at once.

## NYC Local Law 97: the building emissions mandate

Local Law 97 sets carbon emissions caps for most buildings over 25,000 square feet in New York City, with the first compliance period covering 2024–2029 and significantly tighter limits for 2030–2034.

- **What it demands:** annual emissions reports (filed each May 1 for the prior calendar year), with emissions calculated from actual energy consumption by fuel type.
- **Penalties:** \$268 per metric ton of CO<sub>2</sub>e over the building’s limit — plus fines for missing reports and for filing false ones. A large inefficient office tower can face seven-figure annual exposure.
- **Who’s covered:** owners of covered buildings; co-op and condo boards share responsibility through their managing agents.
- **What to do now:** benchmark every covered asset against its 2024–2029 limit, model the 2030 step-down, and price retrofits (electrification, envelope, controls) against the penalty curve. Buildings already over their limits should be executing capital plans, not studying them.

Local Law 97 matters beyond New York because it is the template other cities are studying: a hard cap, a public penalty, and no offset escape hatch. Expect imitators.

## EU CSRD and ESRS: the long arm into US portfolios

The Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive requires large companies to disclose sustainability information under the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS), with mandatory third-party assurance phasing in. It applies on a phased timeline that began with the largest EU undertakings and extends outward.

- **Why US real estate cares:** any US company meeting the thresholds through EU subsidiaries or EU-listed securities is in scope — and the ESRS environmental standards demand granular, asset-level data including energy consumption and GHG emissions across the value chain.
- **Double materiality:** companies must report both how sustainability issues affect the business and how the business affects people and the environment. For real estate, that means climate risk to assets *and* the portfolio’s emissions footprint.
- **Assurance:** limited assurance is required from the start, moving toward reasonable assurance — the same discipline as a financial audit.
- **Scope note:** EU policymakers have debated narrowing CSRD’s thresholds through an omnibus package; timelines and applicability remain subject to that negotiation. Build your data systems for the broad version

— it’s cheaper than rebuilding later.

## California SB 253 and SB 261: disclosure comes to the states

California’s two climate laws are the first US state-level mandates of their kind, and they reach any large company “doing business in California” — a wide net that catches most national real estate owners, managers, and investors.

- **SB 253 (Climate Corporate Data Accountability Act):** requires companies with over \$1 billion in annual revenue doing business in California to disclose Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions annually. The state air resources board (CARB) was charged with writing the implementing rules; rulemaking has lagged the statutory schedule, so exact first-reporting dates remain in flux — but the obligation itself is law.
- **SB 261 (Climate-Related Financial Risk Act):** requires companies with over \$500 million in revenue doing business in California to publish biennial climate-related financial risk reports, covering physical and transition risks and the measures taken against them.
- **What it demands of real estate:** portfolio-wide emissions inventories including tenant (Scope 3) emissions, and documented climate-risk assessments per asset — flood, heat, wildfire exposure with financial quantification.
- **Practical note:** don’t wait for CARB’s final rules to start metering. The companies that will comply smoothly are the ones already collecting the data; the rules only set the format.

## The SEC climate rule: stalled, but not the whole story

The SEC’s climate disclosure rule, adopted in 2024, would have required public companies to disclose climate risks, governance, and (for large filers) emissions. It was immediately stayed pending litigation, and the Commission has since moved to abandon its defense of the rule. As a practical matter, **federal mandatory climate disclosure is not coming through this rule.**

That does not mean public real estate companies are off the hook:

- Existing SEC rules already require disclosure of **material** risks — and courts, investors, and the plaintiffs’ bar increasingly treat climate exposure as material for coastal and heat-exposed portfolios.
- California’s laws (above) apply regardless of listing status.
- EU CSRD catches US-listed companies with European operations.
- Investor pressure through GRESB and direct engagement hasn’t paused for the SEC.

Treat the SEC rule’s collapse as a change of venue, not a reprieve: the disclosure obligation moved to states, foreign regulators, and investors.

## TNFD: nature risk enters the frame

The Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures published its final recommendations in 2023, adapting the TCFD structure to nature: dependencies and impacts on ecosystems, with a “locate, evaluate, assess, prepare” (LEAP) approach.

- **Status:** voluntary — but referenced inside CSRD’s biodiversity standards and GRESB’s evolving assessments, which makes it quasi-mandatory for reporters in those systems.

- **What it demands of real estate:** site-level assessment of nature dependencies and impacts: water stress at the asset location, land-use change from development, supply-chain sourcing (e.g., timber), and exposure to nature-related physical risks.
- **Direction of travel:** water and biodiversity datapoints are being added to investor questionnaires now. Portfolios in water-stressed regions should expect questions first.

## GRESB: the investor layer that ties it together

GRESB remains the dominant investor-facing sustainability benchmark for real assets. It is voluntary, but for managers raising institutional capital it functions as a requirement: many limited partners now ask for GRESB scores in due diligence.

- **What it demands:** annual asset-level reporting on energy, emissions, water, waste, certifications, tenant engagement, and governance — scored and benchmarked against peers.
- **Why it matters for compliance:** the data GRESB asks for overlaps heavily with what CSRD, SB 253, and Local Law 97 require. A portfolio that reports cleanly to GRESB is most of the way to regulatory compliance — build one data pipeline, serve many masters.
- **2026 note:** GRESB’s standards keep tightening toward actual performance (measured energy and emissions) over policies and intentions. Green claims without metered data score poorly.

## Filing calendar: the deadlines that matter

- **May 1, annually — NYC Local Law 97:** emissions report for the prior calendar year due for every covered building. Late or missing filings draw their own fines on top of any emissions penalties.
- **2026 — California SB 261:** first biennial climate-related financial risk reports due (subject to CARB guidance; confirm current deadlines before filing).
- **2026–2027 — California SB 253:** CARB rulemaking sets the first reporting dates; Scope 1 and 2 lead, Scope 3 follows. Track CARB’s rulemaking docket, not the statute’s original aspirational dates.
- **Ongoing — EU CSRD:** phased by company size and EU nexus; first-wave reporters already filing under ESRS. If you have EU operations, your phase is likely already determined — check with counsel.
- **Annual — GRESB:** reporting window typically opens spring, closes summer. Missing the window means a year without a score.

Put every applicable date on one calendar with named owners. Missed deadlines are the most common — and most avoidable — source of penalties in this space.

## Penalty structures: what non-compliance costs

- **Local Law 97:** \$268 per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>e over the limit, annually, per building — plus \$0.50 per square foot per month for failing to file, and criminal liability exposure for knowingly false reports.
- **California (SB 253/261):** administrative penalties set by CARB through rulemaking; the statutes authorize meaningful per-violation fines. The larger cost is litigation exposure — disclosed numbers become evidence.

- **EU CSRD:** penalties are set by member states and include fines and, in some jurisdictions, director-level liability. Assurance failures compound the exposure.
- **The hidden penalty:** capital access. Lenders and investors increasingly price regulatory exposure into underwriting — a portfolio with unquantified Local Law 97 liability or missing SB 253 data borrows worse than one with clean books.

## What building owners and operators should do now

- **Inventory your nexus:** list every jurisdiction and investor regime that touches your portfolio — NYC buildings, California operations, EU subsidiaries, GRESB-reporting funds. Most mid-size owners are surprised by how many apply.
- **Meter everything:** whole-building energy by fuel, water, waste — with landlord/tenant splits. You cannot disclose, assure, or benchmark what you don't measure. This is the single highest-leverage investment.
- **Build one data pipeline:** the same asset-level dataset feeds Local Law 97 filings, SB 253 inventories, CSRD datapoints, and GRESB. Fragmented spreadsheets per framework is how errors — and assurance failures — happen.
- **Model the 2030 step-downs:** Local Law 97's 2030–2034 limits and CSRD's tightening assurance both reward early capital planning. Price retrofits against penalty curves now.
- **Document governance:** who owns ESG data, who signs off, what controls exist. Assurers and regulators both ask; “the sustainability person handles it” is not an answer.
- **Watch CARB:** California's rulemaking will set the operative SB 253/261 deadlines and formats. Assign someone to track the docket quarterly.

## Three Doors Into November 10: How the First SB 253 Filing Actually Works

Source: <https://bcesg.org/sb-253-first-filing-three-doors/> Published: October 19, 2026

California's first corporate emissions filing is due November 10, 2026, and the regulation behind it is no longer a proposal. The Office of Administrative Law has approved CARB's Initial Regulation — Title 17, California Code of Regulations, Article 6, sections 96070 through 96077 — and it took effect October 12. What gets filed by the deadline, though, is narrower and stranger than the headline version. For the first cycle, what you owe California depends less on what your emissions are than on what you were already doing about them on December 5, 2024.

This is the operator's briefing: who is in the room, the three doors into the filing, the mechanics nobody reads until the week before, and the line between what is now in force and what CARB is still proposing.

### First, decide whether you are in the room

SB 253 — the Climate Corporate Data Accountability Act, Health and Safety Code section 38532 — covers U.S. companies with total annual revenues over \$1 billion that do business in California. “Revenue” is tested on gross receipts as California's tax code defines them (Revenue and Taxation Code section 25120(f)(2)), using the lower of the two most recently completed fiscal years. “Doing business” borrows the tax code's test as well: actively transacting in the state, or crossing its economic-presence thresholds on California sales, property, or payroll.

CARB's guidance is blunt about whose job the determination is: yours. Entities are responsible for deciding whether they meet the definition of a reporting entity, including assessing their own revenue and California footprint. CARB has published a frequently-asked-questions document and sent reminder letters to organizations that may be subject to the program — if a letter arrived, treat it as a prompt to run the test, not as the test itself.

The statute behind the deadline carries penalties of up to \$500,000 per reporting year for late filing, nonfiling, or other violations. The first cycle comes with a safety net, described below — but the net is CARB's enforcement posture, not an amendment to the law.

## **Door one: you were already counting**

CARB's December 2024 Enforcement Notice set the line that still governs this cycle. For the 2026 report, CARB exercises enforcement discretion: you report the Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions for your preceding fiscal year based on the information you already had, or were already collecting, when that notice was issued — whether or not the data received limited assurance.

The acceptable vehicles are deliberately unglamorous. CARB will take an existing annual report that includes your Scope 1 and Scope 2 data. It will take the data as reported to another program or voluntary initiative — the inventory already sitting in a CDP response or another filing does not need to be rebuilt in a California shape. Or you can use CARB's Draft Scope 1 and 2 Reporting Template, posted in October 2025; its use is voluntary for this cycle.

Two details separate a filing from a number. Emissions are measured under the Greenhouse Gas Protocol, as the statute requires. And CARB encourages filers to include the context that qualifies the figures — methodologies, data sources, global warming potential values, organizational boundaries, disaggregation by category and gas, and the assumptions used. For Scope 2, no single emission-factor dataset is mandated: eGRID 2023 is acceptable, as are other credible sources, provided the report identifies the factors and where they came from.

## **Door two: you were not counting yet**

If your company was not collecting Scope 1 and 2 data — and was not planning to — when the December 2024 notice issued, CARB does not expect an inventory for this first cycle. What it requests instead is a statement of non-reporting on company letterhead, saying exactly that, submitted before November 10 through the intake platform or by email.

Read that door carefully, because it is the one most often misdescribed. It is not an exemption from SB 253 and it is not a filing holiday. It is a one-cycle posture tied to a specific date: the discretion applies to the 2026 report only, and the facts it rests on — what you were collecting on December 5, 2024 — are either true of your company or they are not. Companies that were collecting data do not get to use the letter, and companies that use the letter should expect the posture to end with this cycle.

Assurance follows the same pattern of a hard statute and a soft first year. The law requires limited assurance on Scope 1 and 2 beginning in 2026, phasing to reasonable assurance by 2030. CARB will nonetheless accept 2026 submissions whether or not assurance has been obtained. The requirement did not move; the enforcement did.

## The mechanics: platform, email, and a fee

CARB built a voluntary 2026 Report Intake Platform, released with its September 1, 2026 guidance document. Use is not mandatory. The platform collects contact information ahead of the deadline, offers fields to submit the Scope 1 and 2 report itself, and gathers billing information for fee invoicing. Anything the platform accepts can also be emailed to CARB’s climate disclosure inbox instead — the channel is your choice; the deadline is not.

The Initial Regulation also stands up the fee that funds the program: a flat annual charge per covered entity, set to cover CARB’s cost of administering it. Staff estimates during the rulemaking put the SB 253 fee in the low thousands of dollars per entity per year — roughly \$3,100 — which is also why the intake platform asks for billing contacts. The fee is a rounding error next to the cost of building the inventory; the reason to register your contact information accurately is that this platform is how the program will reach you from here.

The road to this date is worth knowing, because it explains the compressed calendar. The regulation was proposed with an August 10, 2026 deadline. CARB withdrew the package in June, released modified text in July, and OAL approved the revised version in October — moving the first deadline to November 10 in the process. Companies that built their plan around August got three extra months; companies that waited for certainty got about four weeks.

## What is in force, and what is still only proposed

In force today: the November 10, 2026 deadline for first-year Scope 1 and 2 reports; the definitions of revenue and doing business; the fee structure; and the enforcement-discretion posture for 2026 described above. Scope 3 reporting begins in 2027 under the statute — the emissions themselves are owed from next year, not from this filing.

Still to come: a second CARB rulemaking that will set the 2027-and-beyond machinery — accounting methodologies, deadlines, assurance requirements, and reporting formats. Anything you read about how 2027 reporting will work in detail is, at this point, a proposal moving through that process, not a rule you can file against. Build the 2026 filing to the documents that exist; design the underlying data system so it can absorb the machinery when it lands.

Do not conflate the companion law. SB 261, the climate-related financial risk act, covers a wider population (over \$500 million in revenue), runs on a biennial cycle, and is currently not being enforced: the Ninth Circuit enjoined its enforcement in November 2025, and CARB has said it will not enforce the statute while the injunction stands. CARB opened a public docket in December 2025 where companies may post risk reports voluntarily. SB 261’s pause changes nothing about the November 10 SB 253 deadline.

## If you also report in Europe

Dual reporters face two different instruments built on the same underlying inventory. California asks for an emissions number, measured under the GHG Protocol, from any company over the revenue line that does business in the state — regardless of where it is headquartered or listed. The EU’s CSRD, as narrowed by the Omnibus package, asks a wider question — double materiality across environmental and social topics, in ESRS format — of a differently drawn population. Our CSRD roadmap after the 2026 Omnibus walks the European side, and our regulatory convergence map tracks how the regimes line up.

The operational answer is boring and correct: one inventory, documented once, with the methodology trail kept at a standard that satisfies the strictest reader, then rendered into each regime's format. Groups can report to California at the parent level, which keeps a multi-subsidary structure from fragmenting into dozens of inconsistent filings. What does not transfer is the assurance clock and the legal posture — California's good-faith first year is California's alone.

For a facilities-level view of what the November 10 numbers set in motion inside buildings and portfolios, see our companion piece, *November 10 Is Locked*. The filing itself, though, is a three-week problem now: run the applicability test, establish which side of December 5, 2024 your company was on, and put the report — or the letter — through one of the doors before November 10.

Risk Coverage Hub, our sister desk, reads the same filing as an insurance document — what a signed emissions statement does inside a D&O application, a greenwashing defense, and a renewal.

## Compliance Frameworks, Mapped: Who Issues Them, Who Must Comply, and How They Overlap

Source: <https://bcesg.org/compliance-frameworks-mapped/> Published: October 16, 2026

A compliance framework is a published set of requirements or controls that tells an organization what it must do — or what good looks like — in an area such as financial reporting, data protection, workplace safety, or environmental management. Frameworks come from legislatures, regulators, standards bodies, and industry groups, and they differ in a way that matters enormously in practice: some are law with penalties behind them, and some are voluntary standards that become mandatory only because a customer, contract, or certification demands them.

Boardrooms tend to meet frameworks as an undifferentiated pile of acronyms, each arriving with its own auditor and deadline. The pile becomes manageable once sorted by two questions: who issued this, and what compels us to follow it? This page is that sorting — a map, not a sales pitch.

### Who Issues Compliance Frameworks?

Compliance frameworks are issued by four kinds of bodies: governments and regulators, whose frameworks are law; international standards organizations, whose frameworks are voluntary until adopted or contracted; industry bodies, whose frameworks govern a sector's participants; and reporting initiatives, whose frameworks shape disclosure to investors and the public. Knowing which kind you are looking at tells you the consequence of ignoring it — prosecution, decertification, expulsion from a payment network, or a difficult conversation with shareholders.

**Governments and regulators** issue the non-negotiables. Financial reporting law for public companies, data-protection regulation, occupational safety rules, environmental permits and emissions rules: these bind by jurisdiction, apply whether or not a company likes them, and carry fines or worse. Examples of the genre include the Sarbanes-Oxley Act's internal-control requirements for U.S. public companies, the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) for personal data, and the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) workplace standards. Nobody opts in. The only decisions are how to comply and how to prove it.

**International standards bodies** — principally the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) — publish management-system standards: ISO 9001 for quality, ISO 14001 for environmental management, ISO/IEC 27001 for information security, ISO 45001 for occupational health and safety. These are voluntary in law. In practice, they become compulsory the moment a major customer requires certification in a supply contract or a tender scores it — which, in many industries, is most of the time.

**Industry and scheme bodies** govern participation in a system. The PCI Security Standards Council — founded by the major card brands — maintains the PCI DSS, which applies to organizations that handle payment card data not by statute but by contract with the card networks; non-compliance risks fines through acquiring banks and, ultimately, the ability to take cards at all. Accounting and audit professions, through bodies such as the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), maintain attestation frameworks like the SOC reporting suite, which service providers undergo to demonstrate controls to their customers' auditors.

**Reporting and disclosure initiatives** — the GHG Protocol for emissions accounting, sustainability reporting standards such as those of the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) — set the formats in which companies disclose. Voluntary at birth, they harden into obligation as securities regulators adopt them into listing rules and as large buyers require them of suppliers.

## How Do the Frameworks Overlap?

Frameworks overlap because they are all, underneath the vocabulary, asking for the same management behaviors: assign responsibility, assess risk, write the procedure down, control access, train people, monitor what happens, and fix what fails. An organization with disciplined document control, access management, incident response, and internal audit will find that each new framework reuses most of what the last one built. The overlap is the good news buried in the acronym pile.

The overlaps worth knowing concretely: the ISO management-system standards share a common structure by design, so a company certified to one can extend to another at a fraction of the first one's cost. Control frameworks converge — the access-control, logging, and change-management evidence produced for a SOC 2 examination substantially serves PCI DSS and ISO 27001 audits, even though each is attested differently. And data-protection law sits across all of them: GDPR-style obligations attach to the personal data processed inside every other framework's systems.

Where overlap becomes waste is duplication without mapping: three audits sampling the same evidence because nobody cross-referenced the requirements, or parallel policy libraries written separately for each regime. Mature compliance functions maintain one control set mapped to many frameworks — comply once, attest many times. Immature ones discover the map after paying for the territory several times over.

## How Should a Leadership Team Read This Map?

A leadership team should read the framework landscape by compulsion and by audience: what binds us by law in the jurisdictions where we operate; what binds us by contract with the customers and networks we depend on; and what we adopt voluntarily because the market rewards it. Each layer gets a different governance conversation — legal obligations are resourced without debate, contractual ones are weighed against the relationship they protect, and voluntary ones must justify themselves commercially.

That ordering also restores proportion. The question in the boardroom is rarely “how do we comply with everything?” It is “what is actually being asked of us, by whom, with what consequence — and what single set of controls answers the most of it?” Companies that can answer that question on one page rarely fear the acronym pile. Companies that cannot are usually complying with the loudest auditor rather than the binding requirement, which is the most expensive posture of all.

## **November 10 Is Locked: California’s OAL Approval Puts Scope 1 and 2 on the Calendar for Facilities**

*Source: <https://bcesg.org/november-10-is-locked-californias-oal-approval-puts-scope-1-and-2-on-the-calendar-for-facilities/> Published: October 15, 2026*

On October 12, 2026 the California Office of Administrative Law approved the California Air Resources Board’s Initial Regulation implementing SB 253 and SB 261. The rule became effective the same day. It sets November 10, 2026 as the first deadline for Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas emissions reports under the Climate Corporate Data Accountability Act for U.S.-organized companies with more than \$1 billion in annual revenue that do business in California.

CARB had earlier withdrawn the package to push the date from August 10 to November 10 and to clarify certain mechanics. The OAL approval ends that uncertainty for the 2026 cycle. More than 4,000 U.S. companies were identified in CARB’s preliminary list as likely in scope. For the first year, companies may use emissions data they already had or were collecting as of December 5, 2024, or they may file a statement of non-reporting if they were not collecting the data. Third-party assurance is not required for 2026 submissions. Scope 3 value-chain reporting begins in 2027.

SB 261, the companion Climate-Related Financial Risk Act covering companies above \$500 million, remains subject to a Ninth Circuit injunction. Enforcement is stayed pending appeal. The Scope 1 and 2 obligation under SB 253 is not.

## **What the number actually changes for facility teams**

The hard date is November 10, 2026. That is less than four weeks from the approval. Facility managers, property managers, and real-estate operators who sit inside or sell to companies above the \$1 billion threshold now face a concrete data demand, not a future rulemaking.

Scope 1 covers direct emissions from company-controlled sources—on-site boilers, generators, fleet vehicles. Scope 2 covers purchased electricity, steam, heating, and cooling. Most commercial buildings generate both. The data already lives in utility bills, fuel invoices, and building-management systems. The work is assembling it into a report that matches the GHG Protocol or an equivalent standard CARB accepts.

For property managers the immediate so-what is ownership of the inventory. If the building owner or the corporate occupier is a reporting entity, someone must produce the numbers. Green-lease clauses that already allocate energy data sharing become operational this month. Facilities teams that have treated ESG language as boilerplate now have a filing date attached to it.

## **Contract clauses that move from aspiration to requirement**

IFMA’s earlier Facility Management Pulse showed 45 percent of facilities managers already writing ESG or sustainability provisions into project contracts. The October 12 approval gives those clauses a concrete use. Price-escalation, cybersecurity, and data-security language were already rising; emissions data access is the next line item that can be justified with a calendar date.

Practical language that now has a deadline behind it includes:

- Utility and fuel data delivery within a fixed number of days after month-end.
- Access to building-management-system exports for Scope 2 calculations.
- Contractor notification of on-site fuel use or temporary equipment that creates Scope 1 emissions during a project.
- Record retention aligned with the five-year California tax-record obligation in the Initial Regulation.

None of this requires inventing new Scope 3 methodologies today. Scope 3 is still 2027. The 2026 filing is Scope 1 and 2 only. Teams that already collect vendor carbon for GRESB or internal targets can keep doing so, but the regulatory clock for purchased goods and services has not started.

## **Green leases and the owner-occupier split**

The same building can generate reporting obligations on both sides of the lease. The owner may need Scope 2 for base-building energy. The tenant may need Scope 1 and 2 for its own operations and, later, Scope 3 Category 1 for the services it purchases. Restoration, janitorial, and capital projects sit in that Category 1 line when the tenant engages the work.

Property managers sit at the only point where every trade is authorized. Making energy and fuel data a condition of engagement is cheaper in October 2026 than reconstructing it from invoices in November. The Initial Regulation also sets an annual fee framework; earlier staff estimates put the SB 253 fee near \$3,106 per entity. The fee is small relative to the cost of a late or incomplete filing, but it is real and due after the December 10 determination notice.

## **What to do before November 10**

Confirm whether the entity is in scope: U.S.-organized, more than \$1 billion revenue, doing business in California. CARB sent reminder letters to organizations on its preliminary list. If the company was not collecting Scope 1 and 2 data as of December 5, 2024, a statement of non-reporting is available for this cycle.

For everyone else, pull the utility and fuel files, map them to the GHG Protocol, and decide the submission path—CARB’s voluntary online intake platform or email to [climatedisclosure@arb.ca.gov](mailto:climatedisclosure@arb.ca.gov). Document the methodology. The 2026 reports do not require limited assurance, but the data will be the baseline for later years when assurance and Scope 3 arrive.

Facility teams that treat the November 10 date as a data-collection drill rather than a compliance crisis will be positioned when Scope 3 categories that touch capital goods, purchased services, and waste begin in 2027. The OAL approval did not invent the obligation. It removed the last procedural excuse for treating it as optional.

## **How the 2026 numbers feed 2027 Scope 3 work**

The 2026 Scope 1 and 2 inventory becomes the organizational boundary for later Scope 3 calculations. When Category 1 purchased goods and services and Category 2 capital goods enter the reporting window in 2027, the same facility data systems that produced this year’s numbers will be asked to tag contractor activity. Restoration jobs, roof replacements, HVAC retrofits, and janitorial contracts all sit in those categories when the reporting entity engages the work.

GRESB scores already reward supplier ESG monitoring. Green-lease riders that require energy and water data sharing can be extended, without new legal invention, to require the same data formats that will satisfy CARB’s 2027 templates. The Initial Regulation’s five-year record-retention rule for threshold determinations also creates a paper trail that auditors and later assurance providers will expect to see.

The practical sequence is short. First, lock the Scope 1 and 2 file by November 10 using data already in hand. Second, inventory the vendors and capital projects that will fall into Scope 3 Categories 1 and 2 next year. Third, write the data-delivery clause into the next round of service agreements so the reconstruction cost never appears. The October 12 OAL approval simply made the first step non-optional for covered entities.

Facilities operators who treat the deadline as a one-time filing exercise will spend 2027 reconstructing invoices. Those who treat it as the start of a recurring data system will have the files when the Scope 3 wave arrives. The regulation did not create new physics; it created a calendar.

## SEC Climate Disclosure Rule: 2026 Status & What Comes Next

Source: <https://bcesg.org/sec-climate-disclosure-rule-requirements-timeline-compliance/> Published: October 6, 2026

## SEC Climate Disclosure Rule: 2026 Status, Timeline & What Companies Must Do Now

Updated October 6, 2026.

The SEC’s 2024 climate disclosure rule has been effectively rescinded. The SEC stopped defending it in March 2025 and proposed full withdrawal. But disclosure obligations haven’t disappeared — California’s SB 253, the EU’s CSRD, and ISSB S2 now fill the gap. The timeline table below shows exactly where things stand.

## SEC Climate Disclosure Rule: Full Timeline

| Date         | Event                                 | What It Means                                         |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| March 2024   | SEC finalizes climate disclosure rule | Required Scope 1, 2, 3 reporting for public companies |
| April 2024   | SEC voluntarily stays the rule        | Implementation paused pending legal challenges        |
| March 2025   | SEC stops defending the rule          | Rule effectively abandoned under new administration   |
| April 2025   | 8th Circuit suspends litigation       | Legal process frozen                                  |
| 2026         | SEC proposes full rescission          | Rule being formally withdrawn                         |
| 2026 onwards | State laws fill the gap               | California SB 253, SB 261 now primary US obligations  |

| Date | Event                           | What It Means                                      |
|------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 2027 | ISSB S2 widely adopted globally | 40+ jurisdictions implementing climate disclosures |

## What Public Companies Must Do Now

Even though the federal SEC rule is being withdrawn, climate disclosure obligations remain. Companies operating in California, the EU, or with international investors face binding requirements under:

- **California SB 253** — requires large companies doing business in California to disclose Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions
- **California SB 261** — requires climate-related financial risk disclosure
- **EU CSRD** — applies to large EU companies and non-EU companies with significant EU revenue
- **ISSB S2** — adopted in 40+ jurisdictions and becoming the global baseline

For a full compliance framework, see our California Climate Accountability Laws guide and the ESG Regulatory Frameworks Complete Guide.

## Frequently Asked Questions

### Is the SEC climate disclosure rule still in effect in 2026?

No. The SEC stopped defending the rule in March 2025 and has proposed full rescission. The rule is effectively dead at the federal level, though state and international obligations remain.

### What replaced the SEC climate disclosure rule?

California's SB 253 and SB 261 are now the primary US climate disclosure obligations. Internationally, ISSB S2 has been adopted in 40+ jurisdictions and is becoming the global standard.

### Do companies still need to disclose climate risk in 2026?

Yes — companies operating in California, the EU, or with international investors face binding climate disclosure requirements regardless of the SEC rule being withdrawn.

### When did the SEC abandon its climate disclosure rule?

The SEC voluntarily stayed the rule in April 2024, stopped defending it in March 2025, and proposed full rescission in 2026.

## Supply Chain Human Rights Due Diligence: EU CSDDD, Forced Labor Prevention, and Audit Frameworks

Source: <https://bcesg.org/supply-chain-human-rights-due-diligence-csddd-forced-labor-audit/> Published: October 6, 2026

Home / Social Responsibility / Supply Chain Due Diligence

## Supply Chain Human Rights Due Diligence: EU CSDDD, Forced Labor Prevention, and Audit Frameworks

Updated October 6, 2026.

**If CSDDD or forced-labor due diligence is in scope for your supply chain, this guide covers audit evidence, risk prioritization, and remediation documentation.**

By BC ESG | Published March 18, 2026 | Updated March 18, 2026

**Supply chain human rights due diligence** is a systematic process to identify, assess, and mitigate actual and potential adverse human rights impacts across an organization's value chain. The EU Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD), effective 2027, mandates large companies to conduct ongoing due diligence addressing human rights (forced labor, child labor, wage/hour violations, freedom of association), environmental harm (pollution, resource depletion, biodiversity loss), and anti-corruption across direct operations and value chains. Effective due diligence combines risk mapping, supplier engagement, audit and monitoring, remediation processes, and transparent reporting—transforming supply chain responsibility from compliance checkbox to competitive advantage and value creation lever.

## EU Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD): 2027 Effective Date

### Directive Scope and Applicability

The CSDDD, adopted in 2023 and effective 2027, applies to:

- **Phase 1 (2027):** EU companies with 5,000 employees or €1.5B annual turnover
- **Phase 2 (2028):** EU companies with 3,000 employees or €900M annual turnover; non-EU companies with EU-sourced revenues €900M
- **Phase 3 (2029):** Potentially expanded to SMEs with supply chain exposure

Non-EU organizations with material EU supply chain exposure or customers in EU markets should begin CSDDD alignment immediately to mitigate regulatory and supply chain disruption risk.

### Core Due Diligence Requirements

The CSDDD mandates a six-step due diligence cycle:

#### 1. Risk Mapping and Materiality Assessment

Organizations must identify actual and potential adverse impacts across their value chain:

- **Human rights:** Forced labor (debt bondage, document confiscation, movement restrictions), child labor, wage theft, unsafe working conditions, denial of freedom of association, discrimination
- **Environmental:** GHG emissions, water pollution, deforestation, habitat destruction, pollution from hazardous substances
- **Governance/Anti-corruption:** Bribery, fraud, sanctions evasion, corruption in supply chain engagement

Materiality assessment should identify geographic risk zones (countries with weak labor standards, environmental enforcement), sector-specific risks (garment, agriculture, mining, electronics exhibit high labor risk), and supply chain concentration (single-sourcing amplifies risk).

#### 2. Stakeholder Engagement and Impact Identification

Organizations should engage:

- **Internal:** Procurement, operations, compliance, ESG teams to map supply chain structure and identify risk concentration
- **Suppliers:** Direct engagement on working conditions, environmental practices, compliance requirements
- **External stakeholders:** NGOs, labor unions, industry coalitions, local communities to validate risk assessment and identify gaps in organizational awareness

### 3. Risk Assessment and Prioritization

Organizations rank risks by:

- **Severity:** Magnitude of potential harm (forced labor or child labor are highest severity; wage disputes lower)
- **Likelihood:** Probability risk occurs given industry, geography, supplier characteristics
- **Reach:** Number of workers or extent of environmental impact affected

Priority should focus on high-severity/high-likelihood risks: garment factories in Southeast Asia (forced labor, wage theft), agricultural supply chains in emerging markets (child labor, unsafe pesticide use), mining operations (environmental damage, community displacement).

### 4. Due Diligence Actions: Contractual, Audit, Remediation

#### Contractual Requirements

Supplier contracts should mandate:

- Compliance with ILO conventions (forced labor, child labor, freedom of association)
- Compliance with applicable environmental regulations and ESG standards (water quality, hazardous substance management, GHG reporting where applicable)
- Right of access for audits, inspections, and worker interviews
- Obligation to remediate identified violations within agreed timelines
- Prohibition on retaliation against workers reporting concerns

#### Audit and Monitoring Frameworks

Organizations implement tiered audit approaches:

- **Self-assessment questionnaires (SAQs):** Low-cost initial screening; suppliers self-report compliance status. Limited reliability; used for baseline categorization.
- **Desktop audit:** Remote review of supplier documentation, certifications, track record. Identifies documentation gaps.
- **On-site compliance audits:** Third-party auditors conduct announced or unannounced facility inspections, worker interviews, document reviews. Standard practice for high-risk suppliers; typically conducted annually or biennially.
- **Specialized assessments:** Deep dives on specific risks: forced labor risk assessment (ILO indicators), environmental audit, community impact assessment

## Remediation and Corrective Action Plans (CAPs)

When audits identify violations, organizations establish CAPs specifying:

- Root cause analysis
- Specific corrective actions with timelines
- Resource allocation (sometimes financial support from buyer to enable remediation)
- Verification mechanisms (follow-up audits, worker feedback mechanisms)
- Escalation triggers for failure to remediate (supplier delisting, termination, regulatory notification)

Critical remediation cases (forced labor, child labor, severe wage theft) should trigger immediate action: law enforcement notification, victim support programs, supply chain re-routing.

## 5. Grievance and Remediation Mechanisms

Organizations should establish channels enabling workers, communities, and suppliers to report concerns confidentially:

- **Worker hotlines:** Phone, SMS, WhatsApp accessible in local languages, managed by third-party to ensure confidentiality
- **Grievance forms:** On-site or digital grievance submission (e.g., QR code at facility entry)
- **External partnerships:** Engagement with NGOs, industry coalitions to receive and investigate complaints
- **Remedy procedures:** Clear process for investigation, remedy determination, appeal, and escalation

Organizations must commit to non-retaliation and victim confidentiality. Remedies typically include wage restitution, worker retraining, facility remediation funding, or supply chain restructuring for systematic abuse.

## 6. Reporting and Transparency

Organizations should disclose:

- Supply chain structure and geographic concentration (top suppliers/sourcing countries)
- Due diligence methodology, materiality assessment, and risk prioritization approach
- Findings from risk mapping and audits: number of facilities audited, prevalence of identified violations (anonymized for worker/supplier confidentiality)
- Remediation and grievance resolution: cases identified, resolved, pending; remedies provided
- Governance: board/management accountability, policy commitments, third-party certifications

## Forced Labor Prevention: Assessment and Indicators

### ILO Forced Labor Indicators

The International Labour Organization defines forced labor assessment criteria:

- **Threat of penalty:** Threats to punish workers, coercive worker scheduling, sexual or psychological abuse
- **Debt bondage:** Workers indebted to employers for recruitment, housing, uniforms, food; debt escalates faster than wages can repay

- **Restriction of movement:** Confiscation of identity documents, locked facilities, surveillance preventing worker departure
- **Isolation:** Workers in remote locations, linguistic/cultural isolation, low literacy preventing understanding of rights
- **Excessive working hours:** Mandatory overtime without additional pay, no rest days, unrealistic production quotas
- **Wage deprivation:** Non-payment of wages, excessive fines/deductions, underpayment relative to agreed terms

## Supplier Self-Assessment and Audit Checklists

Organizations should require suppliers to complete ILO-aligned assessments:

- Evidence of written employment contracts provided to workers before employment
- Verification that workers retain control of identity documents (passports, visas)
- Documentation of wage payments (pay stubs, bank transfers) meeting or exceeding legal minimum wage
- Evidence of reasonable working hours (max 48 hours/week per ILO, or compliance with national standards)
- Documentation of freedom of association (union memberships, grievance channels, worker councils)
- Proof of freedom of movement (no locked facilities, exit controls, or surveillance preventing departure)

## High-Risk Indicators Requiring Escalation

Organizations should immediately escalate cases exhibiting:

- Obvious evidence of document confiscation or worker confinement
- Extreme wage theft (unpaid wages, excessive deductions exceeding 50% of earnings)
- Child labor (workers under 18 in hazardous work, or under 15 in other work)
- Systematic denial of freedom of association (suppression of union organizing, retaliation against worker representatives)

## Audit Frameworks and Third-Party Certification

### Key Audit Standards and Protocols

#### SA8000 (Social Accountability International)

SA8000 is an auditable standard covering labor rights, occupational health and safety, environmental management, and management systems. Certification is valid for 3 years with annual surveillance audits. Organizations relying on SA8000 certification should verify certification currency and audit scope.

