Sustainable Business Australia Limited trading as
Business Council for Sustainable Development Australia
ABN 48 052 135 609
Level 27
20 Bond Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000
+ 61 2 8005 0780
bcsda@bcsda.org.au
www.bcsda.org.au

Sustainable Finance Unit
Climate and Energy Division
The Treasury
Langton Crescent
PARKES ACT 2600

SustainableFinanceConsultation@treasury.gov.au

Dear Sustainable Finance Unit,

Subject: Sustainable Finance Strategy

Enclosed is our submission in response to the Australian Government's newly released Sustainable Finance Strategy. This strategy is a commendable step towards supporting Australia's journey to net zero emissions, offering a robust framework to lower investment barriers in sustainable activities.

The strategy thoughtfully outlines its priorities across three key pillars: enhancing transparency on climate and sustainability issues, building financial system capabilities, and reinforcing Australian Government leadership in sustainable finance. Each pillar is supported by a range of proposed tools and policies aimed at fostering a sustainable finance environment within Australia.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on this vital strategy, understanding that our insights will contribute to the ongoing policy development and regulatory engagement in sustainable finance. Our submission addresses the strategy's tools, policies, and the specific questions raised in the consultation paper.

We look forward to engaging in this important dialogue and contributing to shaping a sustainable future for Australia.

Andrew Petersen
CEO I **Business Council for Sustainable Development Australia**
andrew.petersen@bcsda.org.au I 0412 545 994
15 December 2023

Executive Summary

BCSD Australia, as a leading business-led sustainability NGO, commends the Australian Government's ambitious Sustainable Finance Strategy. This strategy is a critical step towards aligning Australia's financial markets with the urgent need for sustainable development and the transition to net zero. The proposed pillars and priorities reflect a comprehensive approach, balancing market needs with environmental imperatives. Our response draws on practical business, corporate, and international examples to reinforce our support and suggest enhancements.

Pillar 1: Improve Transparency on Climate and Sustainability

1. Sustainability-Related Financial Disclosures: We support establishing a robust framework for disclosures. Drawing from the success of the EU's Non-Financial Reporting Directive, we recommend a similar approach that mandates detailed reporting on sustainability aspects, not just climate change.
2. Sustainable Finance Taxonomy: The development of a clear taxonomy, akin to the EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities, is crucial. This will provide clarity and consistency for investors and companies alike.
3. Net Zero Transition Planning: We advocate for a framework that not only supports but incentivizes credible net zero transition plans, similar to the Science Based Targets initiative.
4. Labelling System for Sustainable Investment Products: Inspired by France's Greenfin label, a clear and regulated labelling system will enhance consumer trust and market clarity.

Pillar 2: Financial System Capabilities

5. Market Supervision and Enforcement: Strengthening supervision is key. We can learn from the UK's Financial Conduct Authority's approach to ESG-related market oversight.
6. Systemic Financial Risks: Identifying and responding to these risks is vital. The Network for Greening the Financial System provides valuable insights into best practices.
7. Data and Analytical Challenges: Addressing these challenges is essential. Collaboration with platforms like the CDP (formerly Carbon Disclosure Project) can enhance data quality and accessibility.
8. Regulatory Frameworks: Ensuring these are fit for purpose is critical. We suggest looking at Canada's efforts in integrating ESG factors into their financial regulatory framework.

Pillar 3: Australian Government Leadership and Engagement

9. Issuing Australian Sovereign Green Bonds: This initiative is commendable. The success of France's green bond issuance can serve as a model.
10. Catalysing Sustainable Finance Flows and Markets: We support this priority and suggest partnerships with entities like the Green Climate Fund to enhance impact.
11. Promoting International Alignment: Alignment with global standards is crucial. We can draw lessons from the International Platform on Sustainable Finance.
12. Positioning Australia as a Global Sustainability Leader: This is a commendable goal. Australia can take inspiration from the Nordic countries, known for their leadership in sustainability.

Conclusion

BCSD Australia fully supports the Government's Sustainable Finance Strategy. We believe that with the integration of these practical, globally informed recommendations, Australia can not only meet its net zero commitments but also lead in the global sustainable finance arena. This strategy presents an opportunity for Australian businesses to innovate, adapt, and thrive in a sustainable future.