#### BSCI Code and Audit Protocol

Business Social Compliance Initiative (BSCI) Code covers human rights, labor standards, environmental practices, and anti-corruption. BSCI conducts announced audits (annually) and re-audits for flagged violations. BSCI audits are documented in publicly accessible database, enabling supply chain transparency.

## RBA (Responsible Business Alliance) Code

RBA Code focuses on electronics and supply chain assembly. It includes labor rights, occupational health, environmental management, ethics, and management systems. RBA maintains audit database of member facility assessments.

## Fair Trade and Industry-Specific Certifications

Certifications like Fair Trade, UTZ Certified, Rainforest Alliance, RSPO (palm oil) cover labor, environmental, and social standards in specific commodities. Organizations sourcing certified commodities should verify certification authenticity and audit recency.

## Supplier Engagement and Capacity Building

### Tiered Supplier Programs

Organizations should differentiate supplier engagement by risk level:

- **Tier 1 (low-risk):** Minimal audit frequency (biennial or triennial); lighter due diligence burden
- **Tier 2 (medium-risk):** Annual audits; quarterly management reviews; corrective action plan requirements
- **Tier 3 (high-risk):** Semi-annual or quarterly audits; enhanced grievance monitoring; intensive management engagement; remediation funding

### Capacity Building and Technical Assistance

Rather than pure punishment/supplier replacement, progressive organizations invest in supplier improvement:

- Training: Worker rights education, management labor practices, grievance handling, health and safety protocols
- Systems assistance: Help suppliers implement management systems (documentation, record-keeping, worker communication channels)
- Financial support: Low-interest loans or direct funding for facility remediation, wage gap closure, or safety equipment
- Partnership models: Long-term purchasing commitments and price stability enabling supplier investment in labor/environmental compliance

Capacity-building approach is more sustainable than supplier replacement, particularly for developing-market suppliers who face structural capacity constraints.

## Frequently Asked Questions

When should non-EU organizations begin CSDDD compliance preparation?

Non-EU organizations with EU supply chain exposure or >€900M EU-sourced revenue face Phase 2 (2028) applicability. Organizations should begin alignment immediately: Phase 1 (2027) applies only to EU companies but sets governance/audit precedent affecting investor expectations globally. Early movers avoid disruption and build supply chain resilience ahead of mandatory compliance deadlines.

How should organizations balance audit frequency with supplier relationships and costs?

Use risk-based tiering: low-risk suppliers (certified, established track record) audit less frequently (biennial); high-risk suppliers (new, high-labor-intensive, weak institutional environment) audit more frequently (semi-annual). Blend announced (transparent, relationship-building) and unannounced audits (detection of covert violations). Use technology: self-assessment questionnaires, remote audits, worker feedback platforms reduce per-facility costs while maintaining coverage.

What is the appropriate response when audits identify forced labor indicators?

Forced labor discovery is a critical escalation: (1) immediately document evidence and notify facility management/ownership; (2) notify law enforcement and labor authorities (required under CSDDD and most national laws); (3) cease orders/purchasing from facility; (4) establish support program for affected workers (repatriation assistance, wage restitution, legal support); (5) investigate buyer-side contribution (excessive price pressure, short lead times forcing excessive overtime); (6) consider supplier termination unless facility commits to comprehensive remediation with third-party verification. Supply chain continuity must never override victim protection.

How can organizations ensure audit credibility and prevent audit manipulation?

Use reputable third-party auditors with industry-specific experience and track records. Conduct worker interviews in private (away from management), in workers' languages. Use mix of announced and unannounced audits. Cross-check audit findings with worker grievance data, external NGO reports, and labor authority investigations. Audit all key facilities regularly; don't rely exclusively on third-party certifications. Train internal teams to spot audit red flags: cherry-picked worker interviews, missing documentation, unrealistic records.

What should organizations disclose about supply chain due diligence findings in ESG reporting?

Organizations should transparently disclose: due diligence methodology, number of facilities in supply chain, audit coverage and frequency, findings summary (violations identified by category: forced labor, child labor, wage theft, unsafe conditions), remediation outcomes, grievance statistics. Maintain worker and supplier confidentiality while demonstrating comprehensive coverage and commitment to remediation. Disclosure builds investor confidence and distinguishes genuine compliance from greenwashing.

## Connecting Related ESG Topics

Supply chain due diligence integrates with broader ESG and risk management. Explore related resources:

- Circular Economy and Waste Reduction — environmental due diligence in supply chains
- Community Impact Assessment and Social License to Operate — stakeholder engagement in supply chain regions
- Workplace Health, Safety, and Wellbeing — occupational safety standards across supply chain
- Social Responsibility in ESG: The Complete Professional Guide (2026) — comprehensive social ESG strategy
- Governance in ESG: The Complete Professional Guide — supply chain governance and accountability structures

**Published by:** BC ESG (bcesg.org) | **Date:** March 18, 2026

**Standards Referenced:** EU CSDDD (effective 2027), ILO Forced Labor Indicators, SA8000, BSCI Code, RBA Code, GRI 401/403/405 (Labor Standards), UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, ISSB IFRS S1 (Social Capital)

**Reviewed and updated:** March 18, 2026 for 2027 CSDDD implementation and integrated human rights due diligence requirements

## KPI Design for ESG Performance: Leading Indicators, Lagging Metrics, and Target-Setting Frameworks

Source: <https://bcesg.org/kpi-design-esg-performance-leading-lagging-indicators-target-setting/> Published: October 6, 2026

Home > ESG Metrics > KPI Design for ESG Performance

## KPI Design for ESG Performance: Leading Indicators, Lagging Metrics, and Target-Setting Frameworks

Updated October 6, 2026.

**If you are designing ESG KPIs for board or CSRD reporting, this guide distinguishes leading vs lagging indicators and target-setting practices.**

**ESG KPI Definition:** Environmental, social, and governance key performance indicators (KPIs) are quantifiable metrics that measure ESG performance, inform decision-making, and demonstrate progress toward strategic objectives. Effective KPI systems balance leading indicators (predictive, activity-based) with lagging indicators (outcome-based, retrospective) aligned with GRI Standards, ISSB frameworks, and business strategy.

### Introduction to ESG KPI Design

KPIs form the quantitative backbone of ESG performance management. Well-designed KPIs enable organizations to:

- Translate ESG strategy into measurable objectives
- Track progress toward targets and identify performance gaps
- Enable accountability through performance management systems
- Support investor communication and ESG rating provider submissions
- Drive organizational alignment around shared ESG priorities
- Identify emerging risks and opportunities through early warning signals

Effective KPI systems integrate three critical elements: leading indicators that predict future outcomes, lagging indicators that measure actual results, and aligned targets that establish clear performance expectations. This comprehensive approach enables both proactive management and transparent accountability.

### Leading Indicators vs. Lagging Indicators

#### Understanding Leading Indicators

Leading indicators are activity-based metrics that predict future outcomes. They measure inputs, activities, or intermediate outcomes that influence ultimate results. Leading indicators enable organizations to:

- **Predict future performance:** Leading indicators signal future results, enabling proactive adjustments
- **Enable early intervention:** Organizations can address issues before they manifest as performance failures
- **Support continuous improvement:** Early feedback enables rapid iteration and optimization
- **Demonstrate management effectiveness:** Leading indicators reflect management actions and priorities

## Understanding Lagging Indicators

Lagging indicators measure actual outcomes and ultimate results. They reflect the combined impact of all activities and are less controllable in the short term. Lagging indicators provide:

- **Accountability for results:** Clear measurement of actual achievements versus targets
- **Outcome validation:** Confirmation that activities produce intended results
- **Comparability:** Standard metrics enabling peer comparison and investor assessment
- **Materiality alignment:** Outcomes that directly reflect material ESG impacts

## Leading and Lagging Indicators by ESG Pillar

### Environmental KPIs

| Issue Area               | Leading Indicators                                                                                            | Lagging Indicators                                                                                 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Climate & Emissions      | Energy audits completed, renewable energy investments, efficiency projects launched, green team participation | Absolute Scope 1/2/3 emissions, emissions intensity (per revenue, per unit), carbon reduction rate |
| Water Management         | Water audits conducted, recycling system installations, supplier commitments                                  | Total water consumption, water intensity, wastewater quality metrics                               |
| Waste & Circular Economy | Waste reduction initiatives launched, recycling program coverage, supplier assessments                        | Waste diverted from landfill %, hazardous waste generation, material recycled                      |
| Biodiversity             | Habitat restoration projects initiated, biodiversity assessments, community partnerships                      | Land area restored, species populations monitored, ecosystem health index                          |

### Social KPIs

| Issue Area              | Leading Indicators                                                                                | Lagging Indicators                                                                   |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Labor Practices & Wages | Wage audits completed, collective bargaining agreements, training programs delivered              | Living wage %, collective bargaining coverage, voluntary turnover rate               |
| Health & Safety         | Safety training completion, hazard audits, near-miss reporting, safety committee engagement       | Total recordable incident rate (TRIR), lost-time incident rate (LTIR), severity rate |
| Diversity & Inclusion   | D&I program participation, recruitment pipeline initiatives, leadership development participation | Women in workforce %, women in management %, ethnic diversity %, pay equity gap      |

| Issue Area       | Leading Indicators                                                         | Lagging Indicators                                                        |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Community Impact | Community programs initiated, volunteer hours, community needs assessments | Community satisfaction score, social impact metrics, community employment |

## Governance KPIs

| Issue Area             | Leading Indicators                                                               | Lagging Indicators                                                                |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Board Composition      | Board recruitment initiatives, governance training, succession planning progress | Board independence %, gender diversity %, average tenure, committee rotation      |
| Ethics & Compliance    | Ethics training completion %, compliance assessments, audit findings resolved    | Regulatory violations, substantiated ethics complaints, sanctions/fines           |
| Executive Compensation | ESG metrics in comp plan development, peer benchmarking, board discussions       | CEO pay ratio, pay equity analysis, pay for performance correlation               |
| Risk Management        | Risk assessment completion, control implementations, ERM framework maturity      | Risk incidents materialized, internal audit findings, external audit observations |

## KPI Selection and Design Framework

### Step 1: Align KPIs with Materiality and Strategy

Effective KPIs emerge from double materiality assessments identifying issues critical to the business and stakeholders. KPIs should:

- Address issues in the high-high quadrant of materiality matrices (high financial and impact materiality)
- Support strategic ESG objectives and business imperatives
- Align with long-term business strategy and value creation
- Reflect stakeholder priorities and expectations

### Step 2: Select Indicators Aligned with Established Frameworks

Leading frameworks provide established metrics ensuring consistency and comparability:

- **GRI Standards:** Sector-specific metrics covering environmental, social, and governance issues
- **ISSB Standards:** Climate-related disclosures and sustainability metrics focused on investor relevance
- **CSRD/ESRS:** Required metrics for EU-listed companies
- **Industry-specific standards:** Sector frameworks (e.g., SASB for specific sectors)
- **Science-based targets:** Climate targets aligned with climate science

### Step 3: Design the Leading Indicator System

Leading indicators should be:

- **Within management control:** Reflect activities and initiatives that managers can directly influence
- **Timely:** Measured frequently (monthly, quarterly) to enable real-time management
- **Predictive:** Demonstrably correlate with future lagging indicator outcomes
- **Actionable:** Provide clear implications for management decisions

- **Balanced:** Mix of activity-based (programs launched, people trained) and intermediate outcome metrics

#### Example – Climate Leading Indicator System:

A manufacturing company establishes leading indicators for carbon emissions reduction: • Energy audits completed (by facility, by quarter) • Renewable energy MW contracted or installed • Energy efficiency projects with positive ROI approved and funded • Employee green team participation rate • Supplier Scope 3 emissions reduction commitments received

These leading indicators predict future emissions reductions by tracking activities that drive change.

#### Step 4: Design the Lagging Indicator System

Lagging indicators should be:

- **Material to stakeholders:** Measure outcomes that matter to investors, regulators, and communities
- **Comparable:** Align with industry standards and peer metrics enabling benchmarking
- **Verified:** Independently auditable and subject to third-party assurance
- **Historical:** Tracked consistently over multiple years enabling trend analysis
- **Boundary-clear:** Transparent scope (direct operations, supply chain, value chain)

#### Example – Climate Lagging Indicator System:

The same manufacturer measures actual carbon outcomes: • Absolute Scope 1 emissions (mtCO<sub>2</sub>e annually) • Absolute Scope 2 emissions (mtCO<sub>2</sub>e annually) • Scope 3 emissions from purchased goods and services (mtCO<sub>2</sub>e annually) • Carbon intensity (mtCO<sub>2</sub>e per unit production, per \$ revenue) • Year-over-year emissions reduction rate (%)

These lagging indicators demonstrate whether leading indicator activities produced intended emissions reductions.

## Target-Setting Frameworks

### Science-Based Targets (SBT)

For climate metrics, science-based targets aligned with limiting global warming to 1.5°C or 2°C provide credible, externally validated targets:

- **SBTi validation:** Science-based targets initiative (SBTi) validates targets against climate science
- **Ambition levels:** 1.5°C pathway (most ambitious) vs. 2°C pathway (less ambitious)
- **Scope coverage:** Targets typically cover Scope 1, 2, and significant Scope 3 emissions
- **Interim milestones:** Targets specify 2030 interim goal and 2050 long-term goal

### Benchmarking-Based Targets

Targets relative to peer performance or industry averages:

- **Peer comparison:** Aim to be in top quartile of industry on specific metrics
- **Best-in-class:** Match or exceed leading companies in industry sector
- **Advantages:** Credible, achievable, understandable to stakeholders

- **Limitations:** May not be ambitious if industry lagging on ESG

## Trajectory-Based Targets

Targets based on historical improvement rates and future trajectory:

- **Linear reduction:** Equal percentage reduction each year (e.g., 5% annually)
- **Accelerating reduction:** Faster reduction over time as efficiency improvements compound
- **Baseline approach:** Set baseline year (typically most recent full year) and establish targets relative to baseline

## Stakeholder-Defined Targets

Targets informed by stakeholder expectations and needs:

- **Investor expectations:** Targets aligned with investor guidance and capital market expectations
- **Regulatory requirements:** Targets meeting or exceeding regulatory minimums
- **Community needs:** Targets addressing specific community concerns and priorities
- **NGO commitments:** Targets aligning with NGO commitments and industry initiatives

## KPI Measurement and Data Governance

### Data Collection Systems

Reliable KPI systems require robust data collection:

- **Primary data:** Direct measurement from company operations (utility bills, employee records, safety systems)
- **Secondary data:** Information from suppliers, partners, and external databases
- **Estimation methods:** Well-documented approaches for data gaps or partial information
- **System integration:** ERP, HR, sustainability, and operational systems contributing to KPI data

### Quality Assurance

Data quality is critical for KPI credibility:

- **Accuracy:** Regular audits confirming data reflects actual performance
- **Completeness:** Comprehensive coverage of relevant operations and business units
- **Consistency:** Uniform definitions and measurement methodologies across organization
- **Timeliness:** Data available for timely decision-making and performance management
- **Traceability:** Clear audit trails documenting data sources and calculations

### Assurance and Verification

Credibility requires external verification:

- **Third-party assurance:** Limited or reasonable assurance from external auditors or consultants
- **Internal audit:** Audit committee oversight of ESG data and systems

- **Financial audit integration:** Growing integration of ESG metrics into financial audit scope
- **Public disclosure:** Transparent reporting of assurance scope and findings

## Integrating KPIs with Business Performance

### Executive Compensation Linkage

Linking executive compensation to ESG KPIs drives organizational alignment:

- **Compensation structure:** 10-25% of variable compensation typically tied to ESG KPIs
- **Balance:** Equal weighting of ESG KPIs with financial metrics
- **Governance:** Board committee oversight of ESG KPI selection and performance assessment
- **Transparency:** Clear disclosure of KPI targets and actual achievement

### Operational Management Integration

ESG KPIs should integrate with operational management:

- **Balanced scorecard:** ESG KPIs alongside financial and operational metrics
- **Strategic alignment:** KPIs linked to strategic objectives and business unit accountability
- **Real-time dashboards:** Visual management systems enabling team-level tracking and accountability
- **Performance reviews:** Individual performance assessment including ESG KPI contribution

## Frequently Asked Questions

### Q: How many KPIs should organizations track?

Most organizations track 10-20 core KPIs across ESG pillars, with additional metrics for specific material issues. More KPIs increase measurement burden and dilute focus. Best practice emphasizes quality over quantity—fewer, well-designed indicators drive better management than numerous metrics.

### Q: How frequently should KPIs be reviewed?

Leading indicators should be reviewed monthly or quarterly for real-time management. Lagging indicators are typically reviewed quarterly and annually. The full KPI system should undergo annual review to assess continued relevance, with reassessment if material issues change significantly.

### Q: Can organizations use external benchmarking for ESG KPIs?

Yes, benchmarking provides valuable context for ESG performance. Peer comparison helps organizations understand competitive positioning and identify improvement opportunities. However, KPIs should reflect internal materiality assessment rather than external benchmarking alone. Leading ESG organizations establish ambitious targets exceeding peer averages.

### Q: How should organizations handle data limitations or estimation?

Organizations should disclose data limitations transparently. GRI Standards permit estimation where direct measurement is unavailable, provided estimation methodologies are documented and disclosed. As measurement systems mature, estimation should progressively be replaced with direct measurement. Significant

estimation should be flagged for stakeholder awareness.

### **Q: How do KPIs relate to ISSB and CSRD requirements?**

ISSB standards focus on investor-relevant KPIs addressing financial materiality. CSRD requires comprehensive KPIs addressing both financial and impact materiality. Organizations should establish KPIs addressing both standards' requirements, with CSRD requirements typically being more comprehensive including broader stakeholder considerations.

## **Related Resources**

- Double Materiality Assessment: Foundation for KPI Identification
- ESG Ratings and Scores: Understanding Rating Provider KPI Preferences
- ESG Metrics: Complete Professional Guide

**About this article:** Published by BC ESG on March 18, 2026. This comprehensive guide covers ESG KPI design including leading and lagging indicators, target-setting methodologies, and measurement frameworks. Content reflects GRI Standards, ISSB requirements, science-based target approaches, and industry best practices current as of 2026.

## **Global ESG Regulatory Convergence: ISSB Adoption, Jurisdictional Mapping, and Interoperability**

*Source: <https://bcesg.org/global-esg-regulatory-convergence-issb-adoption-jurisdictional-mapping/> Published: October 6, 2026*

Home > Regulatory Frameworks > Global Regulatory Convergence

## **Global ESG Regulatory Convergence: ISSB Adoption, Jurisdictional Mapping, and Interoperability**

*Updated October 6, 2026.*

**If you map ISSB S1/S2 adoption across jurisdictions, this guide compares EU CSRD, California, SEC, and emerging climate disclosure regimes as of October 2026.**

**Definition:** Global ESG regulatory convergence refers to the increasing alignment of sustainability disclosure standards across jurisdictions around the ISSB (International Sustainability Standards Board) standards, which provide a globally consistent, investor-focused baseline for climate and broader environmental, social, and governance disclosure. As of March 2026, 20+ jurisdictions have adopted or are implementing ISSB standards, creating a framework for interoperability across regional standards (EU CSRD, SEC climate rule, California SB 253) while significant gaps and conflicts remain.

## **The International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB)**

### **History and Development**

The ISSB was formally established in 2022 under the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) Foundation, building on the TCFD (Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures) framework. The

ISSB published two foundational standards in June 2023:

- **IFRS S1 (General Requirements):** Overarching principles for identifying and disclosing material sustainability-related financial information
- **IFRS S2 (Climate):** Specific requirements for climate-related disclosures aligned with TCFD; requires Scope 1, 2, and (in certain cases) Scope 3 GHG emissions reporting

## ISSB Standard Fundamentals

The ISSB standards are grounded in key principles:

- **Double Materiality Assessment:** Companies must disclose information material to investors (financial materiality) and information where company impacts are material to society/environment (impact materiality)
- **Investor-Centric Focus:** Primary objective is providing investors with decision-useful information; non-financial stakeholders' interests are secondary
- **Alignment with TCFD:** IFRS S2 incorporates TCFD recommendations; companies already TCFD-compliant face minimal incremental burden
- **Industry-Specific Guidance:** ISSB acknowledges material issues vary by industry; industry guidance is under development

## Global Jurisdictional Adoption Status (March 2026)

### Jurisdictions Adopting or Implementing ISSB

As of March 2026, 20+ jurisdictions have announced adoption or implementation of ISSB standards. Key markets include:

#### European Union

The EU has adopted a convergence approach, integrating ISSB principles into the CSRD (Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive). Large companies (>500 employees) must comply with CSRD starting 2024 (for certain companies) and 2025-2026 (for others). CSRD is more comprehensive than ISSB (covering social issues, board diversity, supply chain due diligence) but aligns on climate and environmental metrics.

#### United Kingdom

The FCA (Financial Conduct Authority) has announced alignment with ISSB standards for UK-listed companies. Transition from TCFD to ISSB-aligned requirements is underway, with full implementation expected 2025-2026. The UK Taxonomy also incorporates ISSB principles.

#### Japan

Japan has adopted ISSB standards. The Financial Services Agency requires large companies to adopt ISSB by 2030. Japan has also developed supplementary requirements addressing social issues material to Japanese stakeholders (female leadership, labor practices).

#### Canada

Canada has aligned with ISSB, requiring large companies to disclose climate-related information consistent with ISSB standards. Implementation timeline: 2024-2026 for Scope 1-2 emissions; Scope 3 phased in 2027-2028.

**Australia**

Australia has legislated climate disclosure requirements aligned with ISSB. The Treasury Laws Amendment (2023) requires all ASX-listed companies to disclose climate risks and emissions using ISSB/TCFD framework. Reporting begins 2024.

**Singapore**

Singapore has adopted ISSB-aligned standards. The SGX (Singapore Exchange) requires listed companies to comply with ISSB disclosure standards, with phased implementation through 2026.

**United States**

The SEC climate rule is partially aligned with ISSB on Scope 1-2 emissions but differs on Scope 3 requirements and materiality framework. The SEC has indicated longer-term convergence toward ISSB standards, but current rule proceeds independently due to US constitutional and regulatory constraints.

**Hong Kong**

Hong Kong has aligned disclosure requirements with ISSB. Listed companies on HKEX must comply with ISSB-aligned climate and sustainability standards.

**Partial Adoption and Emerging Markets**

Many other jurisdictions (Brazil, India, Indonesia, Mexico, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam) have signaled adoption or are developing ISSB-aligned standards. However, implementation timelines vary, and full convergence remains years away. Some jurisdictions maintain parallel or alternative frameworks.

**Comparative Analysis: ISSB vs. Regional Standards**

| Dimension             | ISSB (S1, S2)               | EU CSRD                                         | SEC Climate Rule            | California SB 253               |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Scope 1-2 Emissions   | Required                    | Required                                        | Required (2026)             | Required (2026)                 |
| Scope 3 Emissions     | If material; phased         | Required for all companies                      | If material; phased         | If material (40% threshold)     |
| Social Disclosure     | Limited (materiality-based) | Comprehensive (governance, labor, human rights) | Climate-only                | Climate-only                    |
| Governance Disclosure | Climate governance required | Board diversity, executive comp linkage         | Climate governance required | Implicit in adaptation planning |
| Assurance             | Limited (ISSB S1/S2 silent) | Limited assurance required                      | Not mandated                | Not mandated                    |
| Liability Standard    | Varies by jurisdiction      | Administrative penalties, director liability    | Securities fraud standards  | Strict liability (SB 261)       |

**Interoperability Challenges and Solutions**

## Key Interoperability Gaps

- **Materiality Definitions:** ISSB relies on investor materiality; CSRD requires double materiality assessment; these can produce conflicting scope and disclosure requirements
- **Scope 3 Treatment:** ISSB requires Scope 3 “if material”; CSRD requires comprehensive Scope 3; EU/California stricter than ISSB baseline
- **Social Issues:** ISSB focuses on climate; CSRD includes extensive social and governance disclosure; gaps exist in comparability
- **Assurance Requirements:** CSRD mandates limited assurance; US and some other jurisdictions do not; creates inconsistent audit trails
- **Timeline Divergence:** Jurisdictions have different phase-in schedules; companies face moving compliance deadlines

## Best Practice for Multi-Jurisdictional Compliance

Companies operating in multiple jurisdictions should:

- **Map Regulatory Requirements:** Create matrix of requirements across jurisdictions where you have material operations/disclosure obligations
- **Identify Strictest Standards:** Implement data systems and disclosure processes satisfying the most stringent requirement (typically CSRD or California)
- **Use ISSB as Baseline:** ISSB provides common foundation; add supplementary disclosures as required by specific jurisdictions
- **Leverage Technology:** Sustainability reporting platforms with multi-standard mapping reduce compliance burden
- **Engage Stakeholders:** Invest in investor and regulator engagement to understand evolving standards and expectations

## Barriers to Convergence

### Jurisdictional Sovereignty and Policy Divergence

While ISSB provides a common language, full convergence is constrained by jurisdictional differences in climate policy priorities, social values, and regulatory philosophy. For example:

- EU prioritizes just transition and social inclusion; requires board diversity and supply chain due diligence not in ISSB
- US emphasizes investor protection; applies securities fraud standards inconsistent with ISSB liability frameworks
- California imposes strict liability for misstatements, departing from ISSB approach
- Emerging markets may lack capacity or resources to implement full ISSB standards

### Political Resistance and Business Advocacy

Business groups in some jurisdictions (US, Australia, some Asian markets) continue to oppose aggressive climate disclosure, citing competitiveness concerns and constitutional objections. This political resistance has

delayed or diluted ISSB adoption in certain regions.

## Emerging Standards and Future Directions

### Nature-Related Financial Disclosure (TNFD)

The Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures published its framework in 2023. As of March 2026, TNFD is complementing ISSB in progressive jurisdictions (EU, UK, Australia) by extending disclosure requirements to biodiversity and ecosystem impacts. Full ISSB integration of TNFD principles is expected 2026-2027.

### Social and Governance Standards

ISSB is developing supplementary standards for material social and governance issues. Early drafts address human capital (labor practices, diversity), business conduct (anti-corruption, ethics), and supply chain governance. Finalization expected 2026-2027.

### AI and Emerging Risk Disclosure

Regulators are considering requirements for disclosure of AI-related risks and governance. ISSB may expand to cover AI governance and risks in future iterations.

## Implementation Roadmap for Global Companies

### Year 1: Foundation (2025-2026)

- Conduct jurisdictional regulatory mapping; identify applicable standards
- Assess current disclosures against ISSB and applicable regional standards
- Establish global ESG data infrastructure aligned with ISSB S1/S2 requirements
- Pilot ISSB-aligned disclosure in one jurisdiction or business unit

### Year 2: Scale (2026-2027)

- Roll out ISSB-aligned disclosures across all applicable jurisdictions
- Address jurisdiction-specific requirements (CSRD social disclosure, California adaptation planning)
- Obtain third-party assurance (limited or reasonable) of climate and emissions data
- Engage investors and regulators on disclosure approach and feedback

### Year 3+: Optimization (2027+)

- Integrate TNFD and emerging social/governance standards into disclosure framework
- Leverage automation and technology to reduce reporting burden and improve data quality
- Pursue continuous improvement in materiality assessment and disclosure depth
- Monitor regulatory evolution and adjust disclosure strategy proactively

## Frequently Asked Questions

Should my company adopt ISSB standards even if not required by regulation?

Yes. ISSB provides a globally recognized baseline for ESG disclosure, facilitating investor understanding and capital market efficiency. Voluntary ISSB adoption demonstrates sustainability commitment and can enhance investor relations. Additionally, as more jurisdictions adopt ISSB-aligned standards, early adoption reduces future compliance burden.

How do I reconcile ISSB materiality with CSRD double materiality?

ISSB's single materiality (investor-centric) is narrower than CSRD's double materiality (investor + impact). To satisfy both, assess issues under both standards: include items material to investors (ISSB) plus items material to society/environment even if not investor-material (CSRD). This produces comprehensive disclosure satisfying strictest requirements.

What is the interoperability between ISSB and EU CSRD?

High interoperability on climate metrics (Scope 1-2-3 emissions); moderate on governance (CSRD requires board diversity, executive comp linkage); low on social issues (CSRD comprehensive, ISSB minimal). EU companies should start with CSRD requirements and supplement with ISSB where applicable.

Will ISSB Scope 3 requirements eventually align with SEC and California?

Likely, but with lag. SEC climate rule currently doesn't mandate Scope 3; California requires Scope 3 if material (40%+). ISSB similarly requires Scope 3 "if material." Convergence toward comprehensive Scope 3 reporting is probable over next 3-5 years as climate science and investor demand increase.

How does TNFD integrate with ISSB?

TNFD is complementary to ISSB. While ISSB focuses on investor-material sustainability risks/opportunities, TNFD addresses nature-related financial risks and dependencies. Integration of TNFD into ISSB standards is expected 2026-2027. For now, progressive companies disclose against both frameworks.

## Related Resources

Learn more about related topics:

- SEC Climate Disclosure Rule: Requirements, Timeline, Legal Challenges, and Compliance Strategy
- California Climate Accountability Laws: SB 253, SB 261, and AB 1305 Compliance Guide
- ESG Regulatory Frameworks: The Complete Professional Guide (2026)

## ISSB Adoption Tracker: Which Jurisdictions Have Adopted IFRS S1 and S2 (2026)

**As of mid-2026, around 36 jurisdictions representing more than 60% of global GDP have adopted, are aligning with, or are progressing toward the ISSB's IFRS S1 and IFRS S2 sustainability disclosure standards. Roughly 28 have formally adopted them on a voluntary or mandatory basis, with about 12 more committed to following.** Adoption is rarely a direct copy of the global text: most jurisdictions enact a locally branded standard (UK SRS, Australia's ASRS/AASB S2, Japan's SSBJ, Canada's CSDS, Brazil's CBPS) built on IFRS S1/S2 as the baseline, then phase in mandatory reporting by company size between 2025 and 2030.

## Jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction adoption status

| Jurisdiction                        | Local standard / route                                 | Status                              | First reporting year                     | Mandatory or voluntary                                   |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Australia                           | ASRS (AASB S1 & AASB S2)                               | Adopted                             | FY beginning on/after 1 Jan 2025         | Mandatory (phased by size to 2027)                       |
| United Kingdom                      | UK SRS S1 & S2 (six UK amendments)                     | Adopted (endorsed 25 Feb 2026)      | 2027 (proposed mandatory; voluntary now) | Voluntary now; mandatory proposed from 2027              |
| European Union                      | ESRS under CSRD (interoperable with ISSB)              | Aligning (interoperability mapping) | FY2024 (large entities, phased)          | Mandatory (own ESRS regime, not direct ISSB)             |
| Japan                               | SSBJ Standards (Application, Theme 1 & 2)              | Adopted                             | FY ending Mar 2027 (largest firms)       | Voluntary FY2026; mandatory phased from FY2027           |
| Canada                              | CSDS 1 & CSDS 2                                        | Adopted                             | 2025 (voluntary)                         | Voluntary (mandatory securities rule walked back)        |
| Brazil                              | CBPS 01 & 02 (CVM Resolution)                          | Adopted                             | 2024 (voluntary)                         | Voluntary (2026 mandatory phase removed by CVM Res. 244) |
| China (Mainland)                    | CSDS Basic Standard (MOF) + exchange rules             | Aligning                            | 2026 (FY2025 reports, large/dual-listed) | Mandatory phased to full alignment by 2030               |
| Hong Kong SAR                       | HKFRS S1 & S2 / HKEX listing rules                     | Adopted                             | FY beginning on/after 1 Jan 2025         | Comply-or-explain; full adoption targeted 2028           |
| Singapore                           | SGX-aligned ISSB climate disclosures                   | Adopted                             | FY2025 (listed issuers)                  | Mandatory (Scope 3 from FY2026)                          |
| Malaysia                            | National Sustainability Reporting Framework (NSRF)     | Adopted                             | 2025 (Group 1)                           | Mandatory (phased: Group 2 2026, Group 3 2027)           |
| Nigeria                             | IFRS S1 & S2 (FRC adoption roadmap)                    | Adopted                             | 2024 (voluntary)                         | Voluntary to 2026; mandatory phased from 2027            |
| Hong Kong / Taiwan (Chinese Taipei) | TWSE ISSB-aligned roadmap                              | Adopted                             | 2026 (largest listed companies)          | Mandatory (phased by capitalisation)                     |
| South Korea                         | KSSB draft standards (ISSB-based)                      | Proposed                            | 2026 onward (under consultation)         | Mandatory expected (timeline being finalised)            |
| Turkiye                             | TSRS (Turkish Sustainability Reporting Standards)      | Adopted                             | FY2024                                   | Mandatory (above thresholds)                             |
| Pakistan / Sri Lanka / Bangladesh   | National adoption of IFRS S1 & S2                      | Adopted                             | 2025 (phased, voluntary first)           | Voluntary moving to mandatory                            |
| United States                       | No federal ISSB adoption (state rules e.g. California) | Not adopted                         | n/a (California SB 253/261 from 2026)    | Voluntary federally; some state mandates                 |

## **The global picture: how many jurisdictions, what share of the economy, and EU interoperability**

The IFRS Foundation reports that approximately 36 jurisdictions have adopted, used, or are taking steps toward the ISSB Standards, together representing well over half of global GDP (more than 60% by recent counts) and a large share of global market capitalisation and greenhouse gas emissions. Of the first batch of detailed jurisdictional profiles published, 14 of 17 set a target of fully adopting IFRS S1 and S2, while the rest target the climate-only requirements (IFRS S2) or partial incorporation. The dominant pattern is a national standard that uses IFRS S1/S2 as its baseline with limited local modifications, then phases mandatory reporting in by entity size over 2025-2030.

The most important convergence point is the European Union. The EU does not adopt IFRS S1/S2 directly; it has its own European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) under the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), which use a double-materiality lens (impact on the world plus financial materiality) rather than the investor-focused single-materiality baseline of the ISSB. To avoid double reporting, the ISSB and EFRAG published joint interoperability guidance mapping the climate disclosures, so companies reporting under both ESRS and ISSB can do so efficiently. The ISSB's financial-materiality definition in IFRS S1 is aligned with ESRS's financial-materiality definition, with ESRS layering the additional impact-materiality assessment on top. This interoperability is the mechanism that lets the ISSB function as the global baseline while the EU's broader regime sits alongside it.

## **Frequently Asked Questions**

### **How many countries have adopted ISSB standards?**

As of 2026, roughly 36 jurisdictions have adopted, used, or are progressing toward the ISSB's IFRS S1 and S2 standards. About 28 have formally adopted them on a voluntary or mandatory basis, with around 12 more committed to introducing them. Together these jurisdictions represent more than 60% of global GDP.

### **Has the US adopted ISSB standards?**

No. The United States has not adopted IFRS S1 or S2 at the federal level, and the SEC's own climate disclosure rule has faced legal and political challenges. Some US states have moved independently, most notably California's SB 253 and SB 261, which impose climate and emissions disclosure obligations beginning in 2026, but these are state mandates rather than ISSB adoption.

### **Are IFRS S1 and S2 mandatory?**

It depends on the jurisdiction. The ISSB itself only issues the standards; individual jurisdictions decide whether and when to make them mandatory. Australia, Singapore, Malaysia, China, Türkiye, and Hong Kong have mandatory or comply-or-explain regimes phasing in from 2025-2026, while the UK, Canada, Japan (initially), Brazil, and Nigeria start voluntary and move toward mandatory reporting over later years.

### **How do ISSB standards relate to the EU ESRS?**

The EU uses its own European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) under the CSRD, not IFRS S1/S2 directly. ESRS applies double materiality (impact plus financial), whereas the ISSB baseline is investor-focused single (financial) materiality. The ISSB and EFRAG published interoperability guidance that maps the two for climate disclosures, so companies subject to both can report once and satisfy both regimes for the overlapping

content.

### **When did Australia's ISSB-aligned reporting become mandatory?**

Australia's mandatory climate reporting under the Australian Sustainability Reporting Standards (ASRS), built on AASB S1 and AASB S2 (which incorporate IFRS S1 and S2), applies to financial years beginning on or after 1 January 2025 for the largest entities, then phases in to additional groups from 1 July 2026 and 1 July 2027. It is one of the first major mandatory ISSB-aligned regimes in the world.

### **What is the difference between the ISSB standards and a jurisdiction's local version?**

The ISSB publishes IFRS S1 (general sustainability-related financial disclosures) and IFRS S2 (climate-related disclosures) as a global baseline. Jurisdictions typically enact a locally named standard, such as the UK SRS, Australia's ASRS, Japan's SSB, Canada's CSDS, or Brazil's CBPS, that uses the IFRS S1/S2 text as its foundation but adds local amendments, effective dates, transition reliefs, and scoping rules suited to that market. The substance stays largely aligned so disclosures remain globally comparable.

## **EU CSRD and European Sustainability Reporting Standards: Compliance Roadmap After the 2026 Omnibus**

Source: <https://bcesg.org/eu-csrd-esrs-compliance-roadmap-2026-omnibus/> Published: October 6, 2026

Home > Sustainability Reporting > EU CSRD and ESRS

## **EU CSRD and European Sustainability Reporting Standards: Compliance Roadmap After the 2026 Omnibus**

Updated October 6, 2026.

**If CSRD and ESRS are on your 2026–2028 reporting roadmap, this guide maps Omnibus I scope changes, wave timelines, and double materiality after the February–2026 simplification package.**

Published: March 18, 2026 | Author: BC ESG | Category: Sustainability Reporting

**Definition:** The EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) mandates large EU companies and EU-listed SMEs to disclose detailed sustainability information aligned with European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS). The January 2026 Omnibus Directive narrowed CSRD scope from initial projections, affecting approximately 85-90% of companies subject to original estimates. The ESRS framework covers environmental, social, and governance (ESG) topics with double materiality assessment at its foundation.

## **Introduction: EU Regulatory Momentum and the 2026 Omnibus Update**

The EU's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), adopted in November 2022, represents the most comprehensive mandatory sustainability reporting framework globally. In January 2026, the EU adopted the Omnibus Directive, which narrowed the scope of CSRD applicability while maintaining core disclosure requirements. This guide addresses the updated regulatory landscape, implementation requirements, and compliance roadmap for affected organizations.

As of March 2026, the reporting timeline is:

- **2024-2025:** Large listed companies (initially 500+ employees) begin first CSRD disclosures (reporting 2024 data)
- **2025-2026:** Mid-cap listed companies (250+ employees) begin disclosures
- **2026-2027:** SMEs and non-EU companies with significant EU operations transition to CSRD

## EU CSRD Overview: Scope and Timeline After Omnibus Amendment

### Original CSRD Scope (Pre-Omnibus)

The original CSRD directive proposed coverage of:

- All large companies (>250 employees or €50M revenue/€25M assets)
- All EU-listed companies (with limited exceptions)
- Non-EU companies with significant EU revenue (>€150M EU-generated revenue)

### 2026 Omnibus Amendment: Narrowed Scope

The January 2026 Omnibus Directive reduced applicability through several mechanisms:

| Company Category       | Original CSRD                          | Post-Omnibus                                         |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Large Listed Companies | All (€250M+ revenue OR 500+ employees) | €750M+ revenue OR 500+ employees AND 2 of 3 criteria |
| Mid-Cap Listed         | 250+ employees OR €50M+ revenue        | Opt-out provision; delayed timeline                  |
| Small Listed Companies | Covered; proposed exemption            | Exemption confirmed (phase-in timeline)              |
| Private Companies      | Large private companies covered        | Narrowed thresholds; phase-in                        |
| Non-EU Companies       | €150M+ EU revenue threshold            | Clarified nexus; practical application               |

### Estimated Scope After Omnibus

The Omnibus amendments reduce CSRD applicability to approximately 85-90% of original estimates, affecting roughly 15,000-17,000 entities globally (down from ~20,000+ originally projected). Key impacts:

- Many mid-cap listed companies now have opt-out options or delayed timelines
- Large private companies face narrowed thresholds; phase-in timeline extends to 2030
- SME disclosure requirements (if covered) further delayed to 2030
- Non-EU companies with EU operations face clearer but more stringent nexus tests

## European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) Framework

### ESRS Structure: Topical Standards

The European Sustainability Reporting Standards consist of 10 topical standards covering environmental, social, and governance topics:

#### Environmental Standards

- **ESRS E1 (Climate Change):** Governance, strategy, risk management, metrics for GHG emissions (Scope 1, 2, 3), climate targets, capex alignment

- **ESRS E2 (Pollution):** Air, water, soil pollution; hazardous substances management; remediation efforts
- **ESRS E3 (Water and Marine Resources):** Water consumption, stress assessment, quality, biodiversity impacts; marine ecosystem protection
- **ESRS E4 (Biodiversity and Ecosystems):** Land use, biodiversity assessments, species protection, ecosystem services, restoration efforts
- **ESRS E5 (Resource Use and Circular Economy):** Material inputs, waste management, circular business models, product lifecycle

## Social Standards

- **ESRS S1 (Own Workforce):** Employment practices, diversity/inclusion, compensation, health/safety, labor rights, training, work-life balance
- **ESRS S2 (Value Chain Workers):** Supply chain labor standards, forced labor, child labor, freedom of association, wages, grievance mechanisms
- **ESRS S3 (Affected Communities):** Community relationships, human rights due diligence, land rights, indigenous peoples, stakeholder engagement
- **ESRS S4 (Consumers and End-Users):** Product/service health/safety, data privacy, responsible marketing, access and affordability

## Governance Standard

- **ESRS G1 (Business Conduct):** Board diversity, executive compensation linkage to ESG, anti-corruption programs, tax governance, whistleblower protection, business ethics

## ESRS Implementation Approach: Sustainability Matters

ESRS uses “Sustainability Matters” as the organizing principle—combining three complementary approaches:

### Double Materiality Assessment

- **Financial Materiality:** ESG factors that impact corporate financial performance and investor decision-making
- **Impact Materiality:** Company’s actual or potential impacts on environment and society
- **Integration:** Two-dimensional materiality matrix to identify disclosure priorities

### Disclosure Requirements Structure

For each material ESRS topic, organizations disclose:

- **Governance:** Board/management oversight; strategy integration
- **Strategy:** Business model impacts; risks and opportunities; capital allocation alignment
- **Risk Management:** Identification, assessment, mitigation, and monitoring processes
- **Metrics and Targets:** Key performance metrics; progress toward targets; comparative benchmarks

## Key ESRS Environmental Topics

### Climate Change (ESRS E1): Expanded Requirements

ESRS E1 builds on TCFD recommendations with enhanced requirements:

- **Governance:** Board climate competency; committee oversight; climate expertise assessment
- **Strategy:** Climate targets aligned with science-based methodologies (SBTi); scenario analysis (1.5°C, 2°C, 4°C+ pathways)
- **Capex Alignment:** Investment plans aligned with climate strategy; renewable energy transition commitment
- **Scope 3 Disclosure:** Upstream and downstream emissions; value chain engagement
- **Just Transition:** Employee and community impacts of climate transition; workforce reskilling plans

### **Pollution (ESRS E2): Air, Water, Soil**

- Air emissions (not covered by EU ETS) monitoring and reduction targets
- Hazardous substance management; REACH compliance disclosures
- Water discharge quality; environmental incident disclosures
- Soil and land remediation efforts; liability disclosures

### **Water and Marine Resources (ESRS E3)**

- Water consumption and stress assessment (by geography)
- Water efficiency targets and progress
- Marine ecosystem impacts; ocean plastic prevention
- Interdependencies with supply chain water use

### **Circular Economy and Resource Use (ESRS E5)**

Post-January 2026 EU Taxonomy update (effective January 2026), organizations should disclose:

- Alignment with EU Taxonomy technical screening criteria (updated January 2026)
- Circular business model maturity; product take-back programs
- Material sourcing; recycled content percentages
- Waste reduction targets; landfill diversion rates

## **Key ESRS Social Topics**

### **Own Workforce (ESRS S1)**

- **Diversity:** Board and management diversity by gender, age, professional background; targets and progress
- **Pay Equity:** Gender pay gap; ethnicity pay gap (where applicable); remediation plans
- **Health & Safety:** TRIR, LTIFR rates; high-risk location monitoring; incident investigation effectiveness
- **Training & Development:** Investment in workforce development; skills transition planning
- **Engagement & Retention:** Employee engagement scores; turnover rates; eNPS

### **Value Chain Workers (ESRS S2)**

- **Labor Standards Audits:** % of supply chain audited; audit coverage by geography and risk level

- **Wages and Working Hours:** Living wage assessment; excessive hours monitoring
- **Forced Labor Prevention:** Modern slavery assessments; remediation; grievance mechanisms
- **Child Labor Prevention:** Risk assessment; monitoring; community engagement

### Affected Communities (ESRS S3)

- Community engagement; grievance mechanisms effectiveness
- Human rights due diligence; risk assessments
- Indigenous peoples and land rights; consultation processes
- Community investment; local employment

## ESRS Implementation Roadmap: 2026-2028 Timeline

### Applicability Timeline (Post-Omnibus)

| Phase                          | Applicable Companies                               | First Reporting Year | Publication Year           |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Phase 1 (Large Listed)         | €750M+ revenue + 2 of 3 criteria; 500+ employees   | 2024                 | 2025 (initial disclosures) |
| Phase 2 (Mid-Cap Listed)       | €250M+ revenue/€50M net income OR 500+ employees   | 2025                 | 2026                       |
| Phase 3 (SME Listed)           | Opt-in initially; mandatory delayed                | 2028                 | 2029                       |
| Phase 4 (Large Private/Non-EU) | Large private companies; non-EU with EU operations | 2025-2026            | 2026-2027                  |

### CSRD Implementation Phases (Detailed)

#### Phase 1: Assessment and Governance (Now – Q2 2026)

- Assess CSRD applicability based on updated Omnibus criteria
- Conduct double materiality assessment (financial + impact)
- Establish cross-functional CSRD implementation team
- Designate governance owner; board-level awareness training
- Begin data mapping for required metrics

#### Phase 2: Framework and Process Development (Q2 – Q3 2026)

- Document materiality assessment methodology and results
- Identify material ESRS topics and disclosure requirements
- Develop sustainability data governance framework
- Implement systems for metric collection and validation
- Engage with auditors/assurance providers on EDD requirements

#### Phase 3: Data Collection and Analysis (Q3 – Q4 2026)

- Collect GHG emissions data (Scope 1, 2, 3 where material)

- Gather employee diversity, safety, pay equity metrics
- Supply chain labor standards audit compilation
- Assessment of governance structure and business ethics program
- Quality assurance and data validation processes

#### **Phase 4: Disclosure and Assurance (Q4 2026 – Q1 2027)**

- Draft CSRD-aligned sustainability statement (integrated with annual report)
- Double assurance: integrated assurance provider review
- EU Taxonomy assessment (if applicable) and disclosure
- Board-level approval and sign-off on disclosures
- Publication of annual report with integrated ESRS disclosures

## **CSRD Disclosure Integration with Financial Reporting**

### **Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD) Transition**

CSRD replaces the NFRD (Directive 2014/95/EU). Key transition aspects:

- CSRD is significantly more prescriptive and detailed than NFRD
- Double materiality requirement is new; impacts topic coverage
- ESRS provide specific metrics and KPIs (unlike flexible NFRD guidance)
- Assurance requirements strengthened; “Limited Assurance” minimum, escalating to “Reasonable” by 2028-2030

### **Integrated Reporting: Connecting Sustainability to Financial Statements**

CSRD requires sustainability statement integrated with annual report. Key linkages:

- **Environmental Liabilities:** Ecological remediation costs; environmental provisions linked to balance sheet
- **Climate Scenario Impacts:** Potential financial impacts quantified; asset impairment testing
- **Supply Chain Risk:** Contingent liabilities; impairment risks linked to supply chain disruption
- **Human Capital:** Personnel costs; pension obligations; workforce value creation

## **Assurance Requirements Under CSRD**

### **Assurance Timeline**

CSRD assurance requirements phase in over time:

- **2025 (Large Listed – 2024 data):** Limited assurance by statutory auditor OR independent assurance provider
- **2026 onwards:** Assurance providers must be independent (not primary financial auditor)
- **2028 onwards:** Transition to “Reasonable Assurance” for specified disclosure areas

## Assurance Scope

Assurance should cover:

- Completeness of material ESRS topic disclosures
- Accuracy and reliability of reported metrics and KPIs
- Consistency with underlying governance and processes
- Alignment with CSRD and ESRS requirements
- EU Taxonomy alignment disclosure (if applicable)

## Frequently Asked Questions

How did the January 2026 Omnibus amendment affect CSRD scope?

The Omnibus amendment narrowed CSRD applicability by raising size thresholds (€750M+ revenue), offering opt-out options for some mid-cap listed companies, and delaying SME requirements to 2030. The scope was reduced from ~20,000+ entities to approximately 15,000-17,000 entities (85-90% of original estimates).

Are non-EU companies subject to CSRD?

Non-EU companies are subject to CSRD if they have a significant EU nexus. Applicability is determined by EU revenue threshold (post-Omnibus clarification) or listing on EU exchanges. Non-EU companies should assess their specific situation based on updated guidance from their relevant competent authority.

What is double materiality and why is it important?

Double materiality assesses both financial materiality (how ESG factors impact company) and impact materiality (how company impacts environment/society). This comprehensive approach ensures disclosures address both investor needs and broader stakeholder interests, supporting sustainable business practices.

Is Scope 3 emissions disclosure required under ESRS E1?

ESRS E1 requires Scope 1 and 2 emissions universally. Scope 3 is required if material based on double materiality assessment. For many organizations, Scope 3 is material and required. Measurement should follow GHG Protocol methodology.

How does CSRD align with ISSB standards?

CSRD and ESRS are complementary to ISSB standards. Both use double materiality and investor-centric frameworks. ESRS provides more granular requirements on specific topics (e.g., pollution, supply chain labor) not covered in ISSB. Organizations can achieve both ISSB and CSRD compliance with aligned disclosure strategies.

What happens to companies that miss CSRD deadlines?

Non-compliance with CSRD triggers regulatory enforcement actions, including fines and potential disclosure suspension. The CSRD is enforced by national competent authorities (financial regulators) with power to impose penalties. Early compliance is advisable to avoid enforcement actions and maintain investor confidence.

## Conclusion

The EU CSRD and ESRS framework, refined by the January 2026 Omnibus amendment, represents the most comprehensive mandatory sustainability reporting regime globally. While the Omnibus narrowed scope to approximately 85-90% of original estimates, affected organizations face stringent disclosure requirements grounded in double materiality and integrated with financial reporting. Organizations subject to CSRD should prioritize materiality assessment, establish robust data governance, and plan for phased implementation aligned with applicable timelines. Early action strengthens governance maturity, supports data quality, and demonstrates leadership to investors and stakeholders.

**Publisher:** BC ESG at [bcesg.org](https://bcesg.org)

**Published:** March 18, 2026

**Category:** Sustainability Reporting

## EU CSRD After the Omnibus: Who Must Report and When (2026 Status)

**Yes, the EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) is still in force, but the Omnibus I “simplification” package adopted on 24 February 2026 dramatically narrowed it: mandatory reporting now applies only to companies with more than 1,000 employees and over EUR 450 million in net turnover, cutting the number of in-scope companies by roughly 80-90% (from about 50,000 to around 5,000). Most remaining large companies (Wave 2/3) now file their first report in 2028 for financial year 2027.**

| Item                         | Before the Omnibus                                                                                                        | After the Omnibus (2026 status)                                                                                    |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| In-scope threshold           | EU companies meeting 2 of 3 criteria: 250+ employees, EUR 40M+ balance sheet, or EUR 50M+ net turnover (plus listed SMEs) | More than 1,000 employees and more than EUR 450M net turnover; listed-SME mandate removed                          |
| Companies in scope           | ~50,000 companies                                                                                                         | ~5,000 companies (roughly 80-90% reduction)                                                                        |
| First reporting year by wave | Wave 1: FY2024 (report 2025); Wave 2: FY2025 (report 2026); Wave 3 / listed SMEs: FY2026 (report 2027)                    | Wave 1: continues for FY2024-2026; Wave 2 & 3: first report in 2028 for FY2027; non-EU groups: 2029 for FY2028     |
| ESRS data points             | ~1,000+ data points, including voluntary disclosures and planned mandatory sector-specific standards                      | Mandatory data points cut ~60-61%; all voluntary data points removed; mandatory sector-specific standards scrapped |
| Assurance                    | Limited assurance, with a legal mandate to move toward reasonable assurance later                                         | Limited assurance only; the path to mandatory reasonable assurance is removed                                      |

## What changed in the 2025 Omnibus

The European Commission published its Omnibus I proposal on 26 February 2025, and the Council formally signed off the final directive on 24 February 2026 (published in the Official Journal on 26 February 2026, in force 18 March 2026). The package made four major changes:

- **Stop-the-clock:** A separate “stop-the-clock” directive (EU 2025/794, published 16 April 2025) postponed reporting by two years for companies not yet reporting (Waves 2 and 3), moving their first reports from

2026/2027 to 2028.

- **Raised thresholds:** Mandatory reporting now applies only to companies with more than 1,000 employees *and* more than EUR 450 million in net annual turnover, replacing the old “2 of 3” test that started at 250 employees.
- **Scope cut:** The higher thresholds remove roughly 80-90% of previously in-scope companies, dropping the population from about 50,000 to around 5,000. Listed SMEs are no longer mandated, and the non-EU (third-country) parent threshold rose to EUR 450 million of EU turnover.
- **ESRS revision:** EFRAG’s simplified standards (draft delegated act published by the Commission in May 2026) cut mandatory data points by about 60-61%, removed all voluntary data points, and eliminated the obligation to develop mandatory sector-specific standards. The revised ESRS apply from FY2027, with optional early application from FY2026.

## What is still required

CSRD was simplified, not repealed. Companies that remain in scope still face substantive obligations:

- **Double materiality:** The core principle stays. Companies must still report on how sustainability issues affect the business and how the business affects people and the environment.
- **ESRS-based disclosures:** In-scope companies report against the (slimmed-down) European Sustainability Reporting Standards, including climate, governance, and material ESG topics.
- **Limited assurance:** Sustainability reports must still be checked under a limited-assurance standard from the first year of application.
- **Digital tagging:** Disclosures must still be machine-readable (digitally tagged) and published in the management report.
- **Wave 1 continuity:** Original Wave 1 companies that already started reporting generally continue for FY2024-2026, though member states may exempt those that fall below the new thresholds.

## Frequently Asked Questions

### Is CSRD still happening?

Yes. CSRD remains EU law and was not repealed. The 2026 Omnibus I package simplified and narrowed it, raising the size thresholds, delaying reporting deadlines, and cutting the number of required data points, but the directive, its double-materiality requirement, and ESRS-based reporting all remain in force for the largest companies.

### Who is exempt after the Omnibus?

Companies with 1,000 or fewer employees, or with EUR 450 million or less in net turnover, fall outside mandatory CSRD scope. Listed small and medium-sized enterprises are no longer required to report, and many mid-sized companies that were originally captured (those above the old 250-employee line) are now exempt. Roughly 80-90% of previously in-scope companies are removed.

### When is the first CSRD report due?

It depends on the wave. Wave 1 companies (already reporting under the old NFRD) published their first reports in 2025 for financial year 2024 and continue through FY2026. Waves 2 and 3 now file their first CSRD report

in 2028, covering financial year 2027. Non-EU parent groups report from 2029 for FY2028.

### Does CSRD apply to US companies?

It can. A non-EU company (including a US parent) is caught if its group generates more than EUR 450 million in net turnover in the EU and it has an EU subsidiary or branch above the relevant size threshold (a branch with more than EUR 50 million turnover, or a subsidiary that is itself a large EU company). These third-country groups report from 2029 for financial year 2028. The Omnibus raised the EU-turnover trigger from EUR 150 million to EUR 450 million, so fewer US companies are now in scope.

### How many companies are still in scope of CSRD?

Approximately 5,000 companies, down from an estimated 50,000 under the original directive. The higher thresholds (1,000+ employees and EUR 450M+ turnover) account for the roughly 80-90% reduction in the in-scope population.

### What level of assurance does CSRD require now?

Limited assurance, the same standard required since the directive took effect. The Omnibus removed the previous legal requirement for the Commission to escalate to reasonable assurance later, so reasonable assurance is no longer on the mandatory roadmap. The deadline for the Commission to adopt limited-assurance standards was pushed to July 2027.

Related: Sustainability Reporting: The Complete Professional Guide (2026).

## Mid-Market ESG Disclosure Templates (GRI / ISSB-Aligned)

Source: <https://bcesg.org/mid-market-esg-disclosure-templates/> Published: August 27, 2026

Last verified: August 22, 2026. By Will Tygart. A copy-ready skeleton for CRE operators — not a 200-page enterprise report.

**Copy each section into the board or investor pack. Replace the brackets. Link evidence in an appendix** (use the lender evidence pack as the index).

### Template A — one-page board ESG snapshot

- **Scope:** entities, geographies, % GFA covered
- **Material topics (max 6):** e.g. energy/GHG, physical climate, safety, tenants, vendors, governance
- **KPIs this period:** EUI, emissions (method noted), incidents, filing status (LL97 if NYC)
- **Top 3 risks / opportunities**
- **Decisions needed from the board**
- **Next-quarter milestones**

### Template B — climate section (ISSB S2-style headings)

- Governance of climate risks
- Strategy: physical + transition impacts on the portfolio
- Risk-management process

- Metrics and targets (intensity, absolute if available, 2030 pathway)
- CapEx alignment note

The longer ISSB implementation walkthrough already lives at ISSB IFRS S1 and S2: implementation guide. This page is the operator skeleton, not a second pillar.

## Template C — controls and data

| Metric                   | Definition                           | Source system  | Owner | Assurance          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------|--------------------|
| Energy                   | intensity / total                    | ESPM / utility |       | none / limited     |
| GHG                      | method + factors                     |                |       |                    |
| Water                    |                                      |                |       |                    |
| Safety                   |                                      |                |       |                    |
| NYC LL97 (if applicable) | filed / grace / extension / over cap | BEAM / ESPM    |       | RDP-certified file |

## Template D — what we are not claiming

Write the non-claims in the same pack. No net-zero sentence without a pathway. No “GRESB leader” language without the score and year. This is how you reduce greenwash risk without a law firm rewriting the PDF.

Related: GRESB scoring levers · ratings compared.

**Related reading:** IFRS S1 and S2 disclosure checklist, lender and investor evidence pack, and GRESB scoring levers. Sister hubs: Restoration Intel, Healthcare Facility Hub, Continuity Hub, Risk Coverage Hub, and Tygart Media.

## Disaster Recovery Plan for Buildings & IT (2026 Framework)

Source: <https://bcesg.org/disaster-recovery-plan-complete-framework-2026/> Published: June 21, 2026

Updated October 6, 2026. By Will Tygart.

**If you operate commercial real estate, a property-management stack, or hybrid IT that keeps a building running, this is the recovery framework.** It covers business impact analysis, RTO/RPO by system tier, hot/warm/cold/cloud sites, ransomware and failover, and the runbooks a team can actually execute. If you need a portfolio operator playbook (life safety, tenants, vendors, claims), start with Disaster Recovery for Commercial Real Estate Portfolios and come back here for the IT spine.

## RTO / RPO tiers for a CRE and PM stack

| Tier                  | Examples                                                                 | RTO          | RPO       | Strategy                    |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| 1 – Mission critical  | Access control, fire/life safety, emergency comms, payment/lease systems | Under 1 hour | Near-zero | Hot site / sync replication |
| 2 – Business critical | Work-order, tenant portal, email, identity provider                      | 4-8 hours    | 1-4 hours | Warm site / async           |

| Tier             | Examples                   | RTO         | RPO      | Strategy            |
|------------------|----------------------------|-------------|----------|---------------------|
| 3 – Support      | HR, reporting, development | 24-72 hours | 24 hours | Cold site / backups |
| 4 – Non-critical | Archives, test             | 1 week+     | Weekly   | Offsite restore     |

**Operating buildings?** Use the CRE specialized guide as the operator start. This URL stays the IT/framework spine. Continuity Hub holds ISO-centric BIA tooling. Restoration after the event: [restorationintel.com](https://restorationintel.com).

## FAQ

### What org structure does IT disaster recovery need?

Name a recovery owner and an alternate for every Tier 1 system. Separate incident commander (business) from technical lead (IT). Pre-authorize vendor after-hours contacts. If the identity provider is in the cloud, the on-prem building stack is in the same blast radius – put identity on the same tier as access control.

### What belongs in a disaster recovery plan for business data?

RPO by system, backup immutability, restore-test evidence, and who can declare a ransomware event. Backups are not the plan. The plan is detection, declaration, restore order, integrity check, then return to production.

### Is disaster recovery the same as business continuity?

No. DR restores systems. BC keeps the business operating (people, tenants, vendors, communications). See the hotel BCP and property-management BCP.

### What about ransomware and auto-failover in 2026?

Treat ransomware as a declared disaster with a separate runbook: isolate, preserve forensics, restore from immutable backups, do not fail over a dirty replica. Auto-failover is for infrastructure loss, not for encryption events.

### Who should own this on a CRE board?

Operational resilience is a governance metric. Point the board to CRE ESG programs and the climate physical-risk guide so DR is not parked as an IT policy.

Every organization operates under the assumption that its systems will be available tomorrow. A **disaster recovery plan** exists to protect the organization when that assumption fails. Whether the trigger is a ransomware attack encrypting production databases, a hurricane flooding a data center, or a cascading cloud outage pulling dependent services offline, the distance between an organization that recovers in hours and one that never fully recovers is a documented, tested, and funded disaster recovery framework.

In 2026, the stakes have escalated. Hybrid IT architectures have multiplied the interdependencies between cloud and on-premises systems. Regulatory bodies across finance, healthcare, and real estate have moved from recommending disaster recovery to mandating it with audit trails. ESG frameworks now treat operational resilience as a governance metric, making **business disaster recovery** a boardroom concern rather than an IT department afterthought.

This guide provides the complete framework: from the foundational analysis that determines what to protect, through the technical architectures that enable recovery, to the testing and governance protocols that ensure the

plan actually works when invoked.

## What a Disaster Recovery Plan Actually Covers

**Definition:** A **disaster recovery plan (DRP)** is a documented, structured set of procedures for restoring IT systems, applications, and data to an operational state after a disruptive event. It specifies recovery priorities, technical procedures, team responsibilities, and communication protocols, all calibrated to predefined recovery objectives.

A disaster recovery plan is not a backup strategy. Backups are one component. The plan encompasses the full recovery lifecycle: detection and declaration of a disaster, activation of recovery procedures, restoration of systems in priority order, validation of data integrity, and return to normal operations. It assigns ownership at every stage and defines the decision authority for escalation.

The scope of a modern **IT disaster recovery plan** includes:

- **Infrastructure recovery:** Servers, networks, storage, and virtualization platforms
- **Application recovery:** Business-critical applications restored in dependency order
- **Data recovery:** Database restoration, transaction log replay, and data validation
- **Communication recovery:** Voice, email, collaboration tools, and emergency notification systems
- **Facility recovery:** Alternate work locations, building management systems, and physical access controls
- **Third-party recovery:** Vendor dependencies, SaaS platforms, and cloud service continuity

The DRP operates as a subset of the broader business continuity plan, which covers non-technical recovery functions including personnel, supply chain, and customer communications.

## Business Impact Analysis: The Foundation You Cannot Skip

**Definition:** A **Business Impact Analysis (BIA)** is a systematic process that identifies and evaluates the potential effects of an interruption to critical business operations. It quantifies financial loss, regulatory exposure, reputational damage, and operational degradation across time horizons to establish recovery priorities.

Every disaster recovery plan begins with a Business Impact Analysis. Without a BIA, recovery priorities are based on assumptions and politics rather than measured business impact. The BIA produces three outputs that directly shape the DRP:

### Critical Process Identification

The BIA maps every business process to its supporting technology systems and quantifies the cost of downtime per hour, per day, and per week. This is not a theoretical exercise. It requires input from business unit leaders who can articulate actual revenue impact, contractual penalties, regulatory fines, and customer attrition rates tied to specific system outages.

### Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO)

**Definition:** **Recovery Time Objective (RTO)** is the maximum acceptable duration between a disruption and the restoration of a system to operational status. **Recovery Point Objective (RPO)** is the maximum acceptable amount of data loss measured in time – the point to which data must be recovered

after a disruption.

RTO and RPO are the two metrics that govern every technical decision in the disaster recovery framework. They are not interchangeable, and they must be set independently for each system tier:

| System Tier                | Examples                                                           | RTO Target  | RPO Target | Recovery Strategy                    |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------------|
| Tier 1 – Mission Critical  | Financial transactions, emergency systems, building access control | < 1 hour    | Near-zero  | Hot site / synchronous replication   |
| Tier 2 – Business Critical | ERP, email, CRM, tenant management platforms                       | 4-8 hours   | 1-4 hours  | Warm site / asynchronous replication |
| Tier 3 – Business Support  | HR systems, internal portals, development environments             | 24-72 hours | 24 hours   | Cold site / scheduled backups        |
| Tier 4 – Non-Critical      | Archived data, legacy systems, test environments                   | 1 week+     | Weekly     | Offsite backup restoration           |

The fatal mistake is setting uniform RTOs across all systems. A Tier 1 recovery architecture costs ten to fifty times more than Tier 3. Applying Tier 1 standards to Tier 3 systems wastes budget. Applying Tier 3 standards to Tier 1 systems creates existential risk. The BIA prevents both errors. For a broader view of how risk assessment feeds into these tiering decisions, see the complete risk assessment guide.

## Recovery Site Strategies: Hot, Warm, Cold, Cloud, and DRaaS

The **disaster recovery framework** must specify where systems will be recovered. In 2026, organizations typically deploy a combination of strategies matched to system tiers.

### Hot Site

A hot site is a fully operational duplicate of the production environment, running live with real-time data replication. Failover is near-instantaneous – often automated. Hot sites deliver RTOs measured in minutes and RPOs approaching zero. The cost is substantial: you are paying for a fully provisioned environment that sits idle during normal operations. Hot sites are justified only for Tier 1 systems where the cost of downtime exceeds the cost of the standby infrastructure.

### Warm Site

A warm site has the hardware and network infrastructure pre-provisioned but does not run production workloads in real time. Data is replicated asynchronously, introducing a gap between the last replicated transaction and the point of failure. Activation requires loading current data and starting services – typically achievable in 4 to 12 hours. Warm sites balance cost against recovery speed for Tier 2 systems. For guidance on selecting between these options, disaster recovery site selection covers geographic, regulatory, and infrastructure considerations.

### Cold Site

A cold site provides physical space, power, and network connectivity but no pre-installed equipment. Recovery requires shipping, installing, and configuring hardware before data restoration can begin. RTOs are measured in days to weeks. Cold sites are appropriate for Tier 3 and Tier 4 systems or as a last-resort fallback if primary and

secondary recovery sites are both compromised.

## Cloud Disaster Recovery and DRaaS

**Definition: Disaster Recovery as a Service (DRaaS)** is a cloud-based managed service that replicates and hosts an organization's physical or virtual servers, providing failover to a cloud environment in the event of a disaster. The provider manages the recovery infrastructure, replication, and often the failover orchestration.

Cloud DR has become the default recovery strategy for organizations without the capital or operational capacity to maintain dedicated recovery sites. Cloud DR and DRaaS platforms offer compelling advantages: elastic scaling (pay for full compute only during a declared disaster), geographic redundancy across multiple regions, and API-driven automation that enables recovery orchestration.

The risk in 2026 is concentration. When the primary production environment runs in AWS, Azure, or Google Cloud and the disaster recovery environment runs in the same provider – or even the same region – a provider-level outage eliminates both. The 2024 and 2025 cascading cloud outages demonstrated that multi-region does not always mean multi-fate. Organizations with aggressive RTOs should consider multi-cloud DR or a hybrid model with on-premises fallback for Tier 1 systems.

## Hybrid IT Considerations: The Cascading Dependency Problem

Most enterprise IT environments in 2026 are hybrid: a mix of on-premises infrastructure, private cloud, public cloud IaaS/PaaS, and SaaS applications. The **IT disaster recovery plan** must account for the interdependencies between these layers.

A cloud outage does not stay in the cloud. When the identity provider runs in Azure and the on-premises applications authenticate through it, an Azure outage takes down on-premises applications that are otherwise fully functional. When the SD-WAN controller runs in AWS and branch office routing depends on it, an AWS outage fragments the corporate network. These cascading failures are the defining challenge of hybrid DR planning.

The mitigation approach requires:

- **Dependency mapping:** Documenting every cross-environment dependency – not just direct integrations but transitive dependencies (System A depends on System B, which depends on Cloud Service C)
- **Isolation boundaries:** Designing systems so that a failure in one environment does not propagate. This means local caching of authentication tokens, DNS failover independent of cloud providers, and fallback routing that does not depend on cloud-hosted controllers
- **SLA stacking analysis:** Understanding that when you chain five services each with 99.9% uptime, the composite availability is 99.5% – and the DR plan must cover the gap
- **Multi-vendor resilience:** Avoiding single-provider dependency for services that underpin the entire technology stack

This complexity is why the operational resilience discipline has emerged alongside traditional disaster recovery – it focuses on end-to-end service delivery rather than individual system recovery.

## Compliance Frameworks: ISO 22301, NIST SP 800-34, and DORA

Disaster recovery planning in 2026 operates within an increasingly prescriptive regulatory environment. Three frameworks dominate.

### **ISO 22301: Business Continuity Management Systems**

ISO 22301 is the international standard for business continuity management, including disaster recovery. It requires organizations to establish a BCMS (Business Continuity Management System) with documented policies, BIA, risk assessment, recovery strategies, incident response procedures, and a testing program. Certification requires external audit. For organizations in commercial real estate and financial services, ISO 22301 certification is increasingly a contractual requirement from tenants, investors, and insurers. The broader ESG regulatory landscape is accelerating this trend.

### **NIST SP 800-34: Contingency Planning Guide**

NIST Special Publication 800-34 provides the U.S. federal government’s framework for IT contingency planning, which extends to any organization doing business with federal agencies. It defines seven steps: develop the contingency planning policy, conduct the BIA, identify preventive controls, create contingency strategies, develop the contingency plan, test and exercise the plan, and maintain the plan. NIST 800-34 is particularly relevant for organizations managing critical infrastructure or government-contracted facilities.

### **DORA: Digital Operational Resilience Act**

The EU’s Digital Operational Resilience Act, fully enforceable since January 2025, applies to financial entities and their critical ICT third-party providers. DORA mandates specific disaster recovery requirements including documented recovery plans, regular testing with results reported to regulators, and explicit third-party risk management for cloud and technology providers. U.S. organizations with EU financial sector clients or operations must comply. DORA’s testing requirements go beyond previous standards – it requires threat-led penetration testing and advanced scenario testing that simulates sophisticated attack chains.

Aligning the DRP to these frameworks simultaneously is achievable because they share common structural elements. The practical approach is to build the DRP to the most stringent requirement across all applicable frameworks, then map compliance evidence to each standard’s specific documentation requirements. Understanding governance and ESG integration helps contextualize why these compliance frameworks are converging.

## **The Disaster Recovery Plan Document: Structure and Content**

A **disaster recovery plan** that exists only as a high-level policy document will fail in execution. The plan must be operationally specific. The following sections represent the minimum content for an actionable DRP.

### **Plan Activation and Disaster Declaration**

Define the criteria for declaring a disaster and activating the plan. Specify who has authority to declare (primary and alternates), the communication chain for notification, and the thresholds that distinguish a disaster from a routine incident. A common failure: the plan exists but nobody knows when to invoke it, so a slow-developing disaster goes unrecognized until recovery options have narrowed.

### **Runbooks and Recovery Workflows**

Each system tier requires a detailed runbook: step-by-step technical procedures for recovery, written for the competence level of the person who will execute them under stress. Runbooks must include:

- Pre-conditions and dependencies (what must be recovered first)
- Credentials and access procedures (stored securely, accessible during outage)
- Validation steps (how to confirm the system is recovered correctly)
- Rollback procedures (what to do if recovery introduces errors)
- Estimated time for each step

Recovery workflows sequence the runbooks across systems according to dependency order and priority tier. A building management platform cannot be recovered before the network and authentication systems it depends on.

## **Team Assignments and Escalation Procedures**

Every recovery task must have a named owner with a documented alternate. The plan must include a communication tree that works when primary communication channels are down – because the disaster may have taken those channels down too. Out-of-band communication methods (personal cell phones, satellite phones for critical scenarios, pre-configured messaging apps) must be specified and current. Escalation criteria define when a team lead elevates to management, when management elevates to executive leadership, and when external resources (vendors, regulators, law enforcement) are engaged.

## **Communication Procedures**

Internal communication to staff, external communication to customers and partners, regulatory notification requirements, media handling protocols, and status update cadences must all be pre-scripted. During a disaster, drafting communications from scratch wastes time and introduces messaging errors. Templates should be prepared, reviewed by legal, and stored in the DRP alongside the technical runbooks.

## **Testing the Disaster Recovery Plan**

An untested disaster recovery plan is a hypothesis. Regular DR testing transforms it into demonstrated capability. Three testing levels serve different purposes.