Introduction

Introduction

BCSD Australia, as a leading advocate for sustainable business practices, welcomes the Australian Government's commitment to a sustainable finance agenda. This consultation paper reflects a crucial understanding of the role financial systems play in addressing climate change and broader sustainability challenges. We recognize the importance of aligning investment with environmental, social, and climate goals, particularly in financing the transition to net zero.

The Role of Australia's Financial System

1. **Alignment with Global Trends**: The global shift towards sustainable finance is not just a trend but a fundamental change in how financial markets operate. Australia's financial system must align with this shift to remain competitive and relevant. Examples from the EU and UK, where sustainable finance is increasingly integrated into core business practices, offer valuable lessons.
2. **Integrating Climate and Sustainability**: The integration of climate, nature, and sustainability into corporate governance, capital allocation, and risk management is essential. The approach taken by leading global firms, such as Unilever and Siemens, in embedding sustainability into their business models, serves as a practical example for Australian companies.
3. **Responding to Shareholder Demands**: The increasing demand from shareholders for sophisticated climate and sustainability strategies is a critical driver. The proactive stance of investment groups like BlackRock in advocating for sustainability in their investment portfolios is a testament to this trend.
4. **Regulatory Requirements**: Financial regulators worldwide are recognizing climate and sustainability as fundamental financial drivers. The proactive policies of the European Central Bank and the Securities and Exchange Commission (USA) in integrating ESG factors into their regulatory frameworks are commendable models.
5. **Government and Community Roles**: The role of governments and communities in mobilizing financing for net zero goals is pivotal. The Green Bond initiatives in countries like France and Germany illustrate successful government-led efforts in this direction.

Australia's Competitive Advantage in Sustainable Finance

1. **Global Positioning**: Sustainable finance presents a significant competitive advantage for Australia. By adopting robust sustainable finance regimes, Australian firms can maintain competitiveness in global markets.
2. **Leveraging Financial Market Strengths**: Australia has the opportunity to leverage its financial market strengths to invest in technologies and industries essential for a low emissions future. The success of green technology investments in countries like Denmark and South Korea offers insights into potential pathways.
3. **Government Leadership**: The critical role of government leadership in setting policy targets and developing sustainable finance regulatory frameworks cannot be overstated. The coordinated approach of the Canadian government in supporting sustainable finance initiatives serves as a guiding example.

Conclusion

BCSD Australia supports the Government's initiative to pursue a sustainable finance agenda. We believe that with strategic alignment with global practices, integration of sustainability into financial systems, and strong government leadership, Australia can establish a robust, long-term foundation for aligning finance with sustainability goals. This strategy is not only vital for meeting climate-related challenges but also for ensuring the long-term stability and growth of Australia's economy in a global context.

Objectives and Structure

BCSD Australia appreciates the Government's focused approach in the Sustainable Finance Strategy, which aims to enhance sustainability-related transparency, governance, and credibility in financial markets. The strategy's alignment with broader climate, economic, and environmental policies is crucial for creating a cohesive framework for sustainable investment. Feedback on the Three Pillars 1. **Pillar 1: Improve Transparency on Climate and Sustainability** • **Feedback**: While the emphasis on credible and actionable information is commendable, there is a critical need for standardization in reporting formats to ensure comparability. Engaging with international bodies like the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) Foundation will enhance the global relevance of Australian disclosures. 2. **Pillar 2: Financial System Capabilities** • **Feedback**: The focus on equipping firms and financial institutions with sustainability-related tools and resources is vital. However, there is a need for more specific guidance on integrating these tools into existing financial systems. Collaborations with global financial institutions that have successfully embedded ESG considerations, like the Bank of England, could offer practical insights. 3. **Pillar 3: Government Leadership and Engagement** • **Feedback**: The Government's role in accelerating sustainable finance is crucial. However, the strategy could benefit from a clearer outline of the mechanisms for government-industry collaboration. Examples from countries like Germany, where government-industry partnerships have been effective in mobilizing sustainable finance, could serve as a model. Additional Recommendations 1. **Stakeholder Engagement**: Continuous engagement with a broad range of stakeholders, including NGOs, industry bodies, and the private sector, is essential for the strategy's success. This ensures diverse perspectives are considered, particularly from sectors directly impacted by sustainability transitions. 2. **Incentives for Sustainable Practices**: The strategy could explore more on incentives for businesses to adopt sustainable practices. Tax incentives, subsidies, or preferential loan rates for sustainable projects, as seen in countries like Canada, could be effective. 3. **Focus on Innovation and Technology**: Encouraging investment in sustainable technologies and innovations is key. The strategy could include specific measures to support R&D in green technologies, similar to initiatives in South Korea. 4. **Global Alignment and Best Practices**: Ensuring alignment with international standards and practices is crucial for the global competitiveness of Australian firms. The strategy could benefit from a more explicit commitment to aligning with international best practices in sustainable finance. 5. **Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**: Establishing a robust framework for monitoring and evaluating the impact of the strategy will be critical for its success and adaptability. Conclusion BCSD Australia supports the Government's Sustainable Finance Strategy and its objectives. Our feedback aims to enhance the strategy's effectiveness and ensure it leads to tangible, positive outcomes in aligning Australia's financial system with sustainability goals. We look forward to the development of an implementation roadmap and are committed to contributing to this important initiative.
Key Principles
BCSD Australia acknowledges the key principles outlined in the Sustainable Finance Strategy and offers the following feedback to enhance its effectiveness and alignment with global best practices. 1. **Alignment with Global Markets**