### **Tabletop Exercises**

Tabletop exercises gather the recovery team around a scenario and walk through the plan verbally. No systems are actually failed over. The value is in identifying gaps in the plan document, unclear responsibilities, and outdated procedures. Tabletop exercises are low-cost and low-risk – they should be conducted quarterly.

### **Technical Failover Tests**

Failover tests execute actual recovery procedures for specific systems in a controlled environment. Data replication is validated, recovery scripts are run, and RTOs are measured against targets. These tests reveal whether the technical procedures work and whether the stated RTOs are achievable. Semi-annual technical tests are the minimum for Tier 1 and Tier 2 systems.

### **Full-Scale Simulations**

A full-scale simulation declares a disaster and activates the entire plan – including personnel mobilization, communication procedures, and parallel recovery of all systems. This is the only test that validates the plan end-to-end, including the human coordination elements that tabletop exercises cannot fully simulate. Annual full-scale simulations are the standard for organizations subject to regulatory audit.

Every test must produce a documented after-action report. The report identifies what worked, what failed, what took longer than planned, and what has changed since the last test. Plan updates driven by test findings must be completed within 30 days of the exercise.

## Disaster Recovery for Commercial Real Estate

Commercial real estate properties present unique DR challenges that generic IT frameworks do not fully address. Building operations depend on specialized systems – HVAC controls, elevator management, fire and life safety systems, access control, and energy management platforms – that have their own recovery requirements and interdependencies.

### Building Management Systems (BMS)

Modern BMS platforms are IP-networked and increasingly cloud-connected. A network outage or cyber attack can disable environmental controls across an entire portfolio. The DRP must address BMS failover to local control modes, manual override procedures for critical safety systems, and the priority sequence for restoring automated building controls. Understanding NYC building compliance requirements is essential for properties in the city’s regulatory environment.

### Tenant Operations and Data Center Considerations

Properties housing tenant data centers or providing managed connectivity services have contractual SLAs that create binding recovery obligations. The DRP must align building-level recovery (power, cooling, network) with tenant-level expectations. This requires coordination between the property management team’s DR plan and each tenant’s DR plan – a process that should be formalized in lease agreements and tested jointly.

### Portfolio-Level Recovery Prioritization

Real estate organizations with multi-property portfolios must prioritize recovery across properties, not just across systems within a single property. A regional disaster affecting multiple buildings simultaneously forces triage decisions. The BIA should extend to property-level impact analysis: which buildings generate the most revenue, house the most critical tenants, or face the most severe regulatory consequences if operations are disrupted. Property-level risk assessment informs this prioritization, and property insurance structures should align with recovery tier assignments.

## ESG and Governance: Disaster Recovery as a Board-Level Imperative

Disaster recovery has moved from the server room to the boardroom. ESG reporting frameworks now treat operational resilience as a governance indicator. Investors evaluate disaster recovery maturity as a proxy for management quality and climate risk preparedness.

The governance dimension includes:

- **Board oversight:** The board or a designated committee must review and approve the DRP, receive regular testing reports, and be briefed on material changes to the risk landscape

- **Budget accountability:** DR funding must be adequate to meet the RTOs and RPOs established by the BIA. Underfunding the DRP while reporting resilience to stakeholders is a governance failure
- **Third-party governance:** Vendor and cloud provider disaster recovery capabilities must be assessed, contractually documented, and periodically validated. Catastrophe modeling can quantify the financial exposure when third-party recovery fails
- **Regulatory compliance:** Maintaining current compliance with all applicable DR mandates and reporting obligations
- **Disclosure:** Accurately representing DR capabilities and material risks in ESG reports, investor communications, and regulatory filings

The ESG metrics relevant to disaster recovery include mean time to recovery (MTTR), DR test pass rates, percentage of critical systems covered by tested recovery procedures, and time since last full-scale simulation. These metrics belong in the governance dashboard alongside financial and environmental performance indicators.

## Building and Maintaining the Disaster Recovery Framework

A disaster recovery plan is not a one-time project. It is a living operational document that must evolve with the organization's technology environment, risk landscape, and regulatory obligations. The maintenance cycle includes:

- **Quarterly reviews:** Update contact lists, verify credentials, confirm infrastructure changes are reflected in runbooks
- **Post-change updates:** Any significant infrastructure change – new application deployment, cloud migration, office relocation, merger or acquisition – triggers a DRP review and update
- **Annual BIA refresh:** Business priorities shift, new systems are deployed, regulatory requirements change. The BIA must be refreshed annually, and RTO/RPO targets must be revalidated
- **Post-incident reviews:** Any actual disaster or near-miss event produces lessons learned that feed back into the plan
- **Regulatory monitoring:** Track changes to applicable compliance frameworks and adjust the DRP accordingly

The disaster recovery planning lifecycle provides a structured approach to this ongoing maintenance, ensuring that the plan reflects current reality rather than historical assumptions.

For organizations in the hospitality and commercial property sector, business continuity in the hotel industry illustrates how these principles apply to properties with 24/7 occupancy and guest safety obligations.

## Frequently Asked Questions

### What is the difference between a disaster recovery plan and a business continuity plan?

A disaster recovery plan focuses specifically on restoring IT systems, data, and technology infrastructure after a disruption. A business continuity plan is broader, covering all operational functions including personnel, facilities, supply chains, and communications. The disaster recovery plan is a subset of the business continuity plan. Organizations need both: the BCP ensures the business keeps running during a disruption, while the DRP

ensures the technology backbone is restored within acceptable timeframes defined by RTO and RPO metrics.

### **How often should a disaster recovery plan be tested?**

Best practice calls for tabletop exercises quarterly, technical failover tests semi-annually, and full-scale disaster recovery simulations annually. Critical systems with aggressive RTOs may require monthly validation. ISO 22301 and NIST SP 800-34 both mandate regular testing with documented results. After any major infrastructure change, merger, or new regulatory requirement, an additional out-of-cycle test should be performed. Organizations subject to DORA must demonstrate testing results to regulators.

### **What RTO and RPO values should my organization target?**

RTO and RPO targets depend on the criticality of each system as determined by a Business Impact Analysis. Tier 1 critical systems (financial transactions, emergency communications) typically require an RTO of under 1 hour and an RPO of near-zero. Tier 2 important systems (email, ERP) usually target 4-8 hour RTO with 1-4 hour RPO. Tier 3 standard systems may tolerate 24-72 hour RTO with 24-hour RPO. The key is aligning recovery targets with actual business impact – not aspirational goals that the budget cannot support.

### **Is cloud-based disaster recovery sufficient, or do I still need on-premises recovery capabilities?**

Cloud-based DR and DRaaS solutions are sufficient for many workloads, but a hybrid approach is safer for most enterprises in 2026. Cloud DR offers rapid scalability and geographic redundancy, but introduces dependencies on internet connectivity, cloud provider availability, and third-party SLAs. Organizations with strict regulatory requirements, latency-sensitive applications, or operations in areas with unreliable connectivity should maintain on-premises recovery capabilities for critical systems. The 2024-2025 wave of major cloud outages demonstrated that cloud-only DR strategies carry concentration risk.

More in NYC Business Continuity and About BC ESG.

**Related reading:** Disaster recovery for CRE portfolios, LL97 continuity and insurance, and the Restoration Carbon Protocol. Sister hubs: Restoration Intel, Healthcare Facility Hub, Continuity Hub, Risk Coverage Hub, and Tygart Media.

## **New York Just Rewrote Its Climate Law: What the May 2026 CLCPA Amendment Means for Buildings**

Source: <https://bcesg.org/clcpa-amendment-may-2026-buildings/> Published: June 9, 2026

Updated October 6, 2026.

**If you own or operate large NYC buildings, the May 2026 CLCPA amendment changed New York State climate milestones — separate from Local Law 97 — and this guide explains what shifted for building owners.**

**On May 26, 2026, Governor Hochul signed a state budget bill that amended New York’s landmark climate law itself: the CLCPA’s 2030 milestone — a 40% emissions cut below 1990 levels — is gone, replaced by a 2040 target of 60% qualified by “to the maximum extent feasible and cost effective.”** The 2050 milestone (85% below 1990) survives, DEC’s deadline to issue implementing regulations moves to December 31, 2028, the state switches its greenhouse gas accounting from a 20-year to a 100-year global

warming potential timeframe (which reduces how heavily methane counts), and the same budget allocates more than \$450 million toward reducing building emissions — retrofits, heat pumps, and efficiency (BCLP client alert).

For anyone who owns, manages, or occupies commercial buildings in New York, the practical question is what actually changed about your obligations. The short answer: less than the headlines suggest — and nothing at all if your buildings are in the five boroughs.

## What changed on May 26

| Provision                    | Before                    | After                                                                        |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2030 milestone               | 40% below 1990 by 2030    | Removed                                                                      |
| Interim target               | —                         | 60% below 1990 by 2040, “to the maximum extent feasible and cost effective”  |
| 2050 milestone               | 85% below 1990            | Unchanged                                                                    |
| DEC implementing regulations | Due Dec 31, 2024 (missed) | Due Dec 31, 2028                                                             |
| GHG accounting               | 20-year GWP               | 100-year GWP (methane counts for less)                                       |
| Building money               | —                         | \$450M+ for building-emissions reduction (retrofits, heat pumps, efficiency) |

## What did NOT change (this is the part that matters operationally)

- **NYC Local Law 97 is untouched.** LL97 is a city law, not a CLCPA regulation — and the state’s highest court already ruled in *Glen Oaks v. City of New York* (May 22, 2025, unappealable) that the CLCPA does not preempt it. The \$268/ton penalties, the May 1 reporting cycle, and the 2030 cap tightening that roughly 57% of covered buildings currently exceed: all fully in force. If anything, the state softening its own milestone makes LL97 more important as the binding constraint on NYC buildings.
- **The Part 253 Mandatory GHG Reporting Rule stands.** Finalized December 2025: facilities emitting 10,000+ tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year, fuel suppliers, electric power entities, and large waste operations track calendar-year-2026 emissions now, with first reports due **June 1, 2027** (DEC). Most commercial buildings fall below the threshold, but the fuel suppliers serving them do not — which is how a future carbon price reaches your operating budget.
- **Cap-and-invest remains pending, not canceled** — launch expectations sit in late 2026–2027, with litigation over DEC’s rulemaking timeline still moving through the courts.
- **The All-Electric Buildings Act is still in legal limbo, not repealed** — enforcement is suspended under a November 2025 stipulation until roughly four months after the Second Circuit rules on the appeal of the decision upholding it.
- **The 2025 NYS Energy Code** (effective December 31, 2025, statewide, no grace period) continues to govern every permit application — including all of Nassau and Suffolk.

## What this means for each seat at the table

| If you are the...           | The May 26 amendment means...                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Owner                       | No relief on LL97 — your binding constraint is city law and it just became the strictest thing on your calendar by a wider margin. The new \$450M+ building-decarbonization pot is worth watching as it is programmed: it is retrofit money, and the 2030 LL97 cliff is a retrofit problem.                                                                                       |
| Facility / property manager | Your compliance calendar is unchanged: LL97/LL84 filings, Part 253 if you run a 10,000+ tCO <sub>2</sub> e facility (hospitals and campuses, check your number), Energy Code on every permit. The state milestone was never your filing obligation — do not let anyone in a budget meeting tell you “New York rolled back climate rules” as a reason to defer the retrofit study. |
| Tenant (corporate occupier) | Your disclosure obligations live in SB 253, CSRD, and the GHG Protocol — none of them New York state law, none of them affected. The state’s 100-year GWP switch does not change how your corporate inventory counts methane under the GHG Protocol.                                                                                                                              |

## The honest read

The amendment is a genuine softening of state ambition — removing a statutory 2030 milestone and adding “feasible and cost effective” qualifiers is not nothing, and environmental groups have said so loudly. But for building operators the regulatory architecture that actually bills you — LL97 penalties, LL84 filings, the Energy Code, Part 253’s reporting machinery, and the coming fuel-supplier carbon costs — survived intact. New York’s climate pressure on buildings did not get weaker in May; it got more local. The city, not the state, now owns the strictest line — and the city’s line has a \$268-per-ton number on it.

## Frequently asked questions

### What did the May 2026 CLCPA amendment change?

It removed the CLCPA’s 2030 milestone (40% below 1990), added a 2040 target of 60% qualified by “to the maximum extent feasible and cost effective,” kept the 2050 milestone (85%), moved DEC’s regulations deadline to December 31, 2028, switched GHG accounting to a 100-year GWP timeframe, and allocated over \$450 million to building-emissions reduction.

### Does the CLCPA amendment affect NYC Local Law 97?

No. LL97 is city law, upheld against CLCPA preemption by the Court of Appeals in May 2025. Its penalties, deadlines, and 2030 cap tightening are unchanged.

### Is New York cap-and-invest dead?

No — delayed. Only the Mandatory GHG Reporting Rule (Part 253) has been finalized; the full program is expected in late 2026 or 2027, with litigation ongoing over the state’s rulemaking timeline.

### Does Part 253 reporting apply to my building?

Only if a facility emits 10,000+ metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per year — large hospitals, campuses, and industrial sites, not typical offices. But fuel suppliers report regardless, which is the channel through which carbon costs will reach building operating budgets.

## Did the amendment change the All-Electric Buildings Act?

No. That law remains suspended pending the Second Circuit appeal, under the November 2025 enforcement stipulation — a separate track entirely.

## Sources

- BCLP — New York State Amends the CLCPA (May 2026)
- Glen Oaks Village Owners v. City of New York, NY Court of Appeals No. 42 (2025)
- NYSDEC — Mandatory GHG Reporting (Part 253)
- New York Cap-and-Invest
- Harris Beach Murtha — All-Electric Buildings Act delay stipulation
- NYC DOB — Local Law 97

More in Regulatory Frameworks and About BC ESG.

**Related reading:** how to file Local Law 97, LL84 benchmarking as the LL97 prerequisite, and the Restoration Carbon Protocol. Sister hubs: Restoration Intel, Healthcare Facility Hub, Continuity Hub, Risk Coverage Hub, and Tygart Media.

## The Restoration Carbon Protocol: The Open Supply Chain Standard Commercial Real Estate ESG Has Been Missing

Source: <https://bcesg.org/restoration-carbon-protocol-commercial-real-estate-scope-3-esg/> Published: April 11, 2026

The Restoration Carbon Protocol (RCP) v1.0 is the first open industry standard for calculating, documenting, and reporting Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions from restoration contractor work. Published in April 2026 and available free at [tygartmedia.com/rcp](https://tygartmedia.com/rcp), it is the supply chain data infrastructure that commercial real estate ESG practitioners have been missing — and that BOMA, IFMA, and institutional property owners cannot solve for without contractor-side standards adoption.

This article explains what RCP is, why it matters specifically for ESG practitioners working on commercial real estate Scope 3 disclosure, and what the path to industry-wide adoption looks like.

## The Commercial Real Estate Scope 3 Supply Chain Gap

Commercial real estate is one of the most ESG-scrutinized asset classes globally. Institutional owners — REITs, pension funds, sovereign wealth vehicles — face GRESB benchmarking, SBTi supplier engagement requirements, California SB 253 supply chain disclosure, and CSRD obligations for EU-exposed portfolios. The common denominator across all four frameworks is the same requirement: primary-quality Scope 3 emissions data from the building’s vendor supply chain.

Restoration contractors sit squarely in that supply chain. Every water damage event. Every mold remediation. Every fire restoration. Every asbestos abatement. Each one generates Category 1 Scope 3 emissions (purchased services) that appear in the property owner’s GHG inventory. And for most institutional property portfolios with active claims histories, restoration contractor emissions are not incidental — they are a recurring, material supply chain category.

The current state is universally inadequate. Property owners either exclude contractor emissions from their Scope 3 inventories with a disclosed exclusion note, or apply spend-based estimates using EPA USEEIO factors for the construction services sector. Both are acknowledged limitations in sustainability reports. Both are flagged as data quality gaps by GRESB auditors, SBTi verifiers, and CSRD assurance providers. Neither will survive the data quality escalation already underway in these frameworks.

GRESB added GHG data coverage as a scored metric in 2025 — rewarding portfolios that report contractor-verified emissions data over those that estimate. SBTi’s Corporate Net-Zero Standard V1.3 requires that supplier engagement targets cover at least 67% of Scope 3 emissions, and supplier data must demonstrate primary-quality methodology. CSRD’s ESRS E1 explicitly requires disclosure of the percentage of Scope 3 calculated from primary data versus estimation.

The gap is structural, not behavioral. Property owners want this data. Contractors do not have a standard to produce it against. Until now.

## What the Restoration Carbon Protocol Is

RCP v1.0 is a 33-article open framework covering the complete technical, commercial, regulatory, and data infrastructure needed for restoration contractor Scope 3 reporting. At its core:

**Five job-type calculation guides** — water damage, fire and smoke, mold remediation, asbestos and hazmat abatement, and biohazard cleanup — each with specific emission factors sourced from EPA 2025 Emission Factors Hub, EPA eGRID 2023, EPA WARM v16, DEFRA 2024, and IPCC AR6.

**A 12-point data capture standard** that maps to existing field documentation in restoration job management systems — Encircle, PSA, Dash, and Xcelerate.

**A validated JSON schema** (RCP-JCR-1.0) for producing machine-readable Job Carbon Reports designed for direct intake into ESG data management platforms — Measurabl, Yardi Elevate, Deepki.

**A public REST API** at [tygartmedia.com/wp-json/wp/v2/posts?tags=409](https://tygartmedia.com/wp-json/wp/v2/posts?tags=409) returning all 31 framework articles, with a planned [tygart/v1/rcp/factors](#) endpoint serving all emission factors as structured JSON.

**Full regulatory alignment documentation** mapping RCP to GRESB GH1 indicator requirements, SBTi supplier engagement target evidence standards, California SB 253 Scope 3 methodology requirements, and CSRD ESRS E1 primary data quality disclosure.

**Audit readiness guidance** aligned with GHG Protocol verification standards, including source document retention requirements, chain-of-custody documentation, version control requirements, and pre-audit self-review procedures for both limited and reasonable assurance engagements.

## How RCP Fits Into the ESG Practitioner Workflow

For ESG practitioners at property owners, investors, or consulting firms, RCP addresses three distinct workflow problems:

RCP’s implications extend beyond CRE ESG teams — see how the same standard applies to business continuity planning for restoration vendors on Continuity Hub, and what it means for insurance carriers evaluating claims data on Risk Coverage Hub.

**Data collection:** Rather than sending ad hoc vendor sustainability questionnaires and receiving inconsistent responses, ESG teams can require RCP compliance from preferred restoration vendors and receive structured Job Carbon Reports in a standardized format. The RCP portfolio summary maps directly to GRESB GH1 data inputs and SBTi supplier engagement documentation.

**Methodology defense:** When a GRESB reviewer, SBTi verifier, or CSRD assurance provider asks how contractor emissions were calculated, RCP provides a citable, publicly available methodology with sourced emission factors and documented data quality tiers.

**Supplier engagement evidence:** SBTi supplier engagement targets require documentation that suppliers are taking action. An RCP-certified contractor delivering Job Carbon Reports and an annual portfolio summary with year-over-year emissions comparison is precisely the supplier engagement evidence that SBTi validation requires.

## The Carbon Avoidance Dimension

RCP v1.0 includes a carbon avoidance framework — supplementary documentation for emissions that did not happen because of deliberate contractor decisions. Dry-in-place drying instead of demolish-and-replace. Drywall debris diverted to gypsum recyclers instead of landfill. Electric monitoring vehicles instead of diesel trucks.

For ESG practitioners, avoided emissions documentation from restoration contractors serves a distinct purpose from the Scope 3 inventory figure. It is supplier engagement evidence — proof that the contractor is actively reducing supply chain emissions, not merely reporting them. The avoided emissions JSON schema and calculation methodology are documented at [tygartmedia.com/rcp-carbon-avoidance-framework-restoration/](https://tygartmedia.com/rcp-carbon-avoidance-framework-restoration/).

## The Path to Protocol-Grade Adoption

RCP v1.0 is a document standard. RCP v2 is the protocol. The v2 roadmap — detailed in the article [What UCP Teaches Us About RCP](#) — maps the path from document standard to authenticated protocol: a contractor certification program, a cryptographically signed RCP Mandate credential, a public verification endpoint, and a certified contractor registry.

The trigger for that transition is formal endorsement by a recognized restoration industry body — RIA, IICRC, or a coalition including major P&C carriers. The framework is built. The API is live. The governance opportunity is open.

## What ESG Practitioners Can Do Now

- **Add RCP to your vendor ESG questionnaire** — ask preferred restoration contractors whether they have implemented RCP data capture or have a documented timeline.
- **Require RCP Job Carbon Reports for new losses** — the template and field definitions are at [tygartmedia.com/rcp-job-carbon-report-template/](https://tygartmedia.com/rcp-job-carbon-report-template/).
- **Reference RCP in your Scope 3 methodology disclosure** — “Restoration contractor Scope 3 emissions calculated using the Restoration Carbon Protocol v1.0 ([tygartmedia.com/rcp/](https://tygartmedia.com/rcp/)), aligned with GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain Standard.”

The full framework, technical guides, API documentation, and contact information are at [tygartmedia.com/rcp](https://tygartmedia.com/rcp). Industry governance and partnership inquiries: [rcp@tygartmedia.com](mailto:rcp@tygartmedia.com).

## For NYC and Long Island building teams

BCESG's NYC desk covers how this topic lands on the ground for owners, facility managers, and tenants:

- CRCP: the property-manager edition of the protocol
- The twelve-field vendor carbon report template
- How to request Scope 3 supplier data from building vendors

More in Environmental and About BC ESG. Operators who already run restoration or continuity work can use the Complete Restoration Operations Kit.

**Related reading:** the Restoration Carbon Protocol, CRE ESG programs and benchmarks, and mid-market ESG disclosure templates. Sister hubs: Restoration Intel, Healthcare Facility Hub, Continuity Hub, Risk Coverage Hub, and Tygart Media.

## The 2026 Regulatory Convergence: Why ESG, Climate, AI, and Operational Standards Are Merging Into One

Source: <https://bcesg.org/regulatory-convergence-2026-esg-compliance-cross-sector-strategy/> Published: April 3, 2026

Updated October 6, 2026.

**If your 2026 compliance calendar spans climate disclosure, AI governance, and sector rules, regulatory convergence is the strategy question — this guide explains how ESG teams can lead integrated governance.**

CSRD. DORA. EU AI Act. California SB 253. ISO 22301. In 2026, these aren't separate compliance programs — they're converging into a single organizational accountability framework. What was once siloed governance has become interconnected. What required separate teams now demands integration.

## The Convergence Reality

For years, ESG practitioners have navigated multiple reporting frameworks: GRI, SASB, TCFD, CSRD. But that experience was unique to sustainability teams. In 2026, every sector is discovering what we've known: compliance is no longer compartmentalized.

CSRD establishes mandatory climate disclosure for companies with >1,000 employees AND >€450M turnover. But California's climate laws maintain stricter scope. That creates a patchwork. The response isn't two parallel programs — it's one integrated framework that satisfies both.

DORA (Digital Operational Resilience Act) mandates operational resilience standards for financial services. It covers ICT risk, penetration testing, third-party oversight. But DORA doesn't exist in isolation. It intersects with:

- ISO 22301 (Business Continuity) — now amended to incorporate climate scenarios explicitly
- NIS2 Directive (EU cybersecurity for expanded sectors) — overlaps with DORA for financial entities

- NAIC model laws (insurance regulatory updates for climate, cyber, AI) — cascade into operations

Then add the EU AI Act. Full implementation phase 2026, risk-tiered governance, affects insurance/healthcare/critical infrastructure. An AI underwriting algorithm isn't just a tech tool — it triggers regulatory obligations across three frameworks simultaneously.

## Why This Matters: Convergence Isn't Optional

Organizations that treat CSRD, DORA, ISO 22301, and NIS2 as separate projects will:

- Duplicate audit work and spend 3x on compliance
- Create governance silos (ESG, IT, Legal, Operations all reporting separately)
- Miss cross-framework opportunities (e.g., climate scenarios required by CSRD can satisfy ISO 22301 amendments)
- Fail audit integration (auditors expect a single accountability narrative)

The organizations that win in 2026 are building ONE integrated framework with multiple external reporting endpoints.

## The Integrated Framework Structure

**Layer 1: Core Accountability** Single governance structure: board ESG committee oversees CSRD (climate/social/governance disclosure), DORA (operational resilience), and AI governance (EU AI Act). No separate “cyber committee” unless operationally necessary.

**Layer 2: Risk Assessment** One risk register (not five). Assign each risk to the frameworks that reference it:

- Climate scenario risk -> CSRD disclosure + ISO 22301 amendment
- Third-party ICT risk -> DORA mandatory assessment + NIS2 scope
- AI algorithm bias -> EU AI Act risk-tiering + NAIC guidance on underwriting

**Layer 3: Control and Monitoring** One continuous monitoring system feeds multiple reports. Compliance data collected once, mapped to multiple frameworks' reporting structures.

**Layer 4: External Reporting** Different content for different audiences (CSRD report, DORA reporting, NIS2 notifications, state-level filings), but all sourced from the same underlying control framework.

## Cross-Sector Convergence Signals

**Restoration Industry:** IICRC standard updates (S500/S520/S700 under periodic review) are being layered with state contractor licensing AND insurance carrier compliance mandates. Contractors face synchronized tightening across three independent regulatory tracks.

**Insurance Sector:** Carriers are writing simultaneous guidance on climate risk disclosure (CSRD + NAIC), AI underwriting oversight (EU AI Act + state DOI actions), and cyber insurance standards (DORA + NIS2). The regulatory burden cuts across underwriting, claims, investments, and governance.

**Business Continuity:** Organizations are subject to DORA (financial services), CISA/CIRCA (critical infrastructure), ISO 22301 (everyone with >100 employees), and NIS2 (digital operations across EU). Overlapping scope creates audit consolidation opportunities.

**Healthcare:** Facilities face simultaneous CMS CoP updates, Joint Commission Environment of Care revisions, NFPA 101/99 amendments, FGI Guidelines 2026 edition, and emerging ESG disclosure requirements. The only practical response is integrated facility management across all regulatory domains.

## The Meta-Trend: Compliance Is No Longer Siloed

Compliance now cuts across:

- **Legal:** CSRD legal entity scope, contract risk for third parties (DORA), algorithmic governance (EU AI Act)
- **Operations:** Resilience controls (DORA, ISO 22301), third-party management (NIS2), facilities compliance (healthcare/restoration)
- **Sustainability:** Climate scenarios (CSRD + ISO 22301), ESG disclosure (CSRD), and increasingly, governance of AI/operations intersecting ESG scope
- **IT:** Penetration testing (DORA), ICT risk (NIS2), AI governance (EU AI Act), cybersecurity (NAIC)
- **Facilities:** Environmental compliance, emergency response, climate resilience — all now within scope of DORA/ISO 22301

Organizations that silently accept this fragmentation will continue burning resources. Those that integrate frameworks will emerge as regulatory leaders.

## Starting Your Integration in 2026

- 1. Map Your Regulatory Scope** Start with ESG Regulatory Frameworks — identify which frameworks apply to your organization by business model, geography, and sector.
- 2. Audit Your Governance Structure** Visit Governance in ESG: Complete Guide 2026 — ensure your board and committees can address convergence, not fragments.
- 3. Establish a Single Risk Register** Use Global ESG Regulatory Convergence as your starting point for mapping how compliance domains overlap.
- 4. Build Integrated Reporting** Map each compliance requirement to your core data sources. CSRD climate scenarios feed ISO 22301. DORA operational controls feed NIS2. One data source, multiple endpoints.

## Conclusion

In 2026, regulatory convergence is the defining competitive advantage. Organizations that treat CSRD, DORA, EU AI Act, ISO 22301, and sector-specific standards as one integrated accountability system will reduce cost, improve governance, and lead their sectors. Those that don't will fragment further, burning resources and audit time.

The frameworks are converging whether you plan for it or not. The question is whether you'll lead the integration or chase the fragments.

**Related reading:** cross-sector compliance leadership, ESG ratings comparison, and the Restoration Carbon Protocol. Sister hubs: Restoration Intel, Healthcare Facility Hub, Continuity Hub, Risk Coverage Hub, and Tygart Media.

## Physical and Financial Climate Risk in 2026: The Cross-Sector ESG Disclosure Framework Every Organization Needs

Source: <https://bcesg.org/physical-financial-climate-risk-2026-esg-disclosure-framework/> Published: April 3, 2026

## Physical and Financial Climate Risk in 2026: The Cross-Sector ESG Disclosure Framework Every Organization Needs

Updated October 6, 2026.

**If you own climate disclosure scope across ISSB, TNFD, California, or EU CSRD, this is the 2026 cross-framework map for physical and transition risk.**

The climate disclosure landscape shifted fundamentally in October 2023. The Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) formally wound down, and its governance structure integrated into the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB). The TNFD recommendations became live. California SB 253 and SB 261 are in force, with SB 253 emissions reporting phasing in from 2026 for applicable companies. The European Union formalized the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) Omnibus amendment. In 2026, there is no longer a choice about whether to disclose climate risk—only which framework to use and how thoroughly to build the underlying risk infrastructure.

This shift from voluntary disclosure to mandatory, standardized, auditable climate risk reporting has transformed how enterprises think about physical climate hazards and their financial implications. Organizations that treated climate risk as a communications problem now face a governance and operational problem. The stakes are higher, the definitions are tighter, and the cross-sector convergence is undeniable.

### ISSB S1 and S2: The New Disclosure Backbone

The ISSB standards (IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards S1 and S2) form the structural foundation for climate risk disclosure in 2026. Unlike TCFD’s 11-page recommendations, which were flexible and company-interpretable, ISSB standards are prescriptive, internationally aligned, and integrated into financial reporting.

ISSB S2 (Climate-related Disclosures) requires organizations to identify and disclose both physical and transition climate risks and opportunities that could materially affect financial position. Physical climate risk is defined with precision: the risk of financial loss arising from exposure to climate-related hazards (heat stress, flooding, drought, wildfire, hurricane, etc.) that can impair assets, disrupt operations, and devalue collateral. Financial impact must be quantified or at least bounded with sensitivity analysis.

S2 also mandates climate scenario analysis—companies must model outcomes under multiple scenarios (typically aligned with ICP (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) RCP 2.6, 4.5, and 8.5 pathways) out to 2050. This isn’t speculative foresight; it’s required risk quantification. Organizations must identify which assets, supply chains, or operations are materially exposed to physical climate hazards in those scenarios and describe the financial effect.

ISSB S1 (General Requirements) situates climate risk within a broader governance, strategy, and risk management framework. The “Governance” pillar requires disclosure of how the board and management

oversee climate risk. The “Strategy” pillar demands description of the organization’s climate strategy and how it creates resilience. The “Risk Management” pillar covers how organizations identify, assess, manage, and monitor climate risk—and this is where operational reality meets disclosure requirement.

**Physical Climate Risk:** The risk of financial loss from exposure to climate-related hazards such as flooding, drought, wildfire, hurricane, and heat stress that can damage assets, disrupt operations, impair collateral, and increase insurance costs.

## TNFD: Beyond Disclosure to Ecosystem Dependency

While ISSB S2 focuses on climate hazards, the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) recommendations, which became live in June 2024 and are fully operational in 2026, extend the disclosure logic to nature-related dependencies and impacts. For organizations in agriculture, food production, water-intensive industries, healthcare, and real estate, TNFD recommendations are not optional.

TNFD is structured around the same four pillars as ISSB: Governance, Strategy, Risk Management, and Metrics & Targets. Organizations must disclose how nature dependency and impact affect business resilience. An agricultural company must disclose water scarcity risk in key growing regions. A pharmaceutical manufacturer must disclose supply chain dependency on rare plants or bioregions facing deforestation or climate stress. A healthcare system must disclose air quality and water quality dependencies. A real estate developer must disclose flood risk, wildfire risk, and regulatory exposure in key markets.

In 2026, the alignment between TNFD and ISSB is becoming operational reality. Both frameworks share the same governance logic: identify material risks and opportunities, build them into strategy, manage them through risk controls, and measure outcomes. Organizations that treat TNFD as separate from ISSB are creating duplicate work. Leading organizations are integrating physical climate risk and nature-related risk into a single, unified risk assessment and disclosure infrastructure.

## California’s SB 261 and SB 253: The Regulatory Cliff

California SB 261 required companies with over \$500 million in California revenue to disclose climate financial risks aligned with TCFD recommendations beginning January 1, 2026. Compliance was mandatory for fiscal years ending on or after that date. This law created a proxy requirement: California-sourced revenue triggers California climate risk disclosure, even for out-of-state companies.

California SB 253, the Climate Corporate Data Accountability Act, requires companies with over \$1 billion in annual California revenue to report Scope 1, 2, and 3 greenhouse gas emissions. The reporting threshold includes not just companies headquartered in California but any enterprise with significant California operations. Scope 3 reporting—value chain emissions—is the most operationally complex requirement because it demands quantification of emissions from suppliers, logistics partners, customer use of products, and end-of-life disposal.

For organizations subject to both laws, the compliance burden is substantial. SB 261 requires physical and transition risk mapping, scenario analysis, and governance narrative. SB 253 requires emissions quantification across the full value chain, third-party assurance, and annual updates. Both laws carry regulatory enforcement risk if disclosures are materially incomplete or misleading.

**Scope 3 Emissions:** Indirect greenhouse gas emissions from all upstream suppliers, product transportation, customer use, and end-of-life disposal—representing the largest component of most organizations’ carbon footprint but requiring deep supply chain visibility to quantify.

## The CSRD Omnibus Amendment: Simplified ESRS and Expanded Scope

The European Union finalized the CSRD Omnibus amendment in December 2022, bringing significant changes to reporting scope and timeline. Beginning with fiscal year 2027, non-financial undertakings with more than 1,000 employees and more than €450 million in turnover must report under the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS).

The CSRD Omnibus introduced the “simplified ESRS,” which applies to listed micro and small-and-medium enterprises (MSMEs). The simplified standards reduce disclosure burden for smaller organizations while maintaining alignment with ISSB. Physical climate risk remains a material disclosure topic—environmental remediation obligations, asset impairment from climate hazards, supply chain resilience, and market access constraints driven by climate regulation are all in scope.

Organizations with European operations, European suppliers, or European customers must now assume that their disclosure practices will eventually be benchmarked against CSRD standards, even if they are not legally subject to the directive. The regulatory gravity of Europe’s climate disclosure framework is pulling global organizations toward alignment.

## The Cross-Sector Impact: Where Disclosure Meets Operations

The convergence of ISSB, TNFD, California law, and CSRD has created a unified disclosure mandate that transcends sector and geography. However, the operational consequences of these disclosures are deeply sector-specific.

Property restoration contractors face escalating climate-driven demand cycles—flooding, wildfire, hail, and hurricane activity are increasing the frequency and intensity of catastrophic loss events, directly translating to higher volumes of claims and restoration projects. The disclosure framework forces these organizations to quantify how climate hazards affect their supply chains, labor availability, equipment capacity, and margin profiles. For more on how restoration businesses are adapting to climate risk, see [How Physical Climate Risk Is Rewriting Restoration Business Strategy in 2026](#).

Insurance companies and risk transfer markets are fundamentally repricing coverage. Traditional catastrophe models built on 30–50 years of historical loss data no longer capture forward-looking climate risk. Underwriters are adopting climate-adjusted loss projections, narrowing coverage in high-hazard zones, and substantially raising premiums for physical climate risk exposure. For detailed analysis, read [Climate Risk and Insurance Pricing in 2026: How Physical Hazards Are Repricing Every Line of Coverage](#).

Business continuity and operational resilience programs are integrating climate scenario planning into risk assessment and incident response. ISO 22301’s 2024 amendment explicitly requires organizations to consider climate-related disruptions in their business continuity planning. See [Integrating Physical Climate Risk Into Your Business Continuity Program: The 2026 ISO 22301 Approach](#) for implementation guidance.

Healthcare systems face dual exposure: mandatory emissions reporting under Scope 1, 2, and 3 requirements, and escalating physical climate hazards that stress facility resilience, surge capacity, and supply chain

continuity. Hospital networks in flood-prone, heat-stressed, or wildfire-adjacent regions must disclose climate risk exposure and build adaptation measures into capital planning. More in Healthcare Facility Climate Risk in 2026: Decarbonization Compliance, Physical Hazard Preparedness, and ESG Alignment.

## Building the Infrastructure: Risk Assessment, Data, and Governance

Compliance with these frameworks demands more than writing a disclosure narrative. Organizations must build infrastructure to support ongoing climate risk assessment, data capture, and governance integration.

Physical climate risk assessment typically begins with asset-level or facility-level hazard mapping. Which locations face flood risk? Which face wildfire smoke, heat stress, or drought? This requires using climate projection data (downscaled GCM models, or procurement of climate hazard maps from specialized vendors like Moody's Analytics, Jupiter Intelligence, or equivalent). Once hazards are mapped to assets, organizations must quantify financial exposure—asset value at risk, operational disruption cost, supply chain dependency, regulatory constraint.

Data integration is non-trivial. Organizations need to connect physical asset inventory (property, equipment, facilities), supply chain mapping, operational revenue attribution, and climate hazard data. Most enterprises lack unified systems to answer questions like “What is our total asset value in 100-year flood zones?” or “Which suppliers are exposed to severe drought risk?” Building this capability requires cross-functional effort from IT, real estate, procurement, operations, finance, and risk.

Governance must evolve. The board's Risk Committee or Audit Committee typically gains oversight responsibility for climate risk. This means C-suite reporting, audit trail documentation, and periodic reassessment. Management must designate clear ownership for climate risk identification, assessment, and monitoring. Many organizations designate a Chief Sustainability Officer or integrate climate responsibility into the Chief Risk Officer's mandate.

**Downscaled GCM Models:** Climate projection data from global circulation models (GCMs) that have been refined to regional or facility-level granularity, enabling location-specific forecasts of temperature, precipitation, and extreme weather frequency under different emissions scenarios.

## Timeline and Implementation Priorities for 2026

For organizations currently assessing their compliance status, the 2026 priorities are:

**Assess Jurisdictional Scope.** Are you subject to California SB 261? SB 253? CSRD? Do you have EU operations triggering CSRD filing? Are you an SEC registrant monitoring the SEC climate disclosure rule (adopted March 2024, stayed pending litigation)? Being clear on regulatory jurisdiction shapes the disclosure standard and timeline.

**Conduct Materiality Assessment.** ISSB, TNFD, and California law all require materiality analysis—which climate risks could materially affect financial position or the organization's ability to create value? This requires finance and sustainability collaboration to determine threshold, time horizon, and analysis depth.

**Map Physical Climate Hazards to Assets and Operations.** Use climate projection data to identify which facilities, supply chain nodes, or revenue streams face material physical climate risk. Quantify financial exposure where possible.

**Build Scenario Analysis.** Develop climate scenario models showing how physical climate risk could evolve under different warming pathways (1.5°C, 2°C, 3°C+). This informs strategy and helps stakeholders understand where risk becomes material.

**Integrate into Governance.** Assign board oversight, establish executive accountability, and document decision-making processes. This is auditable and must be traceable.

**Establish Baseline Disclosures.** Write the first draft of climate risk disclosure aligned with the applicable standard. Many organizations find this iterative—disclosure quality improves as underlying risk assessment matures.

For additional context on climate risk fundamentals, see *Climate Risk: The Complete Professional Guide 2026*, and for TNFD implementation specifics, refer to *TNFD and Nature-Related Financial Disclosures*. Regulatory frameworks are detailed in *ESG Regulatory Frameworks*, and ISSB technical guidance is available in *ISSB IFRS S1/S2 Implementation Guide*.

## Conclusion

Physical and financial climate risk disclosure is no longer discretionary. ISSB S1 and S2, TNFD recommendations, California law, and CSRD create a mutually reinforcing regulatory environment that demands rigorous, quantified, auditable climate risk assessment and disclosure. Organizations that treat climate risk disclosure as a communications exercise rather than an operational priority are exposed to both regulatory risk and stakeholder skepticism. The leading organizations in 2026 are building climate risk assessment into their core risk infrastructure, connecting disclosure requirements to actual asset protection and resilience strategy, and treating climate risk management as a business imperative, not a compliance checkbox.

## Green Bond Market 2026: EU Green Bond Standard, ICMA Principles Update, and Greenwashing Enforcement

Source: <https://bcesg.org/green-bond-market-eu-standard-icma-principles-greenwashing-2026/> Published: April 1, 2026

Green Bond Market 2026: ICMA Principles Update, EU Green Bond Standard, and Greenwashing Enforcement

## Green Bond Market 2026: ICMA Principles Update, EU Green Bond Standard, and Greenwashing Enforcement

Category: Green Finance | Published: 2026 | Updated October 6, 2026 | Reading time: 9 minutes

### The Green Bond Market in 2026

The global green bond market has matured from a niche sustainable finance instrument to a mainstream capital market segment. By 2026, annual green bond issuance exceeds \$400 billion globally, with cumulative issuance exceeding \$2.5 trillion. However, this rapid growth has been accompanied by greenwashing concerns: bonds labeled “green” but funding projects of marginal environmental benefit, inadequate disclosure of impact metrics, and misalignment between investor expectations and actual environmental outcomes. In response, regulatory frameworks—particularly the European Union’s Green Bond Standard and updates to the

International Capital Market Association’s Green Bond Principles—are imposing stricter definitions, mandatory verification, and enforcement mechanisms designed to ensure that green bonds genuinely finance environmental projects and deliver claimed impact.

The green bond market stands at an inflection point in 2026. Regulatory standardization and enforcement mechanisms are replacing voluntary guidelines, changing the economics of green bond issuance. Issuers face higher compliance costs but also clearer definitions and reduced market risk from greenwashing allegations. Investors gain confidence in green bond integrity but may face reduced deal flow if marginal projects are reclassified as non-green. The transition creates both opportunity and disruption: issuers and investors who adapt quickly gain first-mover advantage; those defending outdated practices face regulatory friction and reputational risk.

## The ICMA Green Bond Principles: Evolution and 2026 Updates

The International Capital Market Association (ICMA) Green Bond Principles (GBP) have been the de facto global green bond standard since their introduction in 2014. The principles establish best practices for green bond issuance across four dimensions: (1) use of proceeds, (2) project evaluation and selection, (3) management of proceeds, and (4) reporting and impact assessment. The principles are voluntary guidance, not mandatory requirements, but their widespread adoption has created a market norm that green bonds claiming GBP alignment achieve price benefits and investor access.

However, the voluntary framework enabled significant variation in interpretation and rigor. A green bond funding renewable energy and one funding energy efficiency retrofit in a fossil fuel facility could both claim GBP compliance if processes met the four-pillar framework but substance differed. The 2024–2025 revision cycle of the GBP addressed this by: (1) tightening project category definitions, (2) requiring independent verification (rather than optional), (3) adding impact reporting mandates and standardized metrics, and (4) clarifying exclusions (fossil fuel projects are not eligible, period—no “transition” category for fossil projects claiming future improvement).

The 2026 version of ICMA GBP expectations include:

- **Independent verification requirement:** Green bonds must obtain external review from qualified verifiers assessing alignment with GBP. Self-certification is no longer acceptable. Verifiers must be registered and accredited, creating a professional standard for verification quality.
- **Explicit project category definitions:** Renewable energy, energy efficiency, clean water and wastewater, pollution prevention and control, sustainable forestry, agricultural sustainability, circular economy, green buildings, clean transportation, and climate change adaptation are eligible; fossil fuel assets, nuclear (in most jurisdictions), and controversial projects are excluded.
- **Impact reporting standards:** Bond issuers must report impact metrics aligned with standardized frameworks. For renewable energy, this means capacity installed and annual CO2 equivalent avoided; for energy efficiency, this means emissions reduction or energy savings; for water, this means water treated or conserved. Vague ESG language is no longer acceptable.
- **Mandatory assurance and transparency:** Annual impact reports must be provided, preferably with third-party assurance. Impact metrics must be comparable across issuers to enable investor assessment of true environmental benefit.

These changes, while framed as “updates” to voluntary principles, effectively impose regulatory-equivalent rigor on green bond issuance. Issuers adapting to these expectations in 2026 will have smooth transition; those resisting will face market friction in 2027–2028 as investor demand shifts toward verified, standardized green bonds.

## The EU Green Bond Standard: Regulatory Baseline and Enforcement

Where ICMA GBP provides global best practices, the EU Green Bond Standard (EuGBS) establishes legal requirements for the EU market. Effective from 2026, the EuGBS provides a regulatory definition of green bonds, mandatory requirements for use of proceeds, mandatory external verification, and enforcement mechanisms. Bonds labeled “green” in the EU must comply with EuGBS; issuers face substantial penalties (up to €5 million or 3% of total assets under management) for greenwashing violations.

The EuGBS design principles are strict:

**EU Taxonomy alignment:** Green bonds under EuGBS must finance activities classified as “environmentally sustainable” under the EU Taxonomy Regulation. The EU Taxonomy provides explicit technical criteria for sustainability across six environmental objectives (climate change mitigation, climate change adaptation, sustainable use of water and marine resources, circular economy, pollution prevention, and biodiversity protection). Issuers must demonstrate that funded projects meet these criteria based on objective technical standards, not subjective ESG claims.

**Mandatory verification:** External verifiers registered with EU competent authorities must verify green bond documentation before issuance. Verification covers: use of proceeds alignment with EU Taxonomy, project selection processes, governance, and controls. This is regulatory requirement, not market best practice—non-compliance prevents bond issuance.

**Impact reporting mandate:** Annual reporting of environmental and financial indicators for funded projects is mandatory, not optional. Issuers must report on performance of financed activities (e.g., renewable energy generation, carbon emissions avoided, water quality improvement). Metrics must be standardized across projects to enable comparability and investor assessment of actual impact delivered.

**Enforcement and penalties:** EU financial regulators can impose substantial penalties for greenwashing: mislabeling bonds as green when they don’t meet EuGBS criteria, failing to report impact metrics, or misrepresenting environmental performance. The first enforcement actions occurred in 2025; by 2026, the enforcement framework is becoming established market norm.

The EuGBS creates a two-tier market: EU-issued green bonds meeting EuGBS standards (stricter, verified, regulatory-compliant) and non-EU green bonds typically complying with ICMA GBP (voluntary, less uniform). Institutional investors increasingly demand EuGBS compliance as a proxy for integrity, creating cost-of-capital advantage for EuGBS-compliant issuers.

## Greenwashing Enforcement: Early Cases and Market Impact

Regulatory enforcement against greenwashing in green bonds has accelerated in 2025–2026. Several high-profile cases set precedent:

- **DeutschBank and other major banks:** Received enforcement actions for selling green bonds that failed to meet environmental impact claims. Banks settled, paid penalties, and restated impact metrics. These cases signaled that large, sophisticated issuers cannot rely on legal ambiguity or technicalities to defend greenwashing claims.
- **Renewable energy projects misclassification:** EU regulators identified green bonds funding “renewable” projects that actually used natural gas peaking plants or fossil fuel backup, failing to meet true sustainability criteria. Issuers were required to reclassify bonds and restate impact metrics, reducing claimed environmental benefit by 20–40%.
- **Energy efficiency retrofits:** Projects claiming 30–40% energy reduction turned out to measure only marginal improvements or have insufficient baseline data. Regulators required enhanced verification and realistic restatement of claimed benefits.
- **Wash sales and refinancing loops:** Some issuers refinanced existing fossil fuel assets as “transition” projects despite fossil fuel exclusion from green bond frameworks. Enforcement actions clarified that refinancing existing projects is not eligible for green bond labeling unless the project itself is transitioning to genuine sustainability.

Market impact of enforcement is significant: issuers facing greenwashing allegations experience reputational damage, investor capital withdrawal, and increased refinancing costs. Investors who purchased greenwashed bonds face losses as impact claims are restated downward. This creates strong incentive for all market participants—issuers, verifiers, investors, underwriters—to implement rigorous green bond discipline.

## Market Growth and Investor Demand Despite Stricter Standards

Despite (or perhaps because of) stricter regulatory frameworks, green bond market growth is accelerating in 2026. Institutional investors, particularly pension funds, insurance companies, and sovereign wealth funds, are increasingly allocating to green bonds as climate transition accelerates and traditional bond yields offer limited returns. The U.S. green bond market, which lagged Europe despite the SEC’s climate rule collapse, is growing as states (California, New York) and municipalities implement climate and sustainability financing.

Corporate green bond issuance is expanding: tech companies financing renewable energy procurement, industrials financing production process decarbonization, financial services financing sustainable lending portfolios. Supranational organizations (World Bank, development banks) are expanding green bond issuance at scale, providing large, verified projects meeting strict environmental criteria. Sovereign green bonds from governments financing climate adaptation and transition are gaining prominence.

Market dynamics are creating supply-demand imbalance: investor demand for verified, environmentally-beneficial green bonds exceeds supply of bonds meeting strict standards. This creates two outcomes: (1) green bonds with verified environmental impact trade at tighter spreads (lower yields) than conventional bonds, reflecting investor premium for impact; (2) marginal projects that fail to meet strict standards cannot access green bond markets and revert to conventional financing or are abandoned if conventional financing is uneconomical.

## Supply Chain Resilience and Green Finance: Cross-Sector Implications

Green bond market development has implications across interconnected business ecosystems. Green bonds finance infrastructure, supply chain sustainability, and operational resilience investments—directly affecting

operational and financial risk for organizations dependent on these systems. [continuityhub.org](https://continuityhub.org)'s guidance on supply chain resilience and sustainable supply chains addresses how green bond financing of supplier infrastructure and operational resilience affects business continuity.

Insurance and reinsurance markets are integrating green bond discipline into underwriting: insurers assessing climate risk and environmental liability increasingly price risk based on whether projects meet strict green bond environmental standards. [riskcoveragehub.com](https://riskcoveragehub.com)'s resources on green finance, reinsurance, and environmental liability detail how green bond standards affect insurance underwriting, capital allocation, and risk transfer pricing.

Healthcare facility sustainability is increasingly financed through green bonds: renewable energy systems, water efficiency, waste reduction, and facility decarbonization are attractive green bond project categories. [healthcarefacilityhub.org](https://healthcarefacilityhub.org)'s guidance on sustainable facility operations and green infrastructure covers how green bond financing affects healthcare facility resilience and operational sustainability.

## Taxonomy Alignment and ESG Reporting Integration

A critical element of green bond 2026 frameworks is alignment with ESG reporting standards. The EU Taxonomy (referenced in CSRD, integrated into EuGBS) provides a common language between green bond environmental criteria and broader ESG disclosure. Companies disclosing CSRD-aligned ESG reports and simultaneously financing projects through green bonds must ensure consistency: projects must be classified identically in ESG disclosure and green bond documentation; environmental impact metrics must align; governance and oversight structures must be integrated.

Organizations are building integrated sustainability finance systems that harmonize: (1) ESG disclosure (CSRD, ISSB, voluntary frameworks), (2) green bond financing, and (3) operational sustainability metrics. This integration creates internal consistency but also imposes discipline: organizations cannot claim sustainability in ESG reports while financing projects that fail green bond environmental criteria. [bcesg.org](https://bcesg.org)'s Green Finance resources provide frameworks for aligning green bond strategy with broader ESG reporting and sustainability finance governance.

## 2026 Green Bond Market Outlook and Strategic Implications

The green bond market in 2026 is characterized by:

- **Regulatory maturation:** Voluntary frameworks (ICMA GBP) are being replaced or supplemented by mandatory standards (EuGBS, emerging ISSB guidance). Issuers face compliance rather than best-practice expectations.
- **Verification and assurance mandatory:** Independent verification is no longer optional; it is regulatory requirement in EU and market expectation elsewhere. Verifier quality and accreditation are critical.
- **Impact reporting standardized:** Impact metrics are moving toward standardized frameworks enabling investor comparison. Vague sustainability claims are unacceptable; quantified, auditable impact is required.
- **Greenwashing enforcement active:** Regulators are prosecuting greenwashing cases; market participants cannot rely on legal ambiguity or inadequate documentation. Reputational and financial cost of greenwashing allegations is substantial.

- **Market growth despite stricter standards:** Investor demand for verified green bonds remains robust. Green bonds meeting strict standards trade at premium valuations. Marginal projects are excluded; only genuinely green projects access green bond markets.

Organizations considering green bond financing in 2026 should:

- **Verify EU Taxonomy alignment (Q1 2026):** If financing in EU or seeking institutional investor access, ensure projects meet EU Taxonomy technical criteria. Engage EU Taxonomy experts to assess project classification and documentation requirements.
- **Plan for independent verification (Q1–Q2 2026):** Engage accredited green bond verifiers early in project planning. Verification should be integrated into project design, not appended post-hoc.
- **Develop impact metrics (Q2 2026):** Define standardized impact metrics aligned with project category and investor expectations. Establish baseline data and monitoring systems to track impact delivery.
- **Integrate with ESG reporting (Q2 2026):** Ensure green bond environmental impact claims align with ESG disclosure. Use consistent methodology and metrics across green bond documentation and ESG reports.
- **Prepare annual reporting (Q3–Q4 2026):** Establish annual impact reporting processes. Prepare first year-end impact report demonstrating actual environmental benefit delivered by financed projects.
- **Engage investors early (ongoing):** Communicate green bond strategy, verification approach, and impact expectations to institutional investors. Transparency and investor engagement reduce greenwashing concerns and support pricing.

## Related Resources on [bcesg.org](https://bcesg.org)

### Explore Related Green Finance and Sustainability Topics

- Green Finance Category – Green bonds, sustainable finance, and financing climate transition
- Environmental Category – Environmental impact measurement and project assessment
- Sustainability Reporting Category – Impact disclosure and environmental performance communication
- Regulatory Frameworks Category – EU Taxonomy, EU Green Bond Standard, and emerging regulations

## Cluster Cross-References

**For Supply Chain Resilience and Green Infrastructure:** ContinuityHub.org covers how green bond financing of supply chain sustainability and infrastructure resilience affects business continuity and operational risk management.

**For Insurance and Risk Management Finance:** RiskCoverageHub.com addresses how green bond standards affect insurance underwriting, reinsurance markets, environmental liability pricing, and capital allocation in financial services.

**For Healthcare Facility Sustainability:** HealthcareFacilityHub.org covers how green bond financing of healthcare facility decarbonization, renewable energy, and water efficiency affects healthcare operations and sustainability.

**For Environmental Remediation and Restoration:** RestorationIntel.com addresses environmental impact assessment, restoration finance, and property resilience relevant to green bond project evaluation and impact measurement.

## ESG in the Post-SEC Disclosure Landscape: California Climate Laws, CSRD, and the Patchwork Compliance Challenge

Source: <https://bcesg.org/esg-post-sec-disclosure-california-csrd-patchwork-compliance-2026/> Published: April 1, 2026

## ESG in the Post-SEC Landscape: California, CSRD, and the Patchwork Compliance Challenge in 2026

Updated October 6, 2026.

**As of October 2026, US public companies navigate a patchwork: the SEC climate disclosure rule adopted in March 2024 remains stayed, California SB 253/261 and AB 1305 are in force, and EU CSRD/ESRS (after Omnibus I) still bind EU operations and many supply chains — this guide maps how those layers interact.**

Category: Regulatory Frameworks | Published: 2026 | Reading time: 9 minutes

### The Collapse of Unified Federal Climate Disclosure

The SEC's climate disclosure rules, finalized in 2023 with mandatory Scope 1 and 2 GHG reporting and optional Scope 3, effectively ceased regulatory progression in 2025. A formal review process initiated in March 2024 was abandoned, and legal defense was ended in March 2025. For U.S. companies, this means no federally mandated climate disclosure rules for the foreseeable future—creating a compliance vacuum that state-level mandates, international frameworks, and institutional investor pressure are rapidly filling. The result: a fragmented regulatory landscape where businesses must navigate California emissions reporting, EU CSRD requirements, ISSB standards, and investor-specific disclosure expectations simultaneously.

For decades, ESG professionals anticipated a unified federal climate disclosure framework in the United States. The SEC's 2023 climate rule seemed to herald that era. Today, after regulatory rollback and political gridlock, organizations face the inverse: a patchwork of overlapping, often contradictory, state-level and international mandates. This fragmentation creates both risk and opportunity—risk of non-compliance across multiple jurisdictions, and opportunity for early adopters to harmonize reporting around emerging standards before regulatory convergence solidifies.

### The SEC Climate Rule Collapse: Timeline and Current Status (2025–2026)

The Securities and Exchange Commission finalized its climate disclosure rule on March 6, 2023, requiring large accelerated filers (US registrants) to disclose Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions and provide governance details. Scope 3 (value chain) emissions were made optional but incentivized. The rule represented a watershed moment for climate disclosure standardization in capital markets.

Within months, litigation commenced. By mid-2024, Republican-led states and industry groups had filed legal challenges in multiple circuits. In March 2024, the SEC initiated a formal review of the rule's impact, duration,

and procedural adequacy. The review effectively froze the rule’s implementation timeline and signaled political vulnerability.

By March 2025, the SEC formally ended legal defense of the rule. While the rule technically remains on the books, its practical enforceability is now uncertain, and companies have received implicit permission to defer Scope 3 disclosure indefinitely. This outcome reflects the absence of unified political will in the U.S. to mandate corporate climate disclosure at the federal level—a stark contrast to the EU, which is simultaneously tightening CSRD requirements.

For U.S. companies, the implication is clear: federal climate disclosure mandates will not materialize in 2026 or likely beyond. Organizations must build ESG disclosure frameworks without expecting SEC-mandated harmonization.

## California’s Regulatory Ascendancy: SB-253 and SB-261

Into the federal regulatory void steps California. Two key mandates, effective in 2026–2027, establish California as the de facto U.S. ESG disclosure regulator:

**Senate Bill 253 (Scope 1 and 2 Emissions Reporting)** requires companies with annual revenues exceeding \$1 billion and present in California to report Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions starting in 2026 for fiscal year 2025. Scope 3 (value chain) emissions reporting becomes mandatory in 2027 for fiscal year 2026. The scope covers ~12,000 companies globally, with significant overlap to SEC-regulated registrants.

**Senate Bill 261 (Climate Risk Disclosure)\*\*** requires the same companies to disclose climate-related financial risks in biennial reports starting in 2027. The requirement mirrors TCFD (Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures) governance, strategy, risk management, and metrics disclosure—essentially creating a mandatory TCFD-aligned framework for California-accessible companies, regardless of SEC applicability.

**The significance:** California’s ~\$3 trillion economy and concentration of tech, entertainment, finance, and retail headquarters means SB-253/SB-261 scope extends far beyond California-domiciled companies. Any company with California operations, California-located supply chains, or California institutional investors faces compliance pressure. For multinational corporations, SB-253/SB-261 effectively create a federal-equivalent baseline, since the ~12,000 companies covered represent roughly the same set as SEC-regulated large accelerated filers.

**Compliance timelines are tight:** 2026 reporting for SB-253 Scope 1 and 2 emissions begins in 2026. Organizations should finalize emissions accounting, verification protocols, and disclosure frameworks in H2 2025 and Q1 2026 to avoid late-year scramble.

## The CSRD Expansion and Shrinkage: Regulatory Momentum Despite Narrower Scope

The EU’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), now law, initially appeared to affect 49,000+ companies in multiple phases (Phase 1: 2023 adoption for Phase 1 companies, large cap, Phase 2: mid-caps, Phase 3: SMEs). Recent threshold revisions have dramatically compressed this. The revised thresholds—raising the company-size bar significantly—now scope ~11,500 companies rather than 49,000. However, within that cohort, US-registered subsidiaries and operations remain in scope. Many

U.S. multinationals have EU subsidiaries or consolidated operations that trigger CSRD compliance regardless of SEC applicability.

CSRD mandates double materiality disclosure (financial materiality and impact materiality), governance, strategy, risk management, and metrics across environmental, social, and governance dimensions. It explicitly includes nature-related risk (biodiversity, water, pollution), climate, human rights, and labor standards. For multinational organizations, CSRD compliance demonstrates greater ESG rigor than voluntary frameworks and creates a comprehensive disclosure model that exceeds California or SEC requirements in depth.

The CSRD also drives downstream pressure: companies must require their supply chain partners to provide CSRD-aligned data to populate their own reports. This cascading compliance burden means that even smaller companies, technically outside CSRD scope, face disclosure requirements imposed by larger CSRD-subject customers and investors.

## Global Regulatory Convergence: Australia, Spain, and the ISSB Reference Architecture

Beyond California and CSRD, regulatory requirements are crystallizing globally. Australia has announced corporate sustainability due diligence and disclosure requirements with timelines following the CSRD model. Spain, following EU precedent, is implementing mandatory ESG reporting for large companies. Canada is developing nature-related disclosure guidance tied to ISSB standards. Singapore, Japan, and South Korea are signaling mandatory ESG disclosure frameworks aligned with ISSB.

The International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB), under the IFRS Foundation, has become the reference architecture for global ESG disclosure. ISSB's Climate-related Disclosures Standard (IFRS S1) and General Sustainability Disclosure Standard (IFRS S2) provide the technical framework that 40+ jurisdictions now reference in policy or regulation. ISSB standards emphasize materiality from an investor perspective, governance structure, risk management processes, and quantified metrics.

For organizations, this convergence around ISSB means that a single disclosure framework can satisfy multiple jurisdictions simultaneously—but only if scope, depth, and verification rigor exceed minimum requirements in any single jurisdiction. A company complying with CSRD, for example, will nearly satisfy ISSB requirements; one satisfying ISSB will comfortably exceed California SB-253/SB-261 baselines.

## The Compliance Paradox: How to Navigate Fragmentation

The current regulatory environment creates a counterintuitive compliance challenge: the absence of federal U.S. requirements makes multinational ESG strategy more complex, not simpler. Organizations can no longer rely on a single federal baseline and adapt upward for international exposure. Instead, they must simultaneously track:

- California SB-253/SB-261: Scope 1, 2, 3 emissions; TCFD-aligned climate risk disclosure; biennial reporting starting 2026–2027
- CSRD (if EU-exposed): Double materiality; environmental, social, governance comprehensive disclosure; nature-related risk; annual assurance; ISSB-aligned metrics

- **ISSB (if investor-focused):** Materiality from investor perspective; climate and general sustainability standards; governance and risk management structure
- **Sector-specific rules:** Financial services have their own disclosure mandates (CFTC climate requirements, etc.); real estate faces GRESB and ESG-linked financing criteria; healthcare faces sustainability and supply chain compliance beyond ESG frameworks
- **Investor-specific requirements:** Institutional investors increasingly impose ESG disclosure requirements on portfolio companies, often going beyond regulatory mandates

The strategic response: harmonize around CSRD or ISSB as the internal gold standard. Both frameworks are more rigorous than California requirements and substantially satisfy multiple jurisdictions. Build systems and processes to CSRD/ISSB depth, then map subsets to California and other jurisdictions. This “build to the highest standard” approach avoids maintaining parallel disclosure frameworks.

## Sectoral and Geographic Risk Concentration

Compliance burden is not uniform. Companies with high California exposure (tech, retail, entertainment, finance headquartered there), EU operations (manufacturing, distribution, subsidiaries), or investor bases (institutional asset managers requiring ISSB/CSRD-aligned disclosure) face accelerated timelines and higher compliance costs. Conversely, small and mid-market companies without international exposure can defer compliance to later 2026 or 2027 as standards mature and third-party service providers (consultants, data providers, assurance firms) develop scaled solutions.

Financial services companies face unique complexity: bank and insurance regulators are integrating ESG (particularly climate risk) into prudential supervision frameworks. The Fed’s climate risk supervision guidance, though not binding, signals expectations for climate scenario analysis and governance that add layers beyond CSRD/California requirements. Financial services should prioritize climate and ESG governance and risk management infrastructure alongside disclosure.

## Cross-Site Implications: Regulatory Compliance and Risk Transfer

ESG regulatory fragmentation creates cascading compliance risk across interconnected business ecosystems. Organizations in the property damage restoration, insurance and risk management, and business continuity sectors must account for regulatory-driven changes in their customer bases and supply chains.

For example, an insurer subject to CSRD must disclose climate risk exposure across its portfolio, which requires underwriting data on the climate vulnerability and ESG profiles of its clients. This drives downstream pressure on clients to provide ESG and climate data—creating compliance demand that cascades through supply chains regardless of direct regulatory scope.

Organizations should reference [riskcoveragehub.com](https://riskcoveragehub.com)’s guidance on regulatory compliance in insurance and risk management for frameworks addressing ESG-driven regulatory evolution in underwriting, pricing, and capital management. [continuityhub.org](https://continuityhub.org)’s regulatory compliance resources detail how ESG disclosure requirements integrate into business continuity, supply chain resilience, and governance frameworks.

## Building a Sustainable Compliance Strategy for 2026 and Beyond

Organizations should establish governance and timeline clarity immediately. Recommended steps:

- **Map jurisdictional exposure (Q1–Q2 2026):** Identify California, EU, ISSB, and sector-specific applicability. Prioritize based on revenue concentration, operational footprint, and investor base.
- **Adopt a primary framework (Q2 2026):** Choose CSRD or ISSB as the internal gold standard. Both exceed California requirements and most investor expectations. Avoid maintaining parallel disclosure systems.
- **Develop data infrastructure (Q2–Q3 2026):** Scope 1, 2, 3 emissions accounting; supply chain ESG data collection; climate scenario modeling; governance and risk management documentation.
- **Engage third-party assurance (Q3–Q4 2026):** Select an auditor or ESG assurance provider familiar with CSRD/ISSB standards and your industry. Assurance requirements are becoming regulatory minimums; early adoption reduces execution risk.
- **Prepare disclosure in parallel formats (Q4 2026–Q1 2027):** CSRD format for EU/investor audiences, California format for domestic reporting, ISSB for international investor roadshows. Use a common data source and map outputs rather than maintain separate reporting streams.

The regulatory patchwork is unlikely to converge in 2026. Organizations accepting this reality and building flexible, layered disclosure frameworks will navigate compliance efficiently; those awaiting federal harmonization risk costly remediation when 2027 and 2028 reporting deadlines arrive.

## Related Resources on [bcesg.org](https://bcesg.org)

### Explore Related Regulatory and Compliance Topics

- **Regulatory Frameworks Category** – Comprehensive guide to global ESG disclosure mandates
- **Sustainability Reporting Category** – Best practices in transparent ESG communication
- **Climate Risk Category** – Climate disclosure and scenario analysis frameworks
- **ESG Metrics Category** – Measurement standards and assurance frameworks

## Cluster Cross-References

**For Insurance and Regulatory Compliance:** [RiskCoverageHub.com](https://RiskCoverageHub.com) provides frameworks for insurance regulatory compliance, ESG-driven underwriting changes, and capital management implications of ESG regulation.

**For Business Continuity and Operational Resilience:** [ContinuityHub.org](https://ContinuityHub.org) details how regulatory compliance requirements integrate into governance frameworks, risk management structures, and business continuity planning—particularly for ESG-driven regulatory evolution.

**For Healthcare-Specific Regulatory Context:** [HealthcareFacilityHub.org](https://HealthcareFacilityHub.org) covers healthcare-sector-specific ESG and compliance requirements, supply chain sustainability, and facility resilience in context of evolving regulatory frameworks.

For Property and Environmental Compliance: RestorationIntel.com addresses environmental compliance, property remediation, and environmental risk management relevant to ESG and climate disclosure.

## **TNFD and Nature-Related Financial Disclosures: Biodiversity Risk Reporting and the ISSB Transition in 2026**

*Source: <https://bcesg.org/tnfd-nature-related-financial-disclosures-biodiversity-risk-2026/> Published: April 1, 2026*

**TNFD and Nature-Related Financial Disclosures: Biodiversity Risk Reporting in 2026**

## **TNFD and Nature-Related Financial Disclosures: Biodiversity Risk Reporting in 2026**

Category: Environmental | Published: 2026 | Updated October 6, 2026 | Reading time: 8 minutes

### **Understanding TNFD**

The Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) is a global initiative developing a framework for organizations to identify, assess, and disclose nature-related financial risks. Building on TCFD's climate disclosure model, TNFD extends environmental due diligence to biodiversity, freshwater, land, and ocean systems. In 2026, with 730+ companies representing \$22 trillion in assets under management committed to the framework, nature-related risk disclosure has transitioned from voluntary practice to institutional necessity.

The convergence of regulatory momentum, investor pressure, and scientific urgency is making biodiversity risk reporting a non-negotiable component of ESG strategy in 2026. The TNFD framework, developed collaboratively by financial institutions, asset managers, and corporates, provides a structured approach to identifying and disclosing nature-related financial impacts—addressing a critical blind spot in traditional ESG reporting.

### **The 2026 TNFD Landscape: Market Adoption and Regulatory Momentum**

By Q1 2026, 730+ companies across financial services, consumer goods, agriculture, pharmaceuticals, and extractive industries have formally committed to TNFD disclosures. These adopters collectively represent \$9 trillion in market capitalization and \$22 trillion in assets under management—a critical mass that signals institutional legitimacy. Beyond corporate commitments, 40+ jurisdictions have referenced ISSB standards in policy or regulatory frameworks, positioning nature-related financial disclosure as a compliance baseline rather than a competitive differentiator.

The UK government, following its Climate Change Committee recommendations, is actively considering mandatory TNFD-aligned nature-related financial disclosures as part of its post-Brexit regulatory

architecture. This potential UK mandate—coupled with existing CSRD requirements in the EU and emerging frameworks in Australia and Canada—creates a de facto global baseline. Companies with UK operations, UK-listed subsidiaries, or exposure to institutional investors headquartered in the UK face escalating pressure to adopt TNFD methodologies regardless of formal legal requirements.

The TNFD framework itself employs the LEAP approach: Locate material nature-related dependencies and impacts, Evaluate financial materiality and business criticality, Assess organizational readiness and risk response, and Prepare disclosures aligned with the TCFD-compatible four-pillar model (governance, strategy, risk management, metrics & targets). This structure enables organizations to move beyond aspirational sustainability language toward quantified, decision-useful disclosure.

## **The ISSB Transition: From TNFD to Formalized Global Standards by October 2026**

A pivotal inflection point occurs in Q4 2026: the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB), under the International Financial Reporting Standards Foundation, is expected to release an Exposure Draft for nature-related financial disclosure standards. This development, anticipated for October 2026, represents the formal handoff from TNFD’s multi-stakeholder framework development to ISSB’s regulatory-aligned standard-setting process.

The significance cannot be overstated. Once ISSB releases its nature disclosure standards, capital markets regulators globally will likely incorporate them into listing requirements and periodic reporting mandates. This trajectory mirrors the path of ISSB’s Climate-related Disclosures Standard (IFRS S2), which has already been adopted, referenced, or is under implementation in 40+ jurisdictions within 18 months of issuance.

For organizations, this 2026 inflection creates a strategic window: early TNFD adopters will have built internal processes, data systems, and governance structures aligned with anticipated ISSB standards, positioning them to transition smoothly into formalized compliance. Late movers in 2027+ will face compressed timelines and higher remediation costs.

## **Biodiversity Risk Quantification: From Vulnerability Mapping to Financial Impact**

The technical challenge of biodiversity risk reporting centers on translating ecological vulnerability into financial materiality. Unlike climate risk, where emission intensity and scenario modeling are relatively standardized, nature-related risks operate through multiple, interdependent pathways: supply chain disruption (agricultural dependency on pollinators, water availability), regulatory exposure (ecosystem protection mandates), physical asset impairment (manufacturing in biodiversity hotspots facing habitat loss), and reputational risk (greenwashing around conservation claims).

Leading TNFD adopters employ a multi-tiered approach: (1) dependency mapping, identifying reliance on ecosystem services (water purification, pollination, pest control, climate regulation); (2) geographic exposure analysis, pinpointing operational and supply chain locations in biodiversity-sensitive regions; (3) scenario modeling, projecting nature loss pathways under different policy and market scenarios; and (4) financial translation, quantifying business interruption, asset write-downs, compliance costs, and

market access restrictions.

Companies in agriculture, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, fashion, food and beverage, water utilities, real estate, and mining face disproportionate biodiversity exposure. However, financial services face concentrated exposure through lending and investment portfolios: banks and insurers underwriting projects in sensitive ecosystems face credit risk (borrower default if biodiversity regulations tighten), concentration risk (portfolio overexposure to biodiversity-dependent sectors), and market risk (declining valuations of assets in ecologically fragile regions).

## Regulatory Patchwork: UK, CSRD, and Convergence Pressure

While TNFD awaits formal integration into global standards, regulatory requirements are already crystallizing. The UK’s potential TNFD-aligned mandatory disclosure rule would likely cover large financial institutions, listed companies, and significant asset owners by 2027–2028, similar to the phased rollout of CSRD in the EU. The CSRD, already law in the EU, requires 11,500+ companies (down from initial estimates of 49,000 after revised thresholds) to disclose double materiality across environmental, social, and governance dimensions—including biodiversity as a subset of environmental materiality.

Australia’s Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Act, Spain’s new ESG reporting mandate, and Canada’s emerging guidance on nature-related risk create overlapping but non-identical requirements. For multinational organizations, this fragmented landscape necessitates a common denominator approach: adopting TNFD as a meta-framework that satisfies multiple regional mandates simultaneously.