- **Feedback**: The strategy's commitment to aligning with global markets is crucial. However, it is also important to ensure that this alignment does not compromise Australia's unique environmental and economic contexts. A balance between global integration and local specificity is key. Learning from the EU's approach to sustainable finance, which balances global standards with regional priorities, could be beneficial.

2. **High-Ambition Approach**
   - **Feedback**: We support the high-ambition approach, emphasizing the need for science-based targets and sustainability goals. It is essential to ensure that sustainability objectives are holistic and do not inadvertently undermine other goals. The strategy could benefit from explicit guidelines or frameworks to help entities navigate these complex trade-offs, similar to the UN Sustainable Development Goals framework.
3. **Support for Emissions Reduction and Transition Pathway**
   - **Feedback**: The focus on supporting Australia's transition to a low to zero emissions economy is commendable. However, the strategy could further emphasize the need for transitional support for industries and sectors most impacted by this shift. Examples from countries like Germany, which have successfully managed coal phase-outs, could offer valuable insights.
4. **Staged and Sequenced Approach**
   - **Feedback**: The 'building blocks' approach is pragmatic, but it is crucial to maintain momentum and ambition. Clear timelines and milestones should be established to ensure progress is measurable and accountable. The phased approach adopted by the UK in implementing its Green Finance Strategy could serve as a model.
5. **Simplicity and Usability**
   - **Feedback**: Simplifying regulatory requirements is essential for broad adoption. However, simplicity should not come at the expense of comprehensiveness or rigor. The strategy could explore the use of digital tools and platforms to aid in reporting and compliance, as seen in Singapore's digital reporting initiatives.
6. **Focus on Climate and Broader Sustainability Issues**
   - **Feedback**: While starting with climate is logical, the strategy should also outline a clear pathway for integrating other sustainability issues, such as biodiversity and social equity. The inclusion of First Nations perspectives is particularly commendable and should be a model for incorporating diverse voices in sustainability discussions.
7. **Collaboration and Shared Responsibility**
   - **Feedback**: The emphasis on collaboration across sectors is key to the strategy's success. The strategy could benefit from establishing formal mechanisms for ongoing dialogue and co-development, similar to the multi-stakeholder platforms used in the Netherlands.

Box 1: The role of nature and biodiversity within the Strategy

BCSD Australia commends the Government's initiative to integrate nature and biodiversity into the Sustainable Finance Strategy. We offer the following feedback to strengthen this aspect of the strategy.

1. **Transparency in Nature-Related Disclosures**
   - **Feedback**: The plan to expand legislative changes to include nature-related financial disclosures is a positive step. However, it is crucial to establish clear, actionable guidelines for these disclosures to ensure they are meaningful and not just a compliance exercise. Learning from the EU's Biodiversity Strategy, which includes specific targets and indicators, could provide a useful model.
2. **Incorporating Nature in Taxonomy Development**

- **Feedback**: The inclusion of 'do no significant harm' provisions is a good starting point. However, the strategy could benefit from a more detailed roadmap on how nature and biodiversity objectives will be integrated into the taxonomy, especially in the context of climate mitigation. The IUCN's Global Standard for Nature-based Solutions could offer a framework for this integration.