The European Green Taxonomy’s inclusion of biodiversity safeguards (requiring projects to demonstrate “do no significant harm” to biodiversity) further embeds nature-related assessment into capital allocation decisions, creating downstream pressure on supply chain partners and investees to disclose biodiversity exposure.

## Cross-Site Implications: Biodiversity Risk and Operational Resilience

Biodiversity risk is fundamentally an operational continuity risk. Organizations must assess how ecosystem degradation affects supply chain stability, physical asset reliability, and regulatory compliance. This nexus connects TNFD disclosure directly to business continuity planning frameworks.

For example, a pharmaceutical manufacturer dependent on botanical ingredients faces supply shock if source ecosystems face habitat loss or protected status designation. A data center reliant on freshwater cooling faces water scarcity risk if regional biodiversity collapse triggers agricultural consolidation and competing demand. An insurer with real estate portfolios in coastal or forest-adjacent regions faces physical risk not only from climate events but from land-use restrictions tied to ecosystem protection mandates.

Organizations should reference [continuityhub.org](https://continuityhub.org)’s guidance on environmental dependencies in business continuity planning and [riskcoveragehub.com](https://riskcoveragehub.com)’s frameworks on catastrophe modeling and ecosystem-related insurance when translating biodiversity risks into operational scenarios. Healthcare facilities should also review [healthcarefacilityhub.org](https://healthcarefacilityhub.org)’s sustainability and facility resilience resources for biodiversity considerations in site selection and supply chain management.

## Implementing TNFD in 2026: Governance, Data, and Timeline

Organizations committing to TNFD disclosure in 2026 should establish clear governance: board oversight of nature-related risk (often assigned to sustainability, risk, or audit committees), executive accountability for TNFD progress, and cross-functional working groups spanning supply chain, operations, finance, and risk management. Without executive accountability and board-level champion, TNFD initiatives often stall as “sustainability department” projects without capital or decision-making authority.

Data infrastructure is the second critical barrier. Organizations require: (1) supply chain mapping with geographic and commodity-level granularity; (2) site-level biodiversity exposure assessment (using tools like World Wildlife Fund’s Footprint Assessment, Microsoft’s Planetary Computer, or UNEP World Database on Protected Areas); (3) climate scenario and biodiversity loss pathway modeling; and (4) financial impact quantification methodologies. Few organizations have this infrastructure fully mature; 2026 is the year to build it.

**Timeline:** Organizations targeting voluntary 2027 disclosure or anticipating UK/CSRD compliance by 2028 should complete TNFD governance setup and pilot disclosure in H2 2026, leveraging the October 2026 ISSB Exposure Draft to validate methodology and scope decisions.

## Related Resources on [bcesg.org](https://bcesg.org)

### Explore Related ESG Reporting Topics

- Environmental Category – Comprehensive ESG environmental frameworks
- Regulatory Frameworks Category – Navigating global ESG disclosure mandates
- Sustainability Reporting Category – Best practices in transparent ESG communication
- ESG Metrics Category – Measurement and quantification standards

## Cluster Cross-References

**For Risk Management & Catastrophe Modeling:** RiskCoverageHub.com provides frameworks for modeling ecosystem-related catastrophic loss, insurance implications of biodiversity risk, and underwriting criteria for climate and nature-related exposure.

**For Operational Resilience:** ContinuityHub.org details how to incorporate nature-related dependencies into business continuity and disaster recovery planning, including supply chain risk assessment and operational scenario planning.

**For Healthcare-Specific Considerations:** HealthcareFacilityHub.org covers sustainability practices, site resilience, and supply chain continuity specific to healthcare operations, including pharmaceutical and medical device supply chains sensitive to environmental disruption.

**For Property & Restoration Context:** RestorationIntel.com addresses ecosystem damage, property impact from environmental degradation, and restoration economics relevant to biodiversity risk assessment.

# The TNFD Framework in 2026: LEAP Approach, Disclosures, and Adoption Status

The Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) is a market-led, voluntary framework that helps organisations identify, assess, manage, and report their dependencies and impacts on nature. As of November 2025, more than 733 organisations across 56 countries had committed to TNFD-aligned reporting, including financial institutions managing USD 22.4 trillion in assets and listed companies worth USD 9.4 trillion in market capitalisation. The framework is built on 14 recommended disclosures across four pillars and the LEAP approach (Locate, Evaluate, Assess, Prepare), and in November 2025 the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) confirmed it will base its forthcoming global nature-reporting standard directly on the TNFD framework.

Published in its final form in September 2023, the TNFD was deliberately modelled on the structure of the Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) so that organisations already reporting on climate could extend the same governance and risk-management muscle to nature, biodiversity, freshwater, land, and ocean systems. Its central method for putting the recommendations into practice is the LEAP approach.

## The LEAP Approach

LEAP is the TNFD’s four-phase process for identifying and assessing nature-related issues. It is designed to be applied flexibly rather than in a rigid sequence, allowing organisations to scope the assessment to what is material for their business.

| Phase        | What it does                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| L — Locate   | Identify where the organisation's operations, value chain, and assets interface with nature, and which of those locations are in ecologically sensitive areas. Establishes the geographic footprint of the business's contact with ecosystems. |
| E — Evaluate | Develop a granular understanding of the organisation's dependencies on nature (such as water, pollination, or soil) and its impacts (such as pollution or habitat change) at the priority locations identified in the Locate phase.            |
| A — Assess   | Translate those dependencies and impacts into nature-related risks and opportunities for the business, and assess how material they are to strategy, operations, and financial performance.                                                    |
| P — Prepare  | Prepare to respond to the material risks and opportunities and to report in line with the TNFD recommended disclosures, including setting targets and integrating nature into governance and risk management.                                  |

## The 14 Recommended Disclosures Across Four Pillars

The TNFD sets out 14 recommended disclosures, organised under the same four conceptual pillars used by the TCFD. This mirroring is intentional: it lets organisations integrate nature reporting into existing climate and sustainability disclosure processes rather than building a parallel system.

- **Governance (2 disclosures):** the board’s oversight of nature-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and management’s role in assessing and managing them. The pillar also covers

human rights policies and engagement with Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities, and affected stakeholders.

- **Strategy (3 disclosures):** the nature-related risks and opportunities the organisation has identified, their effect on the business model, value chain, strategy, and financial planning, and the resilience of the strategy. It also asks organisations to disclose locations of assets and activities in priority areas.
- **Risk and Impact Management (3 disclosures):** the processes used to identify, assess, prioritise, and monitor nature-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, including across the value chain, and how those processes are integrated into overall enterprise risk management.
- **Metrics and Targets (3 disclosures):** the metrics used to assess and manage material nature-related risks and opportunities, the metrics used to assess dependencies and impacts, and the targets the organisation uses and its performance against them. The TNFD provides a set of core global metrics, including indicators for impacts and dependencies, that apply across all sectors, plus sector-specific metrics.

The remaining disclosures sit within these four pillars, totalling 14, and the TNFD also issues sector-specific and biome-specific guidance so that the recommendations can be applied meaningfully across very different industries.

### Adoption Status in 2026 and the ISSB Relationship

Adoption has grown sharply. The first cohort of around 320 early adopters was announced in January 2024; by mid-2024 the figure had reached roughly 416, by January 2026 it had passed 500, and by the COP30 update in November 2025 more than 733 organisations across 56 countries and 64 of the 77 SASB sectors had committed to report. This represented a 46% increase in adopters since COP16 in November 2024.

The adopter base is heavily weighted toward Asia and Europe. Asia accounts for roughly 45% of adopters and Europe around 35%, while North America represents only about 6%. Japan is the single largest country by adoption, with roughly 130 companies and financial institutions reporting, reflecting strong policy support and a domestic Sustainability Standards Board of Japan (SSBJ) regime that becomes mandatory for the largest Prime Market listed firms from the fiscal year ending March 2027. Financial institutions are a major driver: 179 had committed by late 2025, representing about USD 22.4 trillion in assets under management and around a quarter of the world's systemically important banks.

The most consequential 2026 development is the handover to the ISSB. In November 2025 the ISSB decided to begin standard-setting on nature-related risks and opportunities, drawing directly on the TNFD's recommendations, metrics, and the LEAP approach. The ISSB is targeting an Exposure Draft, expected to take the form of an IFRS practice statement supplementing the existing IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards and SASB Standards, by the time of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity COP17 in October 2026, with finalisation anticipated in 2027. In response, the TNFD will complete its in-progress technical work (including remaining sector guidance) by Q3 2026 and then pause the development of new guidance, redirecting its effort to support the ISSB's work programme. The TNFD framework therefore becomes the foundation for what is expected to evolve into a globally consistent, investor-grade nature-reporting standard.

## Frequently Asked Questions

### What is the TNFD?

The Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) is a market-led initiative that provides a voluntary framework for organisations to identify, assess, manage, and disclose their dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities related to nature. Its final recommendations were published in September 2023 and are structured around 14 recommended disclosures across four pillars: Governance, Strategy, Risk and Impact Management, and Metrics and Targets. It is the nature-focused counterpart to the climate-focused TCFD.

### What is the LEAP approach?

LEAP is the TNFD's four-phase method for identifying and assessing nature-related issues. It stands for Locate (find where the business interfaces with nature), Evaluate (understand its dependencies and impacts at priority locations), Assess (turn those into material risks and opportunities), and Prepare (respond and report). LEAP is meant to be applied flexibly and scoped to what is material rather than followed in a strict order.

### How many companies have adopted TNFD?

As of the November 2025 update ahead of COP30, more than 733 organisations across 56 countries had committed to TNFD-aligned reporting, up 46% from COP16 a year earlier. This includes 179 financial institutions managing around USD 22.4 trillion in assets and listed companies worth about USD 9.4 trillion in market capitalisation. Adoption is concentrated in Asia (about 45%) and Europe (about 35%), with Japan the single largest country at roughly 130 adopters.

### Is TNFD mandatory?

The TNFD framework itself is voluntary and market-led. However, its trajectory mirrors the TCFD's shift from voluntary to mandatory: elements of TNFD are being incorporated into regulation through the EU's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and ESRS standards on biodiversity and water, Japan's emerging SSBJ regime, and jurisdictions such as the UK and Australia that are considering nature-related disclosure mandates. The biggest step toward mandatory status is the ISSB building a global standard on the TNFD foundation.

### How does TNFD relate to TCFD and ISSB?

The TNFD was deliberately modelled on the TCFD, using the same four-pillar architecture (Governance, Strategy, Risk and Impact Management, Metrics and Targets) so that nature reporting could be integrated with existing climate reporting. In November 2025 the ISSB decided to develop a global nature-reporting standard drawing directly on the TNFD's recommendations, metrics, and LEAP approach, targeting an Exposure Draft by COP17 in October 2026. The ISSB has effectively taken on the role of converting the voluntary TNFD framework into investor-grade global standards, just as it consolidated the TCFD recommendations into IFRS S2.

### What is the difference between TNFD and ISSB nature standards?

The TNFD is a voluntary framework that organisations can adopt today, providing recommendations, the LEAP approach, and sector guidance. The ISSB nature standard, by contrast, is being developed as a

formal global disclosure standard (expected as an IFRS practice statement supplementing the IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards) that regulators can require companies to apply. Because the ISSB is building its standard on the TNFD framework, organisations that adopt TNFD now are positioning themselves to comply with the future ISSB requirements with minimal rework.

## Regulatory Frameworks: Expert Video Analysis

Source: <https://bcesg.org/video-regulatory-frameworks/> Published: March 18, 2026

Home > Regulatory Frameworks > Video: Demystifying the CSRD – the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive EXPLAINED

## Demystifying the CSRD – the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive EXPLAINED

Channel: 414- Value Beyond Compliance

Duration: 5:35 | Views: 20K | Published: August 23, 2023

Relevance Score: 65/100

### Why This Matters for ESG Professionals

For sustainability and ESG professionals, deep understanding of regulatory frameworks frameworks and implementation strategies directly impacts organizational credibility, stakeholder trust, regulatory compliance, and competitive positioning. Companies that master these practices gain access to lower-cost capital, attract top talent, improve operational efficiency, and build resilience against emerging regulatory and market risks.

## Key Moments in This Video

| Time | Topic            | What You'll Learn  |
|------|------------------|--------------------|
| 1:23 | Introduction     | Learn more at 1:23 |
| 2:46 | Key Concepts     | Learn more at 2:46 |
| 4:09 | Framework Basics | Learn more at 4:09 |

### Regulatory Frameworks

Government-mandated sustainability reporting requirements including EU CSRD/ESRS, SEC climate rules, and other jurisdictional standards establishing minimum disclosure thresholds and compliance timelines.

Learn more: [GRI Standards](#) | [ISSB](#) | [SASB](#)

## Key Takeaways

- EU CSRD/ESRS (effective 2024+) mandates double materiality reporting from ~50K European companies; represents global standardization shift toward mandatory, audited ESG disclosure.
- SEC climate rules require large registrants to disclose Scope 1/2 emissions and climate risk strategy; compliance deadlines 2024-2026 despite continued regulatory updates.
- Regulatory fragmentation creates compliance burden; companies operating globally navigate 20+ different sustainability reporting requirements. Integrated single-report approach emerging.
- Supply chain scope expansion (Scope 3 emissions) and supplier verification requirements under regulations create visibility challenges; digital tools enabling automated data aggregation from suppliers.
- Non-compliance penalties escalating: EU fines up to 5% revenue for inadequate CSRD disclosure; institutional investor pressure increasingly divests non-compliant companies globally.

## Expert Analysis: Regulatory Frameworks in 2026

The regulatory frameworks landscape in 2026 has matured significantly with standardization and mandatory regulatory requirements reshaping corporate practices globally. The convergence of GRI, SASB, ISSB, and TCFD frameworks toward integrated reporting standards enables organizations to achieve transparency goals more efficiently while meeting investor and regulatory expectations.

Market leaders implementing regulatory frameworks programs as core business strategy (not compliance checkbox) demonstrate measurable financial benefits: lower cost of capital, improved operational efficiency, reduced regulatory risk, and enhanced stakeholder engagement. Companies with substantiated, assured regulatory frameworks performance outperform peers in capital markets valuation by 15-25% on average.

The regulatory environment continues tightening: mandatory climate disclosure for large corporations, mandatory human rights due diligence in EU/Canada, pay equity reporting requirements, and supply chain transparency mandates create compliance imperatives alongside competitive advantage opportunities. Organizations already implementing robust regulatory frameworks governance and disclosure adapt faster to new requirements and maintain stakeholder trust through transparent communication of progress and challenges.

## Industry Standards & Regulatory References

| Standard          | Governing Body                                    | What It Covers                                                  |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| EU CSRD/ESRS      | European Union                                    | Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and standards      |
| SEC Climate Rules | U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission           | Climate and ESG disclosure requirements for SEC registrants     |
| ISSB Standards    | International Sustainability Standards Board      | Global baseline for sustainability-related financial disclosure |
| TNFD Framework    | Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures | Nature and biodiversity-related financial disclosure            |

## Related Reading on BCESG

- [Regulatory Frameworks Guide](#)
- [ESG Best Practices](#)
- [Reporting Frameworks](#)

## Cross-Cluster Resources

- [Risk Coverage Hub – ESG Reporting](#)
- [Continuity Hub – Resilience Planning](#)
- [Sustainability Resource Hub – Frameworks](#)

## Key Terms Glossary

**Materiality Assessment** identifying which ESG issues have material impact on business performance and stakeholder decision-making  
**Double Materiality Analysis** considering both company impact on stakeholders/environment AND stakeholder impact on company  
**GRI Standards** Global Reporting Initiative framework for comprehensive sustainability reporting across environmental, social, economic topics  
**ISSB Standards** International Sustainability Standards Board framework establishing global baseline for climate and sustainability disclosure  
**Third-Party Assurance** Independent verification of reported ESG metrics and data quality by external auditors

## Frequently Asked Questions

**What frameworks should our organization use for regulatory frameworks reporting?**

Start with GRI universal standards as the comprehensive baseline, then add industry-specific SASB metrics and TCFD/ISSB standards as applicable. The goal is integrated, double-materiality-informed reporting connecting to business strategy and value creation.

**How do we identify material regulatory frameworks issues?**

Conduct materiality assessment surveying investors, employees, customers, communities, and other stakeholders to identify most impactful issues. Plot findings on 2×2 matrix (business impact vs. stakeholder concern) to prioritize board-level governance.

**What are the consequences of non-compliance with regulatory frameworks regulations?**

EU CSRD non-compliance can result in fines up to 5% annual revenue; SEC climate rule violations expose companies to enforcement action and shareholder litigation. Beyond legal/financial penalties, non-compliance risks capital access, institutional investor divestment, and reputational damage.

**How should we integrate regulatory frameworks into strategy and governance?**

Board-level ESG committee oversight, executive compensation tied to ESG metrics, cross-functional governance structure, integration with risk management, and transparent reporting to stakeholders creates accountability and drives sustainable value creation.

This watch page was generated for BCESG.org. Video sourced from YouTube. All external links are for reference and education purposes.

For professional regulatory frameworks guidance and strategy support, consult certified ESG consultants and advisors in your region.

## California Climate Accountability Laws: SB 253, SB 261, and AB 1305 Compliance Guide

*Source: <https://bcesg.org/california-climate-accountability-sb-253-sb-261-ab-1305-compliance/> Published: March 18, 2026*

Home > Regulatory Frameworks > California Climate Laws

## California Climate Accountability Laws: SB 253, SB 261, and AB 1305 Compliance Guide

*Updated October 6, 2026.*

If you do business in California above revenue thresholds, this guide summarizes SB 253, SB 261, and AB 1305 reporting and claims obligations as of October 2026.

**Definition:** California’s climate accountability laws—Senate Bill 253 (Climate Corporate Data Accountability Act), Senate Bill 261 (Climate Accountability Act), and Assembly Bill 1305—establish mandatory greenhouse gas emissions reporting requirements and create new liability frameworks for corporations making climate-related claims. Together, these laws create a comprehensive regulatory regime requiring large companies to publicly report Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions, with reporting beginning in 2026, and enabling enforcement action by California’s Attorney General for misleading climate claims.

### Overview of California’s Climate Accountability Framework

California has established itself as the leading subnational jurisdiction for climate regulation. The three primary laws create complementary requirements: mandatory GHG emissions disclosure (SB 253), enforcement authority for misleading climate claims (SB 261), and expanded liability for corporate climate accountability (AB 1305). These laws apply to companies doing business in California with annual revenues exceeding \$1 billion and establish strict liability standards for climate-related misrepresentations.

### Policy Context and Timeline

SB 253 was signed into law in October 2023 with an effective date of January 1, 2024. Reporting begins in 2026 for baseline year 2025 data. SB 261 was signed in October 2023 and became effective immediately, creating enforcement authority. AB 1305 was signed in September 2023 and expands the scope of climate accountability. As of March 2026, these laws are being actively implemented despite legal challenges

from business groups.

## Senate Bill 253: Climate Corporate Data Accountability Act

### SB 253 Overview

**Mandatory GHG emissions reporting requirement for large companies; applies to entities with annual revenues exceeding \$1 billion doing business in California; requires reporting of Scope 1, 2, and material Scope 3 emissions; first reporting deadline January 1, 2026 for fiscal year 2025 data; annual reporting thereafter.**

### Applicability and Scope

**Who Must Report:** Any entity, including corporations, partnerships, and other business entities, with gross annual revenues exceeding \$1 billion in the preceding fiscal year and engaged in business in California.

**Reporting Requirement:** Annual disclosure of GHG emissions for:

- **Scope 1:** Direct emissions from company-controlled sources
- **Scope 2:** Indirect emissions from purchased electricity, steam, heating, and cooling
- **Scope 3 (if material):** Value chain emissions, including supplier emissions, product use, and waste disposal

### Reporting Standards and Methodology

SB 253 requires compliance with one of the following standards:

- **GHG Protocol Corporate Standard:** Greenhouse Gas Protocol Initiative's standards for quantifying and reporting GHG emissions
- **ISO 14064:** International Organization for Standardization standards for GHG quantification and verification
- **Other Equivalently Rigorous Standard:** California Air Resources Board (CARB) may approve equivalent methodologies

### Materiality Threshold for Scope 3

Companies must include Scope 3 emissions if they constitute 40% or more of total GHG emissions (Scope 1+2+3). This threshold balances comprehensiveness with proportionality, recognizing that Scope 3 represents the majority of emissions for most companies but is challenging to measure and verify.

### Assurance and Verification

SB 253 does not initially mandate third-party assurance, but CARB has indicated that assurance requirements may be introduced in future years. Best practice and investor expectations increasingly favor independent verification at limited or reasonable assurance levels.

### Reporting Timeline and Format

| Year                | Reporting Requirement                                                                            |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2026 (First Report) | Report calendar year 2025 GHG emissions; reporting deadline January 1, 2026                      |
| 2027 and Beyond     | Annual reporting by January 1 each year for preceding fiscal year emissions                      |
| Ongoing             | CARB will specify detailed reporting format and data submission procedures; portal expected 2026 |

## Penalties for Non-Compliance

**SB 253 provides for penalties of up to \$5,000 per day of violation. CARB has enforcement authority. However, initial enforcement is expected to prioritize large corporations and flagrant non-compliance; smaller entities may receive compliance assistance.**

## Senate Bill 261: Climate Accountability Act

### SB 261 Overview

**Creates strict liability framework for misleading climate-related claims; empowers California Attorney General to sue corporations making false or misleading statements about climate impacts, emissions reductions, and sustainability; applies to any company making public claims about climate performance or commitments in California.**

### Scope and Applicability

**SB 261 applies to any entity making material misrepresentations about climate-related information, including:**

- GHG emissions levels and trends
- Emissions reduction targets and progress toward targets
- Climate risk assessments and mitigation strategies
- Sustainability certifications or claims
- Investment in green technologies or renewable energy

### Liability Standards

**Strict Liability:** Unlike traditional fraud statutes requiring proof of intent to deceive, SB 261 imposes strict liability for material misrepresentations. A company need not intend to deceive; merely making a false or misleading statement about climate matters creates liability.

**Materiality Standard:** A statement is material if a reasonable consumer, investor, or employee would consider it important in deciding to purchase, invest in, or work for the company.

### Enforcement and Remedies

**The California Attorney General has exclusive enforcement authority under SB 261. Remedies include:**

- Civil penalties up to \$2,500 per violation (or \$5,000 if violation is intentional)
- Injunctive relief and mandated corrective advertising

- Restitution to injured consumers or investors
- Attorney’s fees and costs

## Scope of Enforcement

As of March 2026, the California Attorney General has signaled active enforcement of SB 261. Several enforcement actions have been initiated against companies making overstated climate claims, particularly in the renewable energy, automotive, and consumer goods sectors. Companies should anticipate heightened scrutiny of climate communications.

## Assembly Bill 1305: Expanded Corporate Accountability

### AB 1305 Overview

Expands the scope of corporate climate liability; strengthens enforcement mechanisms; creates independent civil cause of action for climate-related harm; applies to corporations causing climate damages in California; addresses both false climate claims and inadequate adaptation planning.

### Key Provisions

- **Corporate Liability for Climate Damages:** Corporations may be held liable for climate-related injuries and property damage if causation is established
- **Adaptation and Resilience Requirements:** Large corporations must assess and publicly disclose climate adaptation plans for facilities and operations in California
- **Fiduciary Duty Enhancement:** Corporate directors have fiduciary duty to consider climate-related risks and opportunities; breach of this duty creates potential personal liability
- **Supply Chain Accountability:** Corporations are responsible for material climate-related risks in their supply chains; failure to assess and disclose creates liability

### Physical Risk and Adaptation Disclosure

AB 1305 requires corporations to disclose:

- Identification of facilities and operations exposed to physical climate risks (flooding, wildfire, extreme heat, drought)
- Assessment of climate impact on operations, supply chains, and financial performance
- Adaptation strategies and capital investments in resilience and mitigation
- Third-party assurance of adaptation planning where feasible

## Legal Challenges and Current Status (March 2026)

### Business Community Opposition and Litigation

California’s climate laws have faced significant legal challenges from business groups and Republican-led states, arguing overreach and unconstitutionality. Key arguments include:

### Constitutional Arguments Against the Laws

- **Commerce Clause Challenge:** Argument that SB 253 and SB 261 impose undue burden on interstate commerce by regulating conduct outside California or by discriminating against out-of-state entities
- **First Amendment (SB 261):** Free speech arguments that mandatory disclosure of climate information compels speech or prevents freedom of expression on climate matters
- **Due Process and Notice:** Arguments that strict liability standard (SB 261) violates due process by punishing entities without requiring proof of intent
- **Preemption Arguments:** Federal law (SEC climate rule, EPA authority) may preempt state climate laws

## **Litigation Status as of March 2026**

Multiple lawsuits challenging SB 253, SB 261, and AB 1305 are pending in California and federal courts.

**Key developments:**

- California Chamber of Commerce, American Petroleum Institute, and other business groups have filed federal court challenges
- Several Republican states have filed amicus briefs opposing the laws
- Federal court has declined initial motions to block implementation, allowing the laws to proceed
- Final resolution may extend into 2026-2027; potential appeal to Ninth Circuit and Supreme Court

## **Enforcement Pause and Safe Harbor**

While legal challenges proceed, California has not paused enforcement of SB 253 or SB 261. The Attorney General has announced enforcement priorities targeting:

- Material misrepresentations about emissions levels and targets
- Greenwashing in marketing and investor disclosures
- Supply chain emissions concealment

No formal safe harbor has been established, but companies making good-faith efforts to comply and correct errors may receive leniency from enforcement.

## **Compliance Strategy for Companies**

### **Phase 1: Applicability Assessment (Months 1-2)**

- Determine if your company meets SB 253 threshold (>\$1B annual revenue; doing business in California)
- Review current climate disclosures and identify gaps relative to SB 253, SB 261, and AB 1305 requirements
- Assess climate-related claims in marketing, investor materials, and employee communications for compliance with SB 261 standards

### **Phase 2: GHG Emissions Accounting (Months 2-6)**

- Establish GHG accounting methodology aligned with GHG Protocol, ISO 14064, or equivalent standard

- **Collect baseline emissions data for Scope 1 and 2; identify Scope 3 categories and assess materiality (40% threshold)**
- **Implement data management systems for ongoing tracking and annual reporting**
- **Engage third-party verification provider for assurance (limited or reasonable assurance)**

### **Phase 3: Climate Communications Audit (Months 3-6)**

- **Conduct comprehensive audit of all climate-related claims (marketing, advertising, investor relations, sustainability reports, website)**
- **Assess accuracy and substantiation of claims; identify potential SB 261 violations**
- **Correct or remove misleading or unsubstantiated claims**
- **Implement governance framework for climate communication review (legal, sustainability, investor relations approval)**

### **Phase 4: Adaptation and Resilience Disclosure (Months 6-12)**

- **Assess physical climate risks to California facilities and supply chain partners**
- **Develop adaptation and resilience strategies addressing identified risks**
- **Disclose findings and adaptation plans in sustainability reports and corporate communications**
- **Implement capital investments in resilience (hardening, relocation, insurance)**

### **Phase 5: Reporting Preparation (Months 12-18)**

- **Finalize baseline year 2025 GHG emissions calculations**
- **Obtain third-party assurance of emissions data**
- **Prepare SB 253 report for submission to CARB by January 1, 2026**
- **Document methodologies, assumptions, and exclusions for audit trail**

## **Key Differences from Federal SEC Rule and EU Standards**

| <b>Dimension</b>        | <b>SB 253</b>                                | <b>SEC Climate Rule</b>                      | <b>EU Taxonomy/CSRD</b>                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Applicability Threshold | >\$1B revenue (CA business)                  | >\$100M assets (public companies)            | >500 employees (EU companies)                |
| Scope 3 Requirement     | If material (40%+ threshold)                 | Phased; if material                          | Required for most companies                  |
| Assurance Requirement   | Not yet mandated (best practice recommended) | Not mandated (SEC encouraged)                | Limited assurance required                   |
| Liability Mechanism     | Strict liability for misstatements (SB 261)  | Securities fraud standards (intent required) | Administrative penalties; director liability |

## **Frequently Asked Questions**

**If my company generates \$1.2 billion in revenue but only 5% comes from California, do I need to comply with SB 253?**

**Yes. SB 253 applies to any entity with gross annual revenues exceeding \$1 billion “doing business in California.” Even minimal California business operations trigger applicability. The law does not require proportional reporting; full company emissions must be disclosed if any California business activity exists.**

**What is the 40% materiality threshold for Scope 3 emissions?**

**If Scope 3 emissions (value chain, product use, waste) comprise 40% or more of total emissions (Scope 1+2+3), they are deemed material and must be included in SB 253 reporting. This threshold provides clarity on when Scope 3 disclosure is required, though best practice is to report Scope 3 even if below 40% if it represents a significant emission source.**

**How strict is the liability under SB 261?**

**SB 261 imposes strict liability, meaning a company can be liable for making false or misleading climate claims even without intent to deceive. The sole question is whether the statement is material and false. This is a significant departure from traditional fraud standards and creates substantial risk for overstated climate claims.**

**What happens if we miss the January 1, 2026 reporting deadline?**

**SB 253 provides penalties up to \$5,000 per day of violation. While CARB may exercise discretion in enforcement, companies should prioritize meeting the deadline. If a company cannot meet the deadline, it should promptly notify CARB and file as soon as possible to minimize penalty exposure.**

**How do the California laws interact with SEC and federal regulations?**

**The California laws are more stringent than current federal regulations in several respects (strict liability under SB 261, Scope 3 materiality threshold, faster timeline). Companies with both California and federal obligations should implement controls satisfying the strictest standard (California) to ensure full compliance.**

## **Related Resources**

**Learn more about related topics:**

- **SEC Climate Disclosure Rule: Requirements, Timeline, Legal Challenges, and Compliance Strategy**
- **Global ESG Regulatory Convergence: ISSB Adoption, Jurisdictional Mapping, and Interoperability**
- **ESG Regulatory Frameworks: The Complete Professional Guide (2026)**

## **Impact Investing: Measurement Frameworks, GII Standards, and Portfolio Construction**

Source: <https://bcesg.org/impact-investing-measurement-giin-standards-portfolio-construction/> Published: March 18, 2026

Home > Green Finance > Impact Investing

## Impact Investing: Measurement Frameworks, GIIN Standards, and Portfolio Construction

Updated October 6, 2026.

If you build impact portfolios, this guide ties GIIN IRIS+ measurement to portfolio construction and impact thesis documentation.

**Definition:** Impact investing is the practice of allocating capital to enterprises, organizations, or projects with the explicit intention to generate positive, measurable environmental or social outcomes alongside financial returns. Impact measurement frameworks like GIIN's IRIS+ standard enable investors to quantify and compare impact across portfolios, ensuring accountability and authenticity.

### The Rise of Impact Investing

Impact investing has evolved from a niche philanthropic practice into a mainstream asset class. As of 2025, global impact investing assets exceed \$1.5 trillion, driven by institutional investor demand, intergenerational wealth transfer, and regulatory mandates for responsible capital allocation. Impact investors range from private foundations and impact funds to institutional investors and corporates, all seeking to align capital deployment with societal and environmental objectives.

### Core Principles of Impact Investing

The Global Impact Investing Network (GIIN) defines four core characteristics of impact investing:

- **Intentionality:** Explicit commitment to generate positive impact alongside financial returns
- **Measurement:** Rigorous, evidence-based measurement of impact outcomes
- **Financial Returns:** Expectation of competitive, market-rate returns (not purely philanthropic)
- **Diversity:** Flexibility across sectors, geographies, asset classes, and impact themes

### The GIIN IRIS+ Framework

#### Overview and Structure

The IRIS+ standard, maintained by GIIN, provides a comprehensive taxonomy of impact metrics across sectors. IRIS+ comprises:

- **Core Metrics:** Standardized, comparable metrics applicable across sectors (e.g., greenhouse gas emissions avoided, jobs created)
- **Supplementary Metrics:** Context-specific or exploratory metrics for additional insight
- **Impact Themes:** Organized by sustainable development goals (SDGs) and environmental/social outcomes

#### Key Impact Metric Categories

## Environmental Metrics

- **Climate:** GHG emissions avoided (tCO<sub>2</sub>e), renewable energy generated (MWh), energy efficiency gains (MWh saved)
- **Natural Resources:** Water conserved (m<sup>3</sup>), land protected (hectares), biodiversity preservation (species benefited)
- **Pollution:** Air pollutants reduced, hazardous waste managed, plastic diverted from landfills

## Social Metrics

- **Employment:** Jobs created, full-time equivalent (FTE) positions, income per worker, wage level adherence
- **Health:** Lives improved, healthcare access expanded, disease cases prevented
- **Education:** Students trained, curriculum hours delivered, graduation/completion rates
- **Financial Inclusion:** Individuals with access to credit, unbanked populations served, smallholder farmers supported

## IRIS+ Application in Due Diligence

Impact investors use IRIS+ metrics to:

- Define baseline and target impact expectations during investment screening
- Enable standardized impact measurement across portfolio companies
- Benchmark impact performance against peer investments and market standards
- Communicate impact outcomes to stakeholders and limited partners

## Impact Measurement Frameworks Beyond IRIS+

### Additionality and Attribution

Rigorous impact measurement requires addressing critical methodological questions:

- **Additionality:** Would the impact outcome have occurred without the investment? This counterfactual assessment is essential to avoid claiming credit for outcomes that would have happened anyway.
- **Attribution vs. Contribution:** Attribution establishes direct causality; contribution acknowledges the investment's role in a broader ecosystem. Most impact investments rely on contribution metrics.
- **Baseline and Boundary:** Clear definition of measurement scope (e.g., direct beneficiaries vs. indirect spillover effects) ensures transparency and comparability.

### The Impact Management Project (IMP) Framework

The Impact Management Project, a collaborative initiative involving GIIN, EVPA, and other networks, articulates five core dimensions for impact assessment:

- **What:** What outcomes are being targeted? (Environmental/social dimensions)
- **Who:** Who is affected? (Direct vs. indirect beneficiaries; demographic characteristics)

- **How Much:** Scale of impact (absolute numbers and intensity/depth)
- **Contribution:** Causal pathway and additionality assessment
- **Risk:** Probability impact is realized; downside scenarios and mitigation

## Impact Investing Across Asset Classes

### Private Equity and Venture Capital

Impact PE/VC focuses on companies with strong ESG governance and positive social/environmental models. Impact value creation includes both operational improvements and impact scaling. Examples include renewable energy developers, healthcare innovators, and educational technology platforms.

### Fixed Income and Green/Social Bonds

Impact bonds (green, social, sustainability-linked) enable fixed-income exposure to impact assets with defined, measurable outcomes. Investors benefit from documented impact transparency and often access to grant proceeds or guarantees if impact targets are missed.

### Real Assets and Infrastructure

Real assets (renewable energy, water infrastructure, sustainable agriculture) offer tangible, measurable impact alongside inflation-protected cash flows. Impact metrics are often embedded in operational performance targets and regulatory compliance requirements.

### Public Equities

Public market impact investing selects companies demonstrating strong environmental/social performance, positive externalities, and solutions to global challenges. Impact metrics may align with materiality frameworks (SASB, TCFD) or broader SDG contribution.

## Portfolio Construction for Impact

### Impact Thesis and Theory of Change

Successful impact portfolios begin with a clear theory of change, articulating how investments will generate intended outcomes. A theory of change includes:

- Problem definition and context analysis
- Investment strategy and target actors (companies, sectors, geographies)
- Inputs and activities (capital deployment, engagement, capacity building)
- Outputs (investments made, companies supported) and outcomes (impact metrics)
- Impact assumptions and risk factors

### Portfolio Diversification and Risk Management

Impact portfolios balance multiple objectives:

- **Impact Diversification:** Exposure to multiple impact themes and geographies reduces concentration risk

- **Financial Risk Management:** Credit and market risk assessments consistent with conventional investing standards
- **Impact Materiality:** Allocation to investments with meaningful, measurable outcomes (not marginal contributions)
- **Return Expectations:** Realistic return assumptions aligned with asset class and maturity profile

## Investor Typology and Return Expectations

Impact investors have varying return expectations based on mission and capital source:

- **Philanthropic Capital:** Grant-focused or concessionary return expectations; prioritizes impact over financial returns
- **Blended Finance:** Combination of concessionary and market-rate capital; catalyzes private sector participation
- **Mainstream Institutional:** Market-rate return expectations; impact as a value-creation driver and risk mitigation

## Impact Performance Measurement and Reporting

### Standards and Best Practices

- **GIIN IRIS+ Reporting:** Standardized metric reporting enables aggregation and benchmarking
- **GIIRS Ratings:** GIIN's Impact Business Rating uses proprietary methodology to assess company impact governance and performance
- **SASB Standards:** Materiality-based framework for investor-relevant ESG outcomes; increasingly used for impact assessment
- **SDG Mapping:** Alignment with UN Sustainable Development Goals provides stakeholder transparency

### Impact Reporting to Limited Partners

Effective impact reporting communicates both quantitative metrics and qualitative narratives:

- Aggregated impact data across portfolio (e.g., "Portfolio avoided 500,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in 2025")
- Per-investment case studies highlighting mechanisms and outcomes
- Comparison to baseline and targets, with explanation of variances
- Impact attribution and additionality assessment
- Risk factors and contingency plans if targets are missed

## Challenges in Impact Measurement

### Attribution and Causality

Establishing rigorous causal links between investment and outcome is methodologically challenging, particularly for social outcomes influenced by multiple actors and policy environments. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) provide gold-standard evidence but are expensive and impractical for many

investments.

## Benchmark and Baseline Problems

Defining appropriate counterfactuals (what would have happened without the investment) requires context-specific analysis. General benchmarks may not capture local conditions or market dynamics, leading to over- or under-estimation of impact.

## Greenwashing and Impact Inflation

Pressure to demonstrate positive impact can incentivize inflated metrics or inappropriate baselines. Third-party verification and standardized frameworks (IRIS+, GIIRS) help mitigate this risk but require investor diligence.

## Emerging Trends in Impact Investing

### Nature-Based Solutions and Biodiversity Impact

Growing recognition of biodiversity loss has spurred impact investing in ecosystem restoration, sustainable agriculture, and wildlife protection. Metrics frameworks for nature impact are still developing but increasingly aligned with international standards (e.g., Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures).

### Climate Resilience and Adaptation Impact

While mitigation-focused investments remain dominant, adaptation impact (resilience building, climate-proofing infrastructure) is gaining traction, particularly in vulnerable regions.

### Integration with ESG and Mainstream Investing

The boundary between impact and ESG investing is blurring. Mainstream funds increasingly incorporate impact measurement and reporting, while impact funds adopt ESG risk frameworks. This convergence creates opportunities for scale but requires vigilant attention to impact authenticity.

## Frequently Asked Questions

**How does impact investing differ from ESG investing?**

ESG investing focuses on managing material business risks and opportunities related to environmental, social, and governance factors, with the goal of improving financial returns and risk management. Impact investing explicitly targets positive environmental or social outcomes, with financial returns as a secondary consideration. While ESG emphasizes risk mitigation, impact prioritizes outcome generation.

**What financial returns should impact investors expect?**

Expected returns vary by investor type and asset class. Market-rate impact investors target competitive returns (7-10% IRR for PE, 3-5% for fixed income) while generating measurable impact. Philanthropic and blended finance investors may accept concessionary returns (0-3%) if impact is sufficiently strong. Returns must reflect risk profile and market conditions.

**How is additionality assessed in impact investing?**

Additionality is evaluated by defining a counterfactual scenario: what would have happened without the investment? Assessment methods include market analysis (would the investment have occurred anyway?), beneficiary surveys, and comparative outcome measurement. Rigorous additionality assessment typically requires third-party evaluation and baseline data collection.

**Is IRIS+ the only impact measurement standard?**

IRIS+ is the most widely used standardized framework, but others exist, including the IMP framework, SASB Standards, GIIRS ratings, and SDG alignment tools. Many investors use multiple frameworks in combination to capture different dimensions of impact. Standardization is improving but full convergence remains a work in progress.

**Can impact investments achieve market-rate returns?**

Yes. Evidence from GIIN and other research demonstrates that impact investments can deliver competitive financial returns. However, return expectations must be realistic for the asset class and risk profile. Early-stage impact ventures may underperform initially; mature impact businesses in liquid markets often deliver returns on par with conventional peers.

## Related Resources

Learn more about related topics:

- [Green Bonds and Sustainability-Linked Instruments: ICMA Principles, Pricing, and Market Growth](#)
- [EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities: Technical Screening Criteria and 2026 Updates](#)
- [Green Finance: The Complete Professional Guide \(2026\)](#)

## How Impact Is Measured: GIIN, IRIS+, and the Five Dimensions of Impact

Impact in impact investing is measured by setting an intentional social or environmental goal, then tracking it with standardized metrics — most commonly the Global Impact Investing Network’s (GIIN) IRIS+ system — assessed across the Five Dimensions of Impact: What, Who, How Much, Contribution, and Risk. Credible measurement rests on three pillars: intentionality (a deliberate impact goal), additionality (impact that would not have happened otherwise), and measurability (outcomes tracked with evidence and reported transparently).

## The Five Dimensions of Impact

The Five Dimensions of Impact are the shared analytical framework most impact investors use to describe and compare any impact. Originally built by the consensus-driven Impact Management Project (2016–2021) and now stewarded by Impact Frontiers, the five dimensions are also the backbone of how IRIS+ organizes its metrics. Each dimension answers one core question about an outcome.

| Dimension | What it asks                                                                                                            | Example metric                                                                                             |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| What      | What outcome is occurring, is it positive or negative, and how important is it to the people or planet experiencing it? | Type of outcome delivered (e.g., tonnes of CO2e avoided; number of clients gaining access to clean energy) |

| Dimension    | What it asks                                                                                                     | Example metric                                                                                                                  |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Who          | Who experiences the outcome, and how underserved are they?                                                       | Share of beneficiaries who are low-income, women, or otherwise underserved (e.g., % of clients below the national poverty line) |
| How Much     | How many people are affected, what degree of change do they experience, and for how long?                        | Scale, depth, and duration (e.g., number of people reached; income increase per beneficiary; years the benefit persists)        |
| Contribution | Did the enterprise's and investor's efforts produce outcomes likely better than what would have happened anyway? | Counterfactual / additionality assessment (e.g., outcome vs. a baseline or comparison group)                                    |
| Risk         | What is the likelihood that the impact differs from what is expected?                                            | Impact risk rating across factors such as evidence risk, external risk, and drop-off risk                                       |

## IRIS+ and the Core Characteristics of Impact Investing

**IRIS+ is the GIIN's free, generally accepted system for measuring, managing, and optimizing impact. At its center is the IRIS Catalog of Metrics — a standardized library of social, environmental, and financial performance indicators (the IRIS+ 5.3c Catalog was released in December 2025). Rather than asking investors to choose from thousands of metrics alone, IRIS+ packages them into Core Metrics Sets: curated, evidence-backed shortlists of indicators tied to specific Impact Themes (such as clean energy, financial inclusion, or affordable housing) and aligned to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). IRIS+ metrics are also mapped to the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Standards and 50-plus other frameworks, which lets investors report once and translate across standards. In practice, an investor selects a theme, adopts the matching Core Metrics Set, collects the data, and uses it to compare performance against peers and against the investor's own targets.**

**IRIS+ operationalizes the GIIN's four Core Characteristics of Impact Investing, which define what separates impact investing from conventional or simply ESG-screened investing:**

- **Intentionality** — the investment is made with an explicit, up-front intention to generate a positive, measurable social or environmental benefit alongside a financial return. Without a deliberate goal, an outcome is incidental, not impact.
- **Use evidence and impact data in investment design (measurability)** — investors use research and data to design the investment, then systematically track, assess, and transparently report outcomes. Measurability is what makes a claim verifiable rather than aspirational.
- **Manage impact performance** — investors build feedback loops, monitor progress toward the stated intention, and adjust when results fall short.
- **Contribute to the growth of the industry** — investors use shared conventions and metrics (such as IRIS+) and share learnings, so the whole market can compare and improve.

**A closely related concept is additionality: the idea that the capital (or the investor's non-financial support) produces impact that would not have occurred otherwise. Additionality is the practical test behind the "Contribution" dimension — it asks investors to define a counterfactual (what would have happened without the investment) and demonstrate that their participation changed the outcome.**

## How Big Is the Impact Investing Market Today?

According to the GIIN’s *State of the Market 2025: Trends, Performance and Allocations* report (published October 2025, drawing on reliable data from 429 organizations across 54 countries), impact investing assets under management (AUM) total roughly US\$1.6 trillion — up from about US\$1.16 trillion in 2022. The market has grown at a compound annual growth rate of approximately 21% over the past six years, including an 11% increase in the most recent year, a sign of durable demand even amid broader economic headwinds.

The report also signals a maturing market on the returns side: roughly 79% of surveyed impact investors now target risk-adjusted, market-rate returns, rather than accepting below-market (concessionary) returns — evidence that investors increasingly view measurable impact and competitive financial performance as compatible rather than mutually exclusive. The sharpest growth in capital allocation has been in nature/biodiversity and energy-transition themes.

## Frequently Asked Questions

### What is IRIS+?

IRIS+ is the Global Impact Investing Network’s (GIIN) free, generally accepted system for measuring, managing, and optimizing impact. It pairs a standardized Catalog of Metrics (the IRIS+ 5.3c Catalog was released in December 2025) with curated “Core Metrics Sets” tied to specific impact themes and aligned to the UN Sustainable Development Goals, so investors across the market can measure and compare impact in a consistent, evidence-based way.

### What are the Five Dimensions of Impact?

The Five Dimensions of Impact are a shared framework for assessing any impact across five questions: What (the outcome and its importance), Who (who experiences it and how underserved they are), How Much (scale, depth, and duration), Contribution (whether the result was better than what would have happened anyway), and Risk (the likelihood that impact differs from expectations). The framework originated with the Impact Management Project and is now stewarded by Impact Frontiers.

### What is the difference between intentionality and additionality?

Intentionality is about purpose: the investor sets out, deliberately and up front, to create a measurable positive social or environmental outcome alongside a financial return. Additionality is about causation: it asks whether that impact would have happened anyway, and credits only the change the investment actually caused (measured against a counterfactual baseline). An investment can be intentional yet have low additionality if the impact would have occurred without it — which is why both are assessed.

### How is impact measured in impact investing?

Impact is measured by setting a clear intention, selecting standardized metrics (most commonly through the GIIN’s IRIS+ system), collecting data on outcomes, and evaluating that data across the Five Dimensions of Impact. Credible measurement also follows the GIIN’s Core Characteristics — intentionality, use of evidence and impact data, managing impact performance, and contributing to industry standards — so that claims are verifiable and comparable rather than anecdotal.

### How big is the impact investing market?

The GIIN's State of the Market 2025 report estimates global impact investing assets under management at roughly US\$1.6 trillion, up from about US\$1.16 trillion in 2022. The market has grown at a compound annual growth rate of about 21% over the past six years, with an 11% increase in the most recent year. The 2025 report drew on data from 429 organizations across 54 countries.

### What is the difference between IRIS+ and ESG?

ESG (environmental, social, and governance) investing typically screens or scores companies to manage risk and reduce harm within a conventional portfolio. IRIS+ and impact investing go further: they require an intentional impact goal, measurement of actual outcomes (not just policies or ratings), and a demonstration that capital is contributing to change. In short, ESG often asks “is this company well-run and low-risk on sustainability?” while impact measurement asks “what positive outcome did this investment actually produce, for whom, and how much?”

## Double Materiality Assessment: Methodology, Stakeholder Mapping, and CSRD Compliance

*Source: <https://bcesg.org/double-materiality-assessment-methodology-stakeholder-mapping-csrd/> Published: March 18, 2026*

Home > ESG Metrics > Double Materiality Assessment

## Double Materiality Assessment: Methodology, Stakeholder Mapping, and CSRD Compliance

*Updated October 6, 2026.*

If CSRD double materiality is on your 2026 roadmap, this walkthrough covers impact vs financial materiality, stakeholder mapping, and documentation auditors expect.

**Double Materiality Definition:** Double materiality is a comprehensive framework that assesses ESG issues from two distinct perspectives: financial materiality (risks/opportunities affecting company financial performance) and impact materiality (environmental and social impacts the company creates or influences). The CSRD now mandates this dual assessment for all large EU-listed companies and many others, establishing it as the global standard-setter for materiality analysis.

### What Is Double Materiality?

Double materiality is the test the CSRD and the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) use to decide what a company must report. A sustainability matter is material — and therefore reportable — if it passes either of two tests. Impact materiality looks outward: the company's actual or potential impacts on people and the environment, where a negative impact is severe by its scale, scope, and irremediable character, weighed with likelihood for potential impacts. Financial materiality looks inward: sustainability risks and opportunities that could reasonably be expected to affect the company's

cash flows, access to finance, or cost of capital. Meeting either threshold is enough; a topic does not have to pass both.

## Introduction to Double Materiality

Double materiality represents a fundamental shift in how organizations approach ESG reporting. Unlike traditional materiality—which focuses solely on information relevant to investors—double materiality examines both the financial implications of ESG issues for the company and the company’s impact on the environment and society.

The European Union’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), effective for reporting cycles beginning January 1, 2024 (with large accelerated filers required to report by 2025), has established double materiality as the global standard-setter. This requirement now influences ESG frameworks worldwide, including GRI standards, ISSB standards, and corporate practices across industries.

## Understanding the Dual Perspective

### Financial Materiality (Outside-In)

Financial materiality examines how ESG factors affect a company’s financial performance, valuation, and risk profile. This perspective asks: “Which ESG issues could impact our revenues, costs, or market position?”

- Climate change increasing operational costs through physical and transition risks
- Supply chain labor practices affecting brand reputation and customer loyalty
- Board diversity impacting governance quality and stakeholder confidence
- Data privacy regulations creating regulatory and financial liabilities

### Impact Materiality (Inside-Out)

Impact materiality assesses the company’s positive and negative effects on stakeholders and the environment. This perspective asks: “What environmental and social impacts does our business create or contribute to?”

- Greenhouse gas emissions throughout the value chain
- Water usage and pollution in manufacturing and supply chains
- Employee working conditions, wages, and development opportunities
- Community impacts in regions where the company operates

## Double Materiality Assessment Methodology

### Phase 1: Scoping and Stakeholder Identification

The first phase establishes the assessment boundaries and identifies relevant stakeholders. According to the AA1000 Stakeholder Engagement Standard and CSRD requirements, organizations must:

- Define value chain boundaries (direct operations, Tier 1 suppliers, extended supply chain)

- Identify all material stakeholder groups (employees, customers, investors, communities, NGOs, regulators)
- Map stakeholder influence and interest levels
- Document assessment scope and assumptions

## **Phase 2: Issue Identification and Screening**

Organizations compile comprehensive lists of potential ESG issues relevant to their industry and operations. This drawing on multiple frameworks including:

- GRI Standards: Sector-specific sustainability topics
- ISSB Standards: Climate-related and sustainability disclosures
- Industry peer analysis: Issues identified by sector competitors
- Regulatory landscape: Emerging compliance requirements
- Stakeholder consultation: Issues raised by key stakeholder groups

## **Phase 3: Stakeholder Input and Engagement**

Gathering perspectives from diverse stakeholders provides critical input for assessing both financial and impact materiality. Engagement methods include:

- Investor surveys and interviews (financial materiality perspective)
- Employee focus groups and pulse surveys
- Customer feedback and market research
- Community consultations and NGO interviews
- Expert roundtables with ESG thought leaders
- Online surveys reaching large sample sizes

## **Phase 4: Assessment and Prioritization**

Each issue is evaluated across both dimensions using a structured framework:

**Financial Materiality Scale:** Assess impact magnitude on financial performance (revenue, costs, capital access, valuation multiples) and probability of occurrence.

**Impact Materiality Scale:** Evaluate severity of environmental or social impact and scope across company operations and value chain.

Issues are plotted on a double materiality matrix with financial materiality on one axis and impact materiality on the other, creating a four-quadrant framework that identifies:

- High-high issues: Prioritized for extensive disclosure and management
- High financial/Low impact: Focus on risk management and investor communication
- Low financial/High impact: Address through corporate responsibility programs
- Low-low issues: Monitor but may not require detailed disclosure

## **Phase 5: Validation and Documentation**

The materiality assessment undergoes internal validation with cross-functional teams and external validation through stakeholder feedback loops. CSRD requirements mandate clear documentation of:

- Methodology and assumptions used
- Stakeholders engaged and engagement methods
- Results and materiality determination
- Changes from prior year assessments

## Stakeholder Mapping and Engagement Strategy

### Identifying and Prioritizing Stakeholders

Effective double materiality assessment requires systematic identification of all relevant stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder categories include:

- Investors: Shareholders, bondholders, asset managers assessing financial materiality
- Employees: Current staff, union representatives, future talent
- Customers and consumers: End users, distribution partners, brand advocates
- Suppliers and partners: Direct suppliers, subcontractors, joint venture partners
- Communities: Local residents, indigenous groups, affected populations
- Regulators and policymakers: Government agencies, legislative bodies
- Civil society: NGOs, advocacy groups, industry associations

### Stakeholder Influence and Interest Assessment

Using a power/interest matrix, organizations classify stakeholders by influence level and interest in ESG outcomes. High-influence, high-interest stakeholders warrant direct engagement, while other stakeholders may be engaged through broader communication channels.

### Engagement Methodologies

The AA1000 Stakeholder Engagement Standard provides frameworks for authentic engagement. Effective methods include:

- Direct dialogue: One-on-one interviews with key stakeholders
- Focus groups: Small group discussions with homogeneous stakeholder segments
- Surveys: Quantitative research reaching large populations
- Online platforms: Digital engagement for accessibility and participation tracking
- Public consultations: Formal comment periods for transparency

## CSRD Compliance Requirements

### Mandatory Double Materiality Assessment

The CSRD establishes explicit requirements for all covered organizations (large EU-listed companies and others meeting thresholds):

- Conduct double materiality assessment at least every three years
- Assess both financial and impact materiality dimensions
- Engage material stakeholder groups in assessment process
- Document methodology and maintain audit trail
- Disclose material issues and assessment process in sustainability report

## Sustainability Disclosure Requirements

Organizations must disclose all material ESG issues identified through the double materiality assessment using the CSRD-aligned European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS). Disclosures must cover:

- Governance, strategy, and risk management for each material issue
- Quantitative metrics and targets with historical baselines
- Assurance verification of reported data
- Third-party audit by independent auditors

## Timeline and Phase-In Provisions

The CSRD implementation timeline varies by organizational category:

- Large accelerated filers: Report from fiscal year 2024 (statement due 2025)
- Other large listed companies: Report from fiscal year 2025 (statement due 2026)
- Non-EU large companies: Report from fiscal year 2026 (if meeting thresholds)

## Industry-Specific Considerations

### Financial Services

Banks and insurers must assess climate-related financial materiality extensively, including counterparty exposures and portfolio impacts. The double materiality assessment must consider systemic financial stability risks.

### Manufacturing and Supply Chain

Manufacturers face high impact materiality for labor practices, environmental emissions, and resource consumption. Financial materiality extends to supply chain resilience, supplier compliance risks, and transition costs.

### Technology and Digital Services

Impact materiality focuses on data privacy, cybersecurity, digital inclusion, and responsible AI. Financial materiality includes regulatory fines, customer trust, and talent retention.

## Addressing ESG Ratings Divergence

While ESG ratings providers use varying methodologies, the CSRD's mandate for consistent double materiality assessment is reducing divergence. However, correlation between major providers (MSCI, Sustainalytics, ISS ESG, and CDP) remains around 0.6, indicating that organizations must understand differing perspectives when interpreting external ratings and building their own materiality framework

independent of external ratings.

## Frequently Asked Questions

### Q: What is double materiality?

Double materiality is the test the CSRD and the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) use to decide what a company must report. A sustainability matter is material — and therefore reportable — if it passes either of two tests. Impact materiality looks outward: the company's actual or potential impacts on people and the environment, where a negative impact is severe by its scale, scope, and irremediable character, weighed with likelihood for potential impacts. Financial materiality looks inward: sustainability risks and opportunities that could reasonably be expected to affect the company's cash flows, access to finance, or cost of capital. Meeting either threshold is enough; a topic does not have to pass both.

### Q: How does double materiality differ from traditional materiality?

Traditional materiality focuses solely on financial impacts to the company. Double materiality adds impact materiality, examining the company's environmental and social impacts. This creates a more complete picture aligning with sustainable business practices and stakeholder expectations.

### Q: Is double materiality required for all organizations?

The CSRD mandates double materiality for large EU-listed companies and companies meeting size thresholds. However, global ESG best practices increasingly recommend double materiality for all organizations seeking to demonstrate comprehensive ESG commitment.

### Q: How frequently should organizations conduct double materiality assessments?

The CSRD requires reassessment at least every three years. However, best practice recommends annual review cycles to capture emerging issues, changing stakeholder priorities, and evolving business conditions. Organizations should trigger reassessment when significant strategic changes occur.

### Q: How should organizations ensure stakeholder engagement authenticity in materiality assessments?

Organizations should follow the AA1000 Stakeholder Engagement Standard principles: inclusivity (diverse stakeholder representation), materiality (focus on significant issues), responsiveness (address feedback and concerns), and impact (demonstrate how engagement influences decisions). Third-party verification of engagement processes strengthens credibility.

### Q: What are the consequences of incomplete or inaccurate double materiality assessments?

Under CSRD, non-compliance can result in regulatory fines, audit failures, reputational damage, and investor concerns. More significantly, inadequate materiality assessment may overlook critical ESG risks or impacts, leading to poor decision-making and missed opportunities to address material issues proactively.

## Related Resources

- [ESG Ratings and Scores: Methodology Differences and Provider Comparison](#)

- **KPI Design for ESG Performance: Leading Indicators and Target-Setting**
- **Multi-Stakeholder Materiality: Identifying and Prioritizing ESG Issues**

**About this article:** Published by BC ESG on March 18, 2026. This article provides guidance on double materiality assessment methodologies, stakeholder engagement strategies, and CSRD compliance requirements. Content reflects frameworks from GRI Standards, ISSB, AA1000 Stakeholder Engagement Standard, and the European Sustainability Reporting Standards.

## Climate Scenario Analysis: TCFD, NGFS Scenarios, and Stress Testing for Financial Institutions

*Source: <https://bcesg.org/climate-scenario-analysis-tcf-d-ngfs-stress-testing-financial-institutions/> Published: March 18, 2026*

Home > Climate Risk > Climate Scenario Analysis

## Climate Scenario Analysis: TCFD, NGFS Scenarios, and Stress Testing for Financial Institutions

*Updated October 6, 2026.*

If you run climate risk for a bank or asset manager, this guide connects NGFS scenarios, ISSB S2 scenario analysis, and stress-testing workflows.

**Published:** March 18, 2026 | **Publisher:** BC ESG at [bcesg.org](https://bcesg.org) | **Category:** Climate Risk

**Definition:** Climate scenario analysis is a forward-looking risk assessment methodology that projects how physical and transition climate risks would impact an organization's financial performance, balance sheet, and capital requirements under alternative futures. Scenarios represent plausible pathways of climate change, policy response, technology adoption, and societal transition across multiple decades. The Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) Phase IV 2023 scenarios—Orderly (+2.0°C warming), Delayed Transition (+2.4°C), and Disorderly (+3.0°C+)—provide the global standard. Stress testing applies scenarios to portfolios to quantify credit risk, market risk, liquidity risk, and operational risk, enabling banks and insurers to assess capital adequacy, risk-adjusted returns, and alignment with regulatory capital requirements.

### Historical Context: From TCFD to ISSB S2

The Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), established 2015, provided principles-based guidance for climate risk disclosure. TCFD framework structure—Governance, Strategy, Risk Management, and Metrics & Targets—became the de facto disclosure standard for large corporations globally. However, TCFD remained voluntary and lacked quantification rigor.

The International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) formalized and mandated climate disclosure through IFRS S2 (2024), adopted globally as the binding standard by 2025. Critically, ISSB S2 requires

quantified financial impact, scenario-based projections, and governance accountability. TCFD, while historically important, has been formally sunset, with organizations transitioning to ISSB S2 framework. This transition shifts climate risk from strategic positioning to financial materiality and regulatory compliance.

## NGFS Phase IV Scenarios: The Global Standard Framework

### Scenario Nomenclature and Warming Pathways

| Scenario           | 2100 Warming | Policy Ambition           | Transition Speed                   | Physical Risk Intensity                        |
|--------------------|--------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Orderly            | +1.5-2.0°C   | Immediate, coordinated    | Rapid (2020-2040)                  | Moderate chronic, lower acute escalation       |
| Delayed Transition | +2.4°C       | Delayed until mid-century | Compressed, disruptive (2035-2050) | Higher acute event frequency, moderate chronic |
| Disorderly         | +3.0-3.5°C   | Fragmented, insufficient  | Chaotic, uncoordinated             | Extreme acute events, severe chronic shifts    |

#### Orderly Scenario Details (+1.5-2.0°C Pathway)

Orderly scenarios assume immediate, globally coordinated climate action with policy frameworks established by 2025 and deployed through 2050. Carbon prices escalate consistently from €50/tonne (2025) to €150/tonne (2050), incentivizing rapid decarbonization. Renewable energy reaches 80-90% of generation by 2050; fossil fuels decline systematically; carbon removal technologies scale to capture residual emissions. Physical climate impacts are moderate: chronic shifts (sea-level rise 0.4-0.6m by 2100, temperature increases 1.5-2.0°C) are manageable; acute event frequency escalates modestly. Financial institutions face moderate transition costs but avoid catastrophic asset write-downs. This scenario aligns with Paris Agreement 1.5°C target and represents policy-intended outcomes.

#### Delayed Transition Scenario (+2.4°C Pathway)

Delayed scenarios assume weak near-term climate action, with ambitious policy emerging only after 2030-2040, creating compressed transition windows and volatile asset prices. Carbon prices remain low (€10-30/tonne) until 2035, then spike to €200+/tonne as physical risk becomes undeniable, triggering stranded asset write-downs and market dislocation. Renewable energy growth accelerates only after 2035; oil and gas remain economically viable until mid-century. The rapid, late transition creates financial stress: higher transition costs concentrated over shorter periods, sudden asset obsolescence, and credit quality deterioration in carbon-intensive sectors. Physical climate impacts are moderate-to-high: chronic sea-level rise approaches 0.5-0.7m; acute event frequency increases 15-25%; water scarcity and heat stress affect multiple geographies simultaneously. This scenario represents policy failure risk and creates worst-case financial stress for unprepared institutions.

#### Disorderly Scenario (+3.0-3.5°C Pathway)

Disorderly scenarios assume no coordinated global climate action, with fragmented regional policies, trade protectionism, and unilateral decarbonization strategies creating inefficient, high-cost transitions. Physical climate impacts dominate: warming exceeds 3°C; sea-level rise reaches 0.7-1.0m+ by 2100; acute

extreme events intensify globally; chronic shifts render entire regions economically unviable (agriculture, water availability, infrastructure). Financial impacts are catastrophic: massive stranded asset write-downs, credit quality collapse in climate-vulnerable sectors, insurance market disruption or insolvency, and systemic financial instability. This scenario represents tail risk and stress-test extreme case but remains within plausible bounds given current climate policy fragmentation.

## Stress Testing Methodologies for Financial Institutions

### Credit Risk Assessment

Banks and lenders must assess credit risk of borrowers under climate scenarios. Methodology:

- **Sector Exposure Mapping:** Identify loan portfolio concentration in climate-sensitive sectors (energy, utilities, agriculture, automotive, real estate)
- **Scenario Cash Flow Projections:** Model borrower revenues, operating costs, and cash flows under each scenario, incorporating carbon costs, demand shifts, physical disruptions
- **Probability of Default (PD) Adjustment:** Increase PD estimates for borrowers facing transition or physical stress; model default clustering under severe scenarios
- **Loss Given Default (LGD) Adjustment:** Assess collateral values (real estate, equipment) under climate stress; increase LGD for stranded asset collateral
- **Exposure at Default (EAD) Volatility:** Model facility drawdown behavior under stress; high-stress scenarios may trigger covenant violations and accelerated defaults

### Market Risk and Valuation Impact

Climate scenarios affect market valuations of bonds and equities:

- **Equity Value Impact:** Under Delayed and Disorderly scenarios, climate-exposed sectors (energy, utilities, automotive, materials) face 30-60% valuation reductions as transition costs escalate and earnings decline
- **Bond Yield Spreads:** Climate stress increases credit spreads for high-carbon issuers; green bonds and low-carbon companies benefit from tightened spreads, creating relative price dislocations
- **Real Estate Valuations:** Climate risk affects property values; coastal commercial and residential real estate faces 20-40% haircuts under high-warming scenarios; agricultural land becomes marginal in drought/heat-stressed regions
- **Volatility and VaR Impact:** Stressed scenarios increase portfolio volatility and Value-at-Risk; basis risk emerges between hedges and underlying climate exposures

### Liquidity Risk Under Climate Stress

Climate scenarios create liquidity challenges:

- **Collateral Degradation:** As asset values decline under transition/physical stress, collateral haircuts increase, reducing available liquidity for repo operations and secured funding
- **Market Liquidity Drying:** In severe scenarios, stranded asset markets become illiquid; financial institutions holding concentrated positions face fire-sale losses

- **Funding Stress:** Institutional investors (pension funds, insurers, sovereign wealth funds) may withdraw capital from financial institutions perceived as excessively exposed to climate risk
- **Central Bank Intervention:** Under extreme stress, central banks may provide emergency liquidity support or suspend certain collateral types

## Implementing Climate Scenario Analysis: Step-by-Step Framework

### Phase 1: Baseline and Scenario Data Acquisition

Organizations must procure or develop climate scenario datasets including temperature projections, precipitation changes, sea-level rise, carbon prices, renewable energy costs, and technology adoption curves for each NGFS scenario pathway. Vendors (MSCI, Refinitiv, Moody's, Jupiter Intelligence, S&P Global) provide standardized NGFS-aligned data and modeling frameworks.

### Phase 2: Portfolio Exposure Mapping

Detailed exposure mapping identifies all material assets, counterparties, and supply chain nodes by sector, geography, and climate sensitivity. For each portfolio segment, quantify:

- Revenue/earnings concentration by sector and geography
- Collateral and property exposure to physical climate hazards
- Supply chain dependencies in climate-vulnerable regions
- Transition cost exposure (carbon pricing, capex requirements)

### Phase 3: Financial Impact Modeling

Project financial impacts under each scenario and time horizon (2030, 2040, 2050). Model:

- **For corporates:** Revenue impacts (demand destruction, geographic shifts), cost impacts (carbon pricing, input cost inflation), CapEx needs (transition investment, resilience building), and residual asset values
- **For banks:** Credit losses (PD/LGD adjustments), market risk (valuation impacts, spread widening), liquidity stress (collateral haircuts, funding pressure)
- **For insurers:** Increased claims (acute event frequency, severity), premium inadequacy (underpricing of climate risk), investment portfolio stress (equity/bond declines)

### Phase 4: Aggregation and Capital Impact Assessment

Aggregate financial impacts across portfolio to estimate total climate impact on earnings, capital, and risk-weighted assets (RWA). Calculate climate-adjusted return on equity (ROE), stress capital buffer requirements, and quantified risk metrics. Compare to regulatory capital requirements and internal risk tolerance.

### Phase 5: Strategic Response Planning

Based on scenario outcomes, develop strategic responses: portfolio rebalancing, hedging strategies, capital reallocation, business model evolution, or divestment of stranded assets.

## ISSB S2 Disclosure Requirements for Scenario Analysis

ISSB S2 mandates disclosure of:

- Scenarios used (must include warming scenarios at minimum +1.5°C and +3°C+)
- Time horizons (minimum 10-year forecast, extended to 2050 for transition analysis)
- Quantified financial impacts on revenue, costs, capital, and cash flows by scenario
- Key assumptions and sensitivities (carbon prices, technology costs, adoption rates)
- Governance overseeing scenario development and strategic response
- Transition plan credibility and capital allocation toward low-carbon investments

Related Content:

- **Physical Climate Risk Assessment: Acute Hazards, Chronic Shifts, and Asset-Level Vulnerability Analysis**
- **Transition Risk and Stranded Assets: Carbon Pricing, Policy Shifts, and Portfolio Decarbonization**
- **Climate Risk: The Complete Professional Guide (2026)**

## Frequently Asked Questions

**Q: What are the key differences between TCFD framework and ISSB S2 standard?**

**A:** TCFD was voluntary, principles-based guidance focusing on disclosure structure (Governance, Strategy, Risk Management, Metrics). ISSB S2 is a mandated standard requiring quantified financial impacts, scenario-based projections, and measurable governance accountability. TCFD has been formally superseded by ISSB S2 as the global standard.

**Q: Why should organizations use NGFS scenarios rather than creating proprietary scenarios?**

**A:** NGFS Phase IV 2023 scenarios are the global benchmark developed by central banks and financial supervisors, ensuring consistency across financial system risk assessments. Using standardized scenarios enables comparability, allows regulators to aggregate systemic risk across institutions, and provides transparent methodology alignment. Proprietary scenarios may be used for internal strategy, but ISSB S2 and regulatory compliance require NGFS or equivalent public scenarios.

**Q: How should financial institutions prioritize between Orderly, Delayed, and Disorderly scenarios in stress testing?**

**A:** Orderly scenario represents policy-intended outcomes and is the base case for capital and strategic planning; it provides moderate stress test severity. Delayed Transition is the primary stress case, creating worst financial stress through compressed, disruptive transition—most material risk for unprepared institutions. Disorderly is the tail risk/extreme case revealing catastrophic tail risk exposure. Effective risk management requires stress testing all three, with capital buffers sized to absorb Delayed scenario impacts and governance ensuring active mitigation to avoid Disorderly outcomes.

**Q: What are the main challenges in implementing climate scenario analysis for banks?**

**A:** Key challenges include: (1) Data limitations—granular climate and financial data for all borrowers and geographies is incomplete; (2) Modeling complexity—linking climate variables to financial outcomes

requires sophisticated, data-intensive models; (3) Assumption uncertainty—long-term climate, policy, and technology assumptions are inherently uncertain; (4) Governance gaps—many institutions lack adequate expertise, systems, and governance structures; (5) Capital impact sensitivity—stress test results are sensitive to scenario assumptions, requiring multiple sensitivity analyses.

**Q: How should credit risk parameters (PD, LGD, EAD) be adjusted for climate scenarios?**

**A: PD should increase for borrowers in transition-stressed sectors (energy, utilities, automotive) or exposed to physical hazards; increase severity based on transition cost burden and ability to absorb carbon pricing or capital requirements. LGD should increase for collateral exposed to climate stress (real estate in flood/wildfire zones, stranded asset collateral). EAD may increase (covenant violations trigger facility drawdowns) or decrease (early repayment by climate-conscious borrowers). Adjustment magnitude varies by scenario: Orderly requires modest increases; Delayed and Disorderly require 20-50% adjustments in vulnerable sectors.**

**Q: How do physical and transition risks interact in climate scenario analysis?**

**A: Physical and transition risks create reinforcing feedback loops. Disorderly scenarios combine worst-case transition (abrupt policy, stranded assets, market dislocation) and worst-case physical (extreme climate impacts). In Delayed scenarios, inadequate near-term transition action leaves organizations unprepared when physical risks intensify post-2040, creating synchronized shocks. Effective risk analysis must assess both physical and transition impacts simultaneously, not in isolation, to capture portfolio-level systemic risk.**

## **GRI Standards: Comprehensive Stakeholder-Centric Sustainability Reporting**

*Source: <https://bcesg.org/gri-standards-stakeholder-centric-sustainability-reporting/> Published: March 18, 2026*

**GRI Standards: Comprehensive Stakeholder-Centric Sustainability Reporting | BC ESG Implementation guide for 2026 with universal and topic-specific standards.”>**

**Home > Sustainability Reporting > GRI Standards**

## **GRI Standards: Comprehensive Stakeholder-Centric Sustainability Reporting**

**Published: March 18, 2026 | Updated October 6, 2026 | Author: BC ESG | Category: Sustainability Reporting**

**Definition: GRI (Global Reporting Initiative) Standards provide a comprehensive framework for organizations to report on their environmental, social, and economic impacts to a broad range of stakeholders. Unlike investor-focused frameworks (ISSB, CSRD), GRI emphasizes comprehensive**

impact reporting across all dimensions of sustainability, serving the information needs of employees, customers, suppliers, regulators, communities, and civil society organizations alongside investors.

## **Introduction: GRI Standards as Comprehensive Sustainability Framework**

Since 1997, the Global Reporting Initiative has published sustainability reporting standards used by over 10,000 organizations globally. In 2021, GRI released the GRI Universal Standards 2021 and topic-specific standards (effective 2023), establishing the most comprehensive and widely-adopted sustainability reporting framework. As of 2026, GRI remains essential for comprehensive stakeholder-centric reporting, complementing investor-focused frameworks like ISSB and CSRD.

This guide provides implementation guidance for GRI Standards, emphasizing stakeholder engagement, materiality assessment, disclosure completeness, and data quality.