3. **Capability Building in Nature-Related Financial Risks**
    - **Feedback**: Enhancing the capacity of ASIC and CFR to address nature-related financial risks is essential. However, there is also a need for targeted training and resources for businesses to understand and implement these guidelines effectively. Collaborations with organizations like the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) could provide valuable insights and resources.
4. **International Engagement on Nature-Related Issues**
    - **Feedback**: Australia's commitment to international initiatives like the TNFD and ISSB is commendable. However, the strategy could also emphasize the importance of regional collaborations, especially in the Asia-Pacific region, where biodiversity challenges and opportunities are significant. The ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity's initiatives could serve as a reference point.

Additional Recommendations

1. **Incentives for Nature-Positive Investments**: The strategy could explore incentives for businesses to invest in nature-positive activities. This could include tax breaks, grants, or other financial incentives for projects that demonstrably benefit biodiversity.
2. **Public-Private Partnerships**: Encouraging public-private partnerships in conservation and biodiversity projects can mobilize significant resources and expertise. Models from countries like Brazil, with its Amazon Fund, could be instructive.
3. **Community and Indigenous Engagement**: Recognizing the role of local communities and Indigenous groups in biodiversity conservation is crucial. The strategy could include mechanisms for their active participation and benefit-sharing.
4. **Monitoring and Reporting**: Establishing robust monitoring and reporting mechanisms for nature-related outcomes is essential. This should include clear metrics and regular assessments of the impact of investments on biodiversity.

Conclusion

BCSD Australia supports the integration of nature and biodiversity considerations into the Sustainable Finance Strategy. We believe that with the incorporation of these suggestions, the strategy will not only align with global best practices but also address the unique environmental challenges and opportunities in Australia.

Pillar 1: Improve transparency on climate and sustainability

BCSD Australia acknowledges the Government's commitment to enhancing transparency in sustainable finance. Transparency is crucial for informed decision-making and fostering trust in the financial markets, particularly regarding sustainability and climate-related issues. We offer the following feedback to further strengthen this aspect of the strategy.

1. **Standardised Disclosure of Climate and Sustainability-Related Financial Opportunities and Risks**
    - **Feedback**: The move towards mandatory climate reporting is a significant step forward. However, it is essential to ensure that these reporting requirements are not only standardized but also actionable and relevant to different industry sectors. Learning from the EU's Non-Financial Reporting Directive, which provides specific guidelines for different sectors, could be beneficial.
2. **Development of an Australian Sustainable Finance Taxonomy**
    - **Feedback**: Creating a sustainable finance taxonomy is a positive initiative. However, it's important to ensure that this taxonomy is adaptable and regularly updated to reflect the evolving nature of sustainability challenges and solutions. The taxonomy should also be developed in consultation with industry experts to ensure its practical applicability.

3. **Supporting Credible Climate Transition Planning and Target Setting**
    - **Feedback**: While supporting climate transition planning is commendable, it is crucial to establish clear criteria and benchmarks for what constitutes 'credible' transition plans. This could include specific milestones, targets, and third-party verification processes, similar to the Science Based Targets initiative.
4. **Improving Sustainability Labelling for Investment Products**
    - **Feedback**: Standardizing labels for sustainable investment products is necessary to avoid greenwashing. However, it is equally important to educate investors and the public about what these labels mean. A public awareness campaign, similar to the EU's Eco-label, could be effective in this regard.

Additional Recommendations

1. **Integration with Global Standards**: While aligning with global frameworks, it's important to ensure that Australian standards are flexible enough to adapt to local contexts and emerging global trends.
2. **Stakeholder Engagement**: Continuous engagement with a broad range of stakeholders, including NGOs, industry groups, and academia, is essential to ensure the transparency measures are robust and effective.
3. **Regular Review and Update**: The transparency framework should be reviewed regularly to ensure it remains relevant and effective in a rapidly changing financial and environmental landscape.
4. **Capacity Building**: Providing training and resources to businesses, especially SMEs, to comply with new reporting requirements is crucial for the successful implementation of these measures.

Priority 1: Establish a framework for sustainability-related financial disclosures	
What are the opportunities for Government, regulators and industry to support companies to develop the required skills, resources and capabilities to make climate disclosures under the proposed new obligations?	The introduction of mandatory climate-related financial disclosure requirements presents several opportunities for the government, regulators, and industry to support companies, especially in developing the necessary skills, resources, and capabilities. Here are some key areas where support can be provided: 1. **Educational Programs and Workshops**: • Government and industry bodies can collaborate to create educational programs and workshops. These should focus on the specifics of climate disclosure requirements and best practices in sustainability reporting. • Tailored training for different sectors, recognizing the unique challenges and opportunities each faces in terms of climate impact and disclosure. 2. **Guidance and Resources**: • Development of comprehensive guides and resources that detail the process of climate-related financial disclosures, including templates and examples of best practices. • Provision of online tools and platforms that offer step-by-step guidance and support. 3. **Financial and Technical Assistance**: • Financial incentives or subsidies for SMEs to develop their reporting capabilities. • Technical assistance in the form of consultancy services or access to software tools that facilitate climate risk assessment and reporting. 4. **Regulatory Clarity and Consistency**:

	• Ensuring that the regulatory framework is clear, consistent, and aligned with international standards to reduce complexity and compliance costs. • Regular updates and clarifications from regulators as international standards evolve. 5. **Partnerships with Academic and Research Institutions**: • Collaborations with universities and research institutions to develop specialized courses and research projects focused on climate reporting and sustainable finance. • Encouraging internships or cooperative programs where students can work with companies on sustainability reporting projects. 6. **Industry Collaboration and Knowledge Sharing**: • Facilitating industry forums and networks where companies can share experiences, challenges, and best practices in climate reporting. • Encouraging larger corporations to mentor smaller businesses in developing their reporting capabilities. 7. **Technology and Innovation Support**: • Promoting the use of innovative technologies like AI and big data analytics to streamline the data collection and reporting process. • Supporting research and development in new tools and methodologies for climate risk assessment and reporting. 8. **Continuous Feedback Mechanism**: • Establishing a feedback loop where companies can communicate challenges and receive guidance from regulators and industry bodies.
How should the Government, regulators and industry prepare for global developments in sustainability-related financial disclosure frameworks and standards, including the TNFD?	To effectively prepare for global developments in sustainability-related financial disclosure frameworks and standards, including the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD), the government, regulators, and industry should adopt a proactive and collaborative approach. Here are key strategies to consider: 1. **Active International Engagement**: • Participate in international forums and working groups to stay abreast of evolving standards and frameworks. • Engage in dialogues with global regulatory bodies to influence and understand the development of standards like the TNFD. 2. **Alignment with Global Standards**: • Assess existing national frameworks and identify areas for alignment with international standards. • Implement regulations that are flexible enough to adapt to global changes while considering Australia's unique environmental and economic context. 3. **Capacity Building and Education**:

- Develop training programs and resources for businesses and financial institutions on global sustainability standards.
- Encourage higher education institutions to include sustainability reporting and finance in their curricula.

4. **Public-Private Partnerships**:
    - Foster collaborations between government, industry, and non-governmental organizations to share knowledge and best practices.
    - Create platforms for dialogue and exchange between different sectors to understand the practical implications of new standards.
5. **Technology and Data Infrastructure**:
    - Invest in technology solutions that can aid in data collection, analysis, and reporting in line with global standards.
    - Develop robust data infrastructure to support the accurate and efficient reporting of sustainability-related information.
6. **Pilot Projects and Case Studies**:
    - Implement pilot projects to test the applicability of new frameworks and standards in the Australian context.
    - Document and disseminate case studies of successful implementations as a learning resource.
7. **Stakeholder Engagement and Communication**:
    - Regularly communicate with stakeholders about the importance and impact of these global developments.
    - Solicit feedback from businesses, investors, and other stakeholders to understand their challenges and needs.
8. **Regulatory Flexibility and Review**:
    - Ensure that the regulatory environment can adapt quickly to changes in global standards.
    - Regularly review and update national standards to ensure they remain relevant and effective.
9. **Risk Management and Scenario Analysis**:
    - Encourage companies to conduct risk assessments and scenario analyses in line with emerging global trends.
    - Provide guidance on integrating sustainability risks into overall risk management frameworks.
10. **Support for SMEs**:
    - Recognize the unique challenges faced by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and provide targeted support and resources.

By adopting these strategies, the Australian government, regulators, and industry can not only prepare for but also actively shape global developments in sustainability-related financial disclosure frameworks and standards.

Box 2: Climate disclosure in the public sector
The Australian Government's commitment to introduce climate disclosure requirements for Commonwealth entities, aligning with those for the private sector, is a significant step towards ensuring transparency and accountability in managing climate risks and opportunities. This approach not only supports market neutrality between the private and Commonwealth public sectors but also reinforces the importance of comprehensive climate risk management across all sectors. Here are some key considerations and recommendations for effectively implementing these requirements: 1. **Standardization of Disclosure Requirements**: • Develop standardized guidelines for climate disclosures that are applicable across both the private and public sectors, ensuring consistency and comparability of data. 2. **Capacity Building for Public Entities**: • Provide training and resources to public sector entities to build their capacity in understanding and reporting climate risks and opportunities. • Encourage knowledge sharing between the private and public sectors to leverage best practices. 3. **Integration with Existing Frameworks**: • Align the new climate disclosure requirements with existing financial and operational reporting frameworks within public entities to streamline the process. • Ensure that these requirements complement other government initiatives like the Climate Risk and Opportunity Management Program (CROMP). 4. **Transparency and Accountability**: • Establish clear accountability mechanisms within public entities for climate risk assessment and disclosure. • Regularly review and publicly report on the progress and effectiveness of these disclosures. 5. **Engagement with Stakeholders**: • Involve a wide range of stakeholders, including the public, in consultations to refine and improve the disclosure process. • Use disclosures as a tool to engage with citizens and stakeholders on climate-related initiatives and policies. 6. **Leveraging Technology**: • Utilize digital platforms and tools for efficient data collection, analysis, and reporting. • Explore innovative technologies like AI and blockchain for enhanced transparency and data integrity. 7. **Risk Management Integration**: • Encourage public entities to integrate climate risk assessments into their broader risk management strategies. • Develop guidelines for prioritizing and managing identified risks. 8. **Benchmarking and Continuous Improvement**: • Regularly benchmark public sector disclosures against international best practices. • Foster a culture of continuous improvement and adaptation to evolving climate risk landscapes. 9. **Collaboration with Financial Institutions**: • Collaborate with financial institutions and regulators to align public sector disclosures with market expectations and requirements. 10. **Special Considerations for Diverse Entities**: • Recognize the diverse nature of public entities and tailor disclosure requirements to different scales and scopes of operation.
Priority 2: Develop a Sustainable Finance Taxonomy

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">In response to the Australian Government's consultation paper on developing a Sustainable Finance Taxonomy, we would offer the following comments and constructive feedback:
1. Mobilization of Private Capital: The emphasis on mobilizing private capital towards sustainable activities is commendable. However, it's important to also consider incentivizing smaller enterprises and start-ups that are often at the forefront of innovative sustainable practices but may lack the financial resources of larger firms.
2. Addressing Greenwashing: The focus on regulatory measures to address greenwashing is crucial. In this context, it might be beneficial to also consider establishing independent auditing bodies or mechanisms to verify the sustainability claims of firms and investment products. This can enhance credibility and investor confidence.
3. Collaborative Development: The proposed collaborative approach between the Government and industry in developing the taxonomy is positive. It is essential that this collaboration includes a wide range of stakeholders, including environmental NGOs, academic institutions, and consumer groups, to ensure a holistic and balanced perspective.
4. Science-Based and Credible: The commitment to a science-based approach is essential for the taxonomy’s credibility. It is recommended that ongoing partnerships with academic and research institutions be established to ensure that the taxonomy stays up to date with the latest scientific findings and technological advancements.
5. Transition Finance Role: Incorporating a role for transition finance is key, especially for industries that are currently high emitting but are crucial for the economy. It