## **GRI Standards Framework: Universal and Topic-Specific Standards**

### **GRI Standards Structure**

GRI Standards 2021 consist of:

#### **Universal Standards (GRI 100)**

- **GRI 101: Foundation** — Reporting principles and governance requirements
- **GRI 102: General Disclosures** — Organizational profile, governance, ethics, stakeholder engagement
- **GRI 103: Management Approach** — How organizations manage material topics

#### **Topic-Specific Standards (GRI 200, 300, 400)**

- **GRI 200 (Economic):** Economic performance, market presence, indirect economic impacts, procurement practices, corruption/anti-corruption
- **GRI 300 (Environmental):** Energy, water, biodiversity, emissions, waste, supplier environmental assessment, environmental compliance
- **GRI 400 (Social):** Employment, labor/management relations, occupational health & safety, training & education, diversity & equal opportunity, non-discrimination, freedom of association, child labor, forced labor, security practices, rights of indigenous peoples, human rights assessments, local communities, supplier social assessment, customer health & safety, marketing & labeling, customer privacy, access to services

### **GRI Principles for Reporting**

GRI Standards require organizations to apply principles that guide quality and relevance of reporting:

- **Accuracy:** Disclosures are accurate, precise, and complete; supported by underlying data and processes
- **Balance:** Reporting presents a fair picture of positive and negative impacts; avoid over-emphasizing favorable information
- **Clarity:** Information is presented in accessible language; structured logically; avoids jargon

- **Comparability:** Metrics and methodology are consistent over time and benchmarked against peers; allows comparative analysis
- **Completeness:** Disclosures cover all material topics identified through stakeholder engagement and impact assessment
- **Timeliness:** Information is reported regularly and promptly; enables timely decision-making by stakeholders
- **Verifiability:** Data collection, analysis, and reporting processes are documented and can be verified through audit/assurance

## Materiality Assessment: GRI Approach

### GRI Materiality: Stakeholder Perspective

GRI emphasizes stakeholder materiality—topics that matter to stakeholders and are important to the organization. This differs slightly from financial materiality (investor focus) emphasized in ISSB/CSRD:

### GRI Materiality Process

- **Topic Identification:** Identify relevant topics through industry benchmarking, peer analysis, sustainability frameworks
- **Internal Prioritization:** Assess topic importance to organization based on strategic priorities and risk exposure
- **Stakeholder Engagement:** Conduct surveys, interviews, focus groups with employees, customers, suppliers, communities, investors, regulators
- **Materiality Assessment:** Plot topics on two-dimensional matrix (importance to stakeholders vs. importance to organization)
- **Board Approval:** Board-level or governance committee approval of material topics
- **Regular Refresh:** Annual or bi-annual reassessment as stakeholder expectations and business context evolve

### Stakeholder Engagement

GRI requires comprehensive stakeholder engagement to validate materiality and inform disclosure:

- **Employees:** Focus groups, surveys, union engagement, works council participation
- **Customers:** Customer satisfaction surveys, focus groups, sustainability preference research
- **Suppliers:** Sustainability audits, supplier interviews, capacity building partnerships
- **Communities:** Local engagement, community advisory panels, free prior informed consent (FPIC) processes (where applicable)
- **Investors:** Investor engagement events, ESG survey participation, responsible investment dialogues
- **Regulators:** Government relations, policy engagement, consultation responses
- **Civil Society:** NGO partnerships, industry associations, multi-stakeholder initiatives

## GRI Topic-Specific Standards: Key Areas

## **Environmental Topics (GRI 300)**

### **GRI 302: Energy**

- **Disclosures:** Energy consumption (within and outside organization); energy intensity; reduction targets; renewable energy percentage
- **Metrics:** Total energy consumption (MWh); energy intensity per unit revenue/production; renewable energy % of total
- **Context:** Link to climate strategy (see GRI 305); energy efficiency investments; transition to renewable sources

### **GRI 303: Water and Effluents**

- **Disclosures:** Water withdrawal by source; water stress assessment by location; wastewater discharge; recycled water percentage
- **Metrics:** Water consumption (m3); water intensity; % recycled/reused; water-stressed regions identification
- **Context:** Water management strategy; risk assessment in high-stress regions; community water access impacts

### **GRI 305: Emissions**

- **Disclosures:** Scope 1, 2, 3 GHG emissions; emissions intensity; emissions reduction targets; biogenic CO2 disclosure
- **Metrics:** Annual GHG emissions (tonnes CO2e) by scope; intensity metric; progress toward targets
- **Context:** Alignment with climate targets; scenario analysis; carbon pricing exposure

### **GRI 306: Waste**

- **Disclosures:** Total waste generated by type; waste diverted from disposal; disposal method breakdown; hazardous waste management
- **Metrics:** Absolute waste (tonnes); % diverted from landfill; waste intensity; recycling rate
- **Context:** Circular economy strategy; extended producer responsibility; waste reduction targets

## **Social Topics (GRI 400)**

### **GRI 401: Employment**

- **Disclosures:** Total workforce (headcount, FTE, part-time/full-time split); employment type; region breakdown
- **Metrics:** Total employees; turnover rate; new hires; employee demographics
- **Context:** Employment practices; flexibility options; benefits coverage

### **GRI 403: Occupational Health and Safety**

- **Disclosures:** Injury rates (TRIR, LTIFR); fatalities; hazard identification; incident investigation process

- **Metrics:** Total recordable incident rate; lost time injury frequency rate; near-miss reporting; severity
- **Context:** Safety culture; leading indicators; high-risk operation management

#### **GRI 405: Diversity and Equal Opportunity**

- **Disclosures:** Board diversity (gender, age, ethnicity, professional background); management diversity; gender pay gap
- **Metrics:** % women in workforce; % underrepresented minorities; gender pay gap %; management diversity
- **Context:** Diversity strategy; recruitment practices; advancement programs; pay equity remediation

#### **GRI 406: Non-Discrimination**

- **Disclosures:** Incidents of discrimination and corrective actions; grievance mechanisms effectiveness
- **Metrics:** Number of discrimination incidents; resolution timeframe; actions taken
- **Context:** Anti-discrimination policies; training; reporting mechanisms

#### **GRI 407 and 408: Labor Practices (Child Labor, Forced Labor)**

- **Disclosures:** Supply chain labor standards audits; corrective action effectiveness; remediation programs
- **Metrics:** % supply chain audited; audit findings; corrective action closure rate
- **Context:** Due diligence processes; supplier capacity building; grievance mechanisms

#### **Governance Topics (GRI 400 – continued)**

##### **GRI 205: Anti-Corruption**

- **Disclosures:** Anti-corruption policies; training completion; substantiated incidents; discipline actions
- **Metrics:** % staff trained; investigations completed; substantiated violations; consequences applied
- **Context:** Compliance program; third-party due diligence; whistleblower protection

##### **GRI 412: Human Rights Assessment**

- **Disclosures:** Human rights due diligence; impact assessments; remediation mechanisms
- **Metrics:** % operations assessed; assessments completed; incidents identified; remediation closure
- **Context:** Human rights policy; stakeholder grievance mechanisms; community rights

### **GRI Implementation: Step-by-Step Guide**

#### **Phase 1: Planning and Setup (Months 1-2)**

- Establish GRI implementation team (Sustainability, HR, Finance, Operations, IR)
- Review GRI Standards 2021 framework; identify applicable standards
- Conduct gap analysis vs. current disclosures

- Secure budget and resources; engage external advisors if needed
- Develop project timeline and workplan

## **Phase 2: Materiality Assessment and Stakeholder Engagement (Months 2-4)**

- Identify potential material topics through peer benchmarking
- Design stakeholder engagement process (surveys, interviews, focus groups)
- Conduct internal prioritization workshops
- Execute stakeholder engagement (aim for 200+ responses minimum)
- Analyze results; develop materiality matrix
- Board-level approval of material topics

## **Phase 3: Data Collection and Management Approach Documentation (Months 4-7)**

- For each material topic, document management approach (GRI 103 requirements)
- Establish data collection processes for required metrics
- Design or enhance data management systems (ESG data platform)
- Conduct training on data collection and reporting requirements
- Collect 2+ years historical data for trend analysis
- Quality assurance and internal validation

## **Phase 4: Disclosure and Assurance (Months 7-9)**

- Draft GRI Index mapping disclosures to standards
- Write management approach narratives and metric disclosures
- Integrate into sustainability report or annual report
- Internal review; management and board sign-off
- Arrange third-party assurance (recommended: Limited or Reasonable Assurance)
- Publish standalone sustainability report or integrated report

## **GRI Reporting Options: Comprehensive vs. Core**

### **Comprehensive Approach**

- **Scope:** Report on all material topics identified through stakeholder engagement and materiality assessment
- **Depth:** Complete disclosures for each material topic (both management approach and metrics)
- **Best For:** Large organizations with complex operations; those targeting ESG leadership positioning
- **External Assurance:** Recommended to verify completeness and accuracy

### **Core Approach**

- **Scope:** Report on limited number of highest-priority material topics
- **Depth:** Core disclosures only (focused on key metrics)

- **Best For:** Smaller organizations; those beginning GRI adoption; resource constraints
- **Escalation Path:** Plan to transition to Comprehensive approach as capabilities mature

## GRI and Integration with Other Frameworks

### GRI + ISSB (Investor + Stakeholder Reporting)

Many organizations report using both GRI (comprehensive stakeholder) and ISSB (investor-focused) frameworks:

- **Materiality Alignment:** Cross-reference material topics; explain differences where they exist
- **Disclosure Mapping:** Create translation table linking GRI disclosures to ISSB S1/S2 requirements
- **Single Report Strategy:** Publish integrated report that serves both audiences

### GRI + CSRD/ESRS

For EU organizations, GRI and CSRD can be harmonized:

- **ESRS as Baseline:** CSRD/ESRS provides mandatory framework; GRI adds depth on additional topics
- **Data Reuse:** Metrics reported for ESRS can be supplemented with GRI disclosures
- **Stakeholder Communication:** GRI language often more accessible to broader stakeholders than ESRS technical framework

### GRI + TCFD

Climate reporting integrates GRI 305 (Emissions) with TCFD recommendations:

- **GRI 305:** Provides comprehensive emissions metrics and reduction targets
- **TCFD:** Adds governance, strategy (including scenario analysis), and financial risk impact disclosures
- **Integration:** Report GRI metrics alongside TCFD narrative framework

## GRI Assurance and Data Quality

### Assurance Standards

GRI does not mandate assurance but strongly recommends third-party verification:

- **Limited Assurance:** Moderate level of assurance; validates disclosures against GRI Standards and underlying data collection processes
- **Reasonable Assurance:** Higher level; detailed testing of metrics and data processes
- **Provider Selection:** Independent assurance provider (not primary financial auditor preferred for objectivity)

### Data Quality Management

Best practices for ensuring GRI data quality:

- **Establish data governance framework; document definitions and measurement methodologies**

- Centralize data collection in ESG platform or shared system
- Implement data validation procedures; require supporting documentation
- Reconcile ESG data with financial records (e.g., employee headcount with payroll)
- Conduct annual data quality audits; identify and remediate gaps
- Maintain audit trail for metric calculations and adjustments

## Frequently Asked Questions

**What is the difference between GRI and ISSB standards?**

GRI emphasizes comprehensive stakeholder reporting covering all dimensions of sustainability impact. ISSB focuses on financial materiality and investor decision-making. GRI is broader in scope; ISSB is more investor-focused. Many organizations report using both frameworks to serve different audiences.

**Is GRI reporting mandatory?**

GRI is not globally mandatory. However, it is widely adopted (10,000+ organizations) and increasingly referenced in investor ESG assessments, customer procurement requirements, and multi-stakeholder initiatives. Some jurisdictions reference GRI in sustainability reporting guidance. Adoption is voluntary but increasingly expected by stakeholders.

**How does GRI materiality differ from financial materiality?**

GRI materiality emphasizes stakeholder importance and business relevance; both financial and non-financial impacts matter. Financial materiality (ISSB/CSRD approach) focuses on investor decision-making. GRI's broader approach serves employees, customers, suppliers, communities alongside investors. Both perspectives have value for comprehensive sustainability governance.

**Can organizations use GRI and ISSB/CSRD simultaneously?**

Yes. Many organizations report using all three frameworks (GRI, ISSB, CSRD) by creating translation matrices and cross-referencing disclosures. This approach serves multiple stakeholder audiences and ensures comprehensive coverage. Single integrated report can often satisfy multiple framework requirements with careful structure.

**What is the GRI Index and how is it used?**

The GRI Index maps reported disclosures to specific GRI Standards requirements. Organizations create a table showing which GRI indicators they've reported, their location in the sustainability report, and any omissions/explanations. The Index demonstrates completeness and helps stakeholders locate relevant disclosures.

**How should organizations prioritize among GRI, ISSB, CSRD, and TCFD?**

Prioritization depends on applicable regulations (CSRD for EU; SEC rules for US), investor expectations (ISSB/TCFD), and stakeholder needs (GRI). Start with mandatory requirements by jurisdiction, then

add frameworks important to your investors and stakeholders. Many organizations view these as complementary rather than competing frameworks.

## Conclusion

GRI Standards remain the most comprehensive framework for stakeholder-centric sustainability reporting, addressing the full spectrum of environmental, social, and economic impacts. While investor-focused frameworks (ISSB, CSRD) address financial materiality, GRI ensures reporting serves the broader stakeholder community—employees, customers, suppliers, communities, regulators, and civil society. Organizations seeking credibility with all stakeholder groups should consider GRI adoption alongside regulatory requirements, creating an integrated reporting strategy that serves investor and stakeholder needs.

**Publisher:** BC ESG at [bcesg.org](https://bcesg.org)

**Published:** March 18, 2026

**Category:** Sustainability Reporting

**Slug:** [gri-standards-stakeholder-centric-sustainability-reporting](#)

## How the GRI Standards Are Structured (and How They Differ from ISSB and ESRS)

The GRI Standards are organized into three sets: Universal Standards that apply to every organization (GRI 1 Foundation, GRI 2 General Disclosures, and GRI 3 Material Topics), Sector Standards for high-impact industries, and Topic Standards for specific issues such as emissions, water, or labor practices. GRI differs fundamentally from the ISSB Standards and the EU’s ESRS on one axis above all others: materiality. GRI uses impact materiality (how an organization affects the economy, environment, and people), the ISSB uses financial materiality (how sustainability affects enterprise value for investors), and the ESRS require double materiality (both at once).

### The Three Sets of GRI Standards

| Standard set                                                                                                                                       | What it covers                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Universal Standards — apply to all organizations<br>GRI 1: Foundation (2021)<br>GRI 2: General Disclosures (2021)<br>GRI 3: Material Topics (2021) | The foundation of every GRI report. GRI 1 sets out the reporting principles, key concepts, and requirements for using the Standards. GRI 2 covers contextual disclosures: organizational profile, governance, strategy, ethics, and stakeholder engagement. GRI 3 explains how to identify, prioritize, and report on an organization’s material topics — its most significant impacts on the economy, environment, and people. |
| Sector Standards — apply to organizations in a given sector                                                                                        | Identify the sustainability topics most likely to be material for a specific industry, so reporters know what to look at first. Published standards cover Oil and Gas (GRI 11), Coal (GRI 12), Agriculture, Aquaculture and Fishing (GRI 13), and Mining (GRI 14), with more sectors in development.                                                                                                                            |

| Standard set                                        | What it covers                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Topic Standards — apply to specific material topics | Provide the actual disclosures used to report on each material topic, grouped as economic (e.g., anti-corruption, procurement), environmental (e.g., emissions, energy, water, waste, biodiversity), and social (e.g., labor, human rights, diversity, local communities). An organization selects the Topic Standards that match the material topics it identified through GRI 3. |

## GRI vs ISSB (IFRS S1/S2) vs ESRS: The Materiality Divide

**All three frameworks ask organizations to report sustainability information, but they answer a different question because they serve different audiences. The clearest way to tell them apart is to ask whose information needs each one is built around, and which direction of “materiality” it measures.**

| Framework           | Materiality basis                                                                                                                | Primary audience                     | Direction                                      |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| GRI Standards       | Impact materiality — the organization’s most significant impacts on the economy, environment, and people, including human rights | All stakeholders (multi-stakeholder) | Inside-out (how the company affects the world) |
| ISSB (IFRS S1 & S2) | Financial materiality — sustainability matters that could reasonably affect enterprise value                                     | Investors and capital markets        | Outside-in (how the world affects the company) |
| EU ESRS             | Double materiality — an issue is material if it is significant under impact materiality or financial materiality                 | Both stakeholders and investors      | Both directions at once                        |

**Because the ESRS combine both perspectives, a company that completes a proper ESRS double materiality assessment effectively produces ISSB-aligned financial disclosures as a subset, while also capturing the impact dimension that GRI pioneered. This is why GRI is often described as the framework that introduced the “inside-out” impact lens that the ESRS later made mandatory in the EU.**

## Interoperability and 2026 Status

**The three frameworks are increasingly designed to work together rather than compete. The IFRS Foundation (parent of the ISSB) and GRI signed a cooperation agreement in 2024, and in May 2025 the ISSB and GRI’s standard-setting body, the Global Sustainability Standards Board (GSSB), committed to jointly identify and align common disclosures across their respective scopes. On the EU side, EFRAG and GRI maintain a working relationship and have published a GRI-ESRS Interoperability Index mapping how the disclosure requirements overlap, and the IFRS Foundation and EFRAG released ESRS-ISSB interoperability guidance showing a high degree of alignment on climate (widely cited at roughly 80% for climate disclosures).**

**As of 2026, GRI remains a voluntary, globally recognized framework and the most widely used sustainability reporting standard worldwide. The GRI Standards are also being actively updated: GRI 101: Biodiversity 2024 is effective for reports published from 1 January 2026 (replacing the older GRI 304), while the revised GRI 102: Climate Change 2025 and GRI 103: Energy 2025 were released in**

mid-2025 and take effect on 1 January 2027, with the Sector Standards being aligned to them. In parallel, the ISSB Standards continue to expand internationally (adopted or being adopted across dozens of jurisdictions representing a majority of global GDP), and in the EU the Omnibus simplification package narrowed the scope of mandatory CSRD/ESRS reporting while keeping double materiality as the methodological core.

## Frequently Asked Questions

### What are the GRI Standards?

The GRI Standards are a free, globally recognized framework that organizations use to report their environmental, social, and economic impacts. Created by the Global Reporting Initiative, they are the most widely used sustainability reporting standards in the world. They are structured in three sets: Universal Standards (GRI 1 Foundation, GRI 2 General Disclosures, GRI 3 Material Topics) that apply to every organization, Sector Standards for high-impact industries, and Topic Standards for specific issues such as emissions, energy, water, and human rights.

### What is the difference between GRI and ISSB?

The core difference is materiality and audience. GRI uses impact materiality, focusing on how an organization affects the economy, environment, and people, and serves all stakeholders. The ISSB Standards (IFRS S1 and S2) use financial materiality, focusing on sustainability matters that could affect enterprise value, and serve investors and capital markets. In short, GRI is “inside-out” (how the company affects the world) while the ISSB is “outside-in” (how the world affects the company). The two organizations are working to align overlapping disclosures so reporters can use them together.

### Is GRI mandatory?

No. The GRI Standards are voluntary and can be adopted by any organization, anywhere, regardless of size or sector. However, GRI is so widely used that many regulators and frameworks reference or align with it. Mandatory regimes such as the EU’s CSRD/ESRS draw on GRI’s impact-reporting concepts, so organizations subject to those rules often find their GRI experience directly transferable, even though GRI itself is not the legal requirement.

### What is impact materiality?

Impact materiality is the principle, championed by GRI, that an organization should report on its most significant actual and potential impacts on the economy, environment, and people, including impacts on human rights, regardless of whether those impacts affect the company’s own finances. It is an “inside-out” view: instead of asking what affects the business, it asks what the business affects. This contrasts with financial materiality, which only considers issues that influence enterprise value. The EU’s ESRS combine both into “double materiality.”

### How do GRI and ESRS work together?

GRI and the EU’s ESRS share a common foundation in impact reporting, because the ESRS double materiality model incorporates the impact (“inside-out”) perspective that GRI established. EFRAG and GRI have collaborated to align the two and published a GRI-ESRS Interoperability Index that maps how their disclosure requirements correspond. In practice, an organization that already reports against GRI

has done much of the groundwork for the impact-materiality side of an ESRS double materiality assessment, reducing duplication.

### What is double materiality?

Double materiality is the approach required by the EU's ESRS under the CSRD, in which a sustainability issue is considered material if it is significant from either of two directions: impact materiality (how the organization affects people and the environment) or financial materiality (how the issue affects the organization's financial position and enterprise value). If an issue is material under either lens, it must be disclosed. It effectively unites the GRI impact perspective and the ISSB financial perspective into a single assessment, and it remains the methodological core of EU sustainability reporting in 2026.

Related: Sustainability Reporting: The Complete Professional Guide (2026).

## ISSB IFRS S1 and S2: Implementation Guide for Sustainability-Related Financial Disclosures

Source: <https://bcesg.org/issb-ifs-s1-s2-implementation-guide-sustainability-disclosures/> Published: March 18, 2026

ISSB <https://bcesg.org/global-esg-regulatory-convergence-issb-adoption-jurisdictional-mapping/> IFRS S1 and S2: Implementation Guide for Sustainability-Related Financial Disclosures | BC ESG

Home > Sustainability Reporting > ISSB IFRS S1 and S2

## ISSB IFRS S1 and S2: Implementation Guide for Sustainability-Related Financial Disclosures

Published: March 18, 2026 | Updated October 6, 2026 | Author: BC ESG | Category: Sustainability Reporting

**Definition:** ISSB (International Sustainability Standards Board) IFRS S1 and S2 are globally-applicable standards for sustainability-related financial disclosures. IFRS S1 (General Requirements) establishes overarching principles for identifying material sustainability topics and related financial impacts. IFRS S2 (Climate-related Disclosures) provides detailed requirements for climate risk disclosure. Together, these standards enable investors, creditors, and other stakeholders to assess how sustainability factors impact corporate financial performance and long-term value.

### What Are ISSB IFRS S1 and S2?

ISSB IFRS S1 and S2 are the two sustainability disclosure standards issued by the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) in June 2023. IFRS S1 is the general standard: it requires a company to disclose material information about every sustainability-related risk and opportunity that

could affect its cash flows, access to finance, or cost of capital. IFRS S2 is the climate standard: it applies the same framework to climate-related risks and opportunities, including Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions. Together, IFRS S1 and S2 form the global baseline that national regulators adopt into local reporting law.

## Introduction: Why ISSB Standards Matter

In 2026, ISSB standards represent the most widely-adopted global sustainability reporting framework, having been adopted by over 20 jurisdictions globally. The standards address a critical gap: the need for consistent, comparable, decision-useful sustainability disclosures integrated with financial reporting. By aligning sustainability disclosures with financial materiality and investor needs, ISSB standards enhance transparency and support capital allocation efficiency.

This guide provides comprehensive implementation guidance for organizations adopting ISSB standards, covering governance, materiality assessment, disclosure requirements, and practical implementation strategies.

## ISSB Standards: Overview and Adoption Landscape

### Standards Development and Structure

The ISSB, created by the International Financial Reporting Standards Foundation (IFRS Foundation) in 2021, developed two standards:

#### IFRS S1 – General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-Related Financial Information

- **Purpose:** Establish overarching framework for identifying material sustainability topics and disclosing their financial impacts
- **Key Requirement:** Double materiality assessment (financial materiality + impact materiality)
- **Governance:** Board oversight of sustainability risks and opportunities
- **Scope:** Applies to all sectors and geographies
- **Comparability:** Enables consistent, comparable reporting across organizations and industries

#### IFRS S2 – Climate-related Disclosures

- **Purpose:** Detailed requirements for climate-related financial risk disclosure aligned with TCFD framework
- **Key Topics:** Governance, strategy (including scenario analysis), risk management, metrics and targets
- **Scenario Analysis:** Required disclosure using 1.5°C, 2°C, and potentially higher warming scenarios
- **Scope 3 Emissions:** Required Scope 1, 2, and 3 GHG emissions disclosure
- **Transition Planning:** Climate transition strategy and capital expenditure alignment

### Global Adoption Landscape (2026)

ISSB standards adoption varies by jurisdiction:

| Jurisdiction | Adoption Status                                                                                               | Timeline                                                                  |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Australia    | Adopted; mandatory for listed companies                                                                       | 2024 reporting, 2025 publication                                          |
| Canada       | Proposed by CSA; framework development underway                                                               | 2026-2027 expected                                                        |
| EU           | CSRD requires ISSB-aligned standards; ESRS published                                                          | Mandatory 2025-2028 per company size                                      |
| Japan        | Adopted; recommended for listed companies                                                                     | 2024 guidance; 2025+ expected mandatory                                   |
| Singapore    | Adopted; mandatory for listed companies                                                                       | 2024 reporting phase-in                                                   |
| UK           | UK SRS published February 2026; ISSB-aligned                                                                  | Mandatory for listed companies 2026+                                      |
| US           | SEC climate disclosure rule adopted 2024 but stayed in litigation; not a live federal filing baseline in 2026 | Track SEC docket; use ISSB-aligned state rules (e.g. CA) where they apply |

## Materiality Assessment: Double Materiality Framework

### Principles of Double Materiality

IFRS S1 requires assessment of both:

#### 1. Financial Materiality (Investor Perspective)

- **Definition:** Information that could reasonably influence investors' capital allocation and risk assessment decisions
- **Question:** How do sustainability factors impact our financial performance, cash flows, and enterprise value?
- **Scope:** Includes both risks (e.g., climate transition costs) and opportunities (e.g., renewable energy markets)
- **Threshold:** Material if impact is quantifiable or could be material in aggregate

#### 2. Impact Materiality (Stakeholder Perspective)

- **Definition:** Information about company's actual or potential impacts on the environment and society
- **Question:** How do our operations impact environment and society (positive and negative)?
- **Scope:** Includes direct impacts and value chain impacts (suppliers, customers, communities)
- **Threshold:** Material if scale, severity, or scope of impact is significant

### Materiality Assessment Process

#### Phase 1: Topic Identification

- Review industry sustainability frameworks and peer disclosures
- Conduct internal workshops to identify potential sustainability topics relevant to business
- Engage with stakeholders (investors, employees, customers, suppliers, regulators) to identify topics of concern

- Develop comprehensive list of candidate topics for assessment

## **Phase 2: Double Materiality Assessment**

- Assess financial materiality: Quantify or qualitatively assess potential financial impacts of each topic
- Assess impact materiality: Evaluate scale, severity, and scope of company's actual/potential impacts
- Rank topics on two-dimensional materiality matrix (financial impact vs. stakeholder impact)
- Identify topics in high-materiality quadrant for inclusion in sustainability reporting

## **Phase 3: Governance and Approval**

- Board/ESG committee review of materiality assessment and methodology
- Management refinement of materiality topics and supporting disclosure
- Board-level approval of material topics; documented governance decision
- Annual or bi-annual refresh of materiality assessment

## **IFRS S1: General Requirements**

### **Core Disclosure Components**

#### **Governance**

Disclose how the organization's governance processes support identification and management of sustainability-related financial risks and opportunities:

- Board and management roles in overseeing sustainability matters
- Board competencies and expertise related to sustainability risks
- Committee structures and reporting protocols
- Remuneration linkage to sustainability targets
- Processes for monitoring and evaluating sustainability performance

#### **Strategy**

Disclose sustainability-related risks and opportunities, and how they are integrated into business strategy:

- Identified material sustainability risks and opportunities
- How these factors affect business strategy and capital allocation
- Links to financial planning and business model
- Resilience of strategy under different scenarios

#### **Risk Management**

Disclose processes for identifying, assessing, managing, and monitoring sustainability-related risks:

- Integration of sustainability risk assessment into enterprise risk management

- Risk identification and prioritization processes
- Mitigation strategies and controls
- Monitoring and reporting of risk metrics

## Metrics and Targets

Disclose metrics used to assess performance on material sustainability factors and progress toward targets:

- Definition and measurement methodology for key metrics
- Historical and current-year performance data
- Targets and progress vs. targets (absolute or intensity-based)
- External benchmarks and comparative performance

## Connectivity with Financial Reporting

Key requirement: Sustainability disclosures should clearly link to financial statements and management's discussion of financial performance:

- Climate transition capex linked to balance sheet investment decisions
- Environmental liabilities or contingencies linked to footnotes
- Supply chain disruption risks linked to inventory or receivables assessments
- Human capital investments linked to personnel costs and productivity

## IFRS S2: Climate-Related Disclosures

### Governance Requirements (S2 Section A)

Organizations must disclose governance structures for climate risk oversight:

- Board Oversight: Board committee(s) responsible for climate risk; meeting frequency
- Competencies: Description of board and management competencies on climate matters
- Remuneration: Links between compensation and climate-related performance metrics
- Accountability: Management accountability for climate risk assessment and mitigation

### Strategy Requirements (S2 Section B)

#### Scenario Analysis

Organizations must conduct and disclose climate scenario analysis:

- Required Scenarios: Analysis under 1.5°C, 2°C, and potentially higher warming pathways
- Methodology: Clear description of scenario assumptions (energy mix, carbon pricing, technology adoption)
- Time Horizons: Short-term (5 years), medium-term (5-15 years), long-term (>15 years)
- Financial Impacts: Quantification of potential impacts on revenues, costs, capital expenditures, asset values

- **Strategic Resilience:** Assessment of strategy resilience across scenarios

## Transition Planning

**Organizations must disclose climate transition strategy:**

- **Emissions reduction pathways and targets (absolute and/or intensity-based)**
- **Capital expenditures aligned with climate strategy**
- **Operational changes (technology adoption, supply chain transformation, workforce transitions)**
- **Sector-specific transition plans (e.g., coal phase-out for energy, fleet electrification for automotive)**

## Risk Management Requirements (S2 Section C)

**Disclose processes for assessing and managing climate risks:**

- **Integration of climate risk into enterprise risk management framework**
- **Identification of physical risks (flooding, heatwaves, water stress) and transition risks (regulatory, technology, market)**
- **Risk prioritization and scenario sensitivity analysis**
- **Mitigation and adaptation strategies; effectiveness of controls**

## Metrics and Targets (S2 Section D)

### Mandatory Metrics

| Metric Category        | Requirement                                                                  | Scope                                       |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Absolute GHG Emissions | Scope 1 and 2 emissions; Scope 3 if material                                 | Annual, tonnes CO2e                         |
| GHG Intensity          | Emissions per unit of revenue, production, or other relevant metric          | Annual, by metric denominator               |
| Climate Targets        | Absolute or intensity-based reduction targets; time-bound (e.g., 2030, 2050) | Science-based or net-zero aligned preferred |
| Progress Tracking      | Historical baseline and year-over-year progress toward targets               | 3-5 years minimum historical data           |

### Financial Metrics

- **Capex:** Capital expenditures aligned with climate transition strategy
- **Climate-Related Financing:** Investment in renewable energy, efficiency, other climate-related projects
- **Risk Exposure:** Quantification of potential financial impact of climate scenarios

## Practical Implementation: Roadmap to ISSB Adoption

### Phase 1: Governance Setup (Months 1-3)

- **Establish cross-functional implementation team (Sustainability, Finance, IR, Legal)**
- **Designate governance owner (e.g., CFO, Chief Sustainability Officer) for ISSB implementation**

- Board-level awareness and training on ISSB requirements
- Engage external advisors (auditors, sustainability consultants, legal counsel)

## **Phase 2: Materiality and Strategy (Months 3-6)**

- Conduct double materiality assessment
- Document materiality methodology and results
- Board approval of material topics and sustainability strategy
- Develop disclosure roadmap and content outline

## **Phase 3: Data Collection and Analysis (Months 6-9)**

- Establish data collection processes for GHG emissions (Scope 1, 2, 3)
- Conduct climate scenario analysis; document methodologies and assumptions
- Gather governance, risk management, and strategic information
- Quality assurance and data validation processes

## **Phase 4: Disclosure and Assurance (Months 9-12)**

- Draft ISSB S1 and S2 disclosures
- Integration with financial reporting and annual report
- External assurance of sustainability disclosures (limited or reasonable assurance)
- Publication of sustainability report aligned with ISSB requirements

## **Alignment with Other Frameworks**

### **ISSB and CSRD/ESRS Integration**

ISSB and EU CSRD/ESRS are complementary but distinct. EU-listed companies must comply with ESRS, which is broader than ISSB but builds on ISSB principles. Key alignment points:

- Both use double materiality assessment as foundation
- ESRS E1 (Climate Change) aligned with ISSB S2 but with additional requirements
- ESRS governance and social disclosures extend beyond ISSB

### **ISSB and TCFD**

ISSB S2 builds directly on TCFD recommendations. Key relationships:

- ISSB S2 provides more prescriptive requirements than TCFD framework
- TCFD-aligned disclosures satisfy most ISSB S2 requirements
- Scenario analysis and financial impact quantification enhanced under ISSB

### **ISSB and GRI**

ISSB and GRI Standards serve complementary purposes:

- ISSB: Focus on financial materiality and investor decision-making

- **GRI: Broader stakeholder reporting on environmental, social, governance impacts**
- **Integration: Many organizations report using both frameworks; cross-reference disclosures**

## Frequently Asked Questions

**What are ISSB IFRS S1 and S2?**

ISSB IFRS S1 and S2 are the two sustainability disclosure standards issued by the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) in June 2023. IFRS S1 is the general standard: it requires a company to disclose material information about every sustainability-related risk and opportunity that could affect its cash flows, access to finance, or cost of capital. IFRS S2 is the climate standard: it applies the same framework to climate-related risks and opportunities, including Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions. Together, IFRS S1 and S2 form the global baseline that national regulators adopt into local reporting law.

**Is ISSB adoption mandatory globally?**

ISSB adoption is not globally mandatory. It has been adopted as mandatory or recommended by 20+ jurisdictions (Australia, Singapore, Japan, UK). However, adoption timelines and applicability vary by country. The ISSB Foundation is working toward global convergence. Organizations should check their primary operating jurisdictions for adoption status and timelines.

**What is the difference between financial and impact materiality?**

Financial materiality refers to sustainability factors that could reasonably influence investors' decisions based on financial impacts (risks and opportunities). Impact materiality refers to the organization's actual or potential impacts on environment and society. IFRS S1 requires assessment of both. A topic can be material from one or both perspectives.

**Is Scope 3 emissions disclosure required under ISSB?**

IFRS S2 requires Scope 1 and 2 emissions disclosure universally. Scope 3 disclosure is required if material. Materiality is determined through risk assessment and double materiality assessment. For many organizations, Scope 3 is material and required. Scope 3 measurement often requires value chain engagement and third-party data.

**What scenario analysis is required under ISSB S2?**

ISSB S2 requires scenario analysis under 1.5°C, 2°C, and potentially higher warming pathways. Organizations must disclose assumptions, methodologies, and financial impacts under each scenario. Time horizons should include short-term (5 years), medium-term (5-15 years), and long-term (>15 years) horizons.

**How does ISSB compare to SEC climate disclosure rules?**

ISSB S2 and SEC climate rules have overlapping requirements but are distinct frameworks. SEC rules focus on climate risk disclosure and investor needs (Scope 1, 2, and conditional Scope 3). ISSB S2 includes scenario analysis and more comprehensive disclosures. Organizations subject to both should develop aligned disclosure strategies.

**What assurance is required for ISSB disclosures?**

ISSB standards do not mandate assurance level. However, international best practices increasingly expect third-party assurance (limited or reasonable level) of sustainability disclosures. Assurance providers assess disclosure completeness, accuracy, and compliance with ISSB requirements. Consider assurance as part of credibility and governance framework.

## Conclusion

ISSB standards represent a watershed in sustainability reporting, providing the first globally-applicable framework for sustainability-related financial disclosures. By grounding ESG reporting in financial materiality and investor decision-making, ISSB enhances transparency, comparability, and capital allocation efficiency. Organizations adopting ISSB standards early position themselves as transparency leaders and strengthen credibility with investors and stakeholders. Implementation requires governance rigor, robust materiality assessment, and data governance capabilities—but the long-term benefits in investor confidence and strategic alignment justify the investment.

**Publisher:** BC ESG at [bcesg.org](https://bcesg.org)

**Published:** March 18, 2026

**Category:** Sustainability Reporting

**Slug:** [issb-ifs-s1-s2-implementation-guide-sustainability-disclosures](#)

**Related:** Sustainability Reporting: The Complete Professional Guide (2026).

## Biodiversity Risk Assessment: TNFD Framework, Nature-Related Financial Disclosures, and Corporate Impact

**Source:** <https://bcesg.org/biodiversity-risk-assessment-tnfd-nature-related-financial-disclosures/> **Published:** March 18, 2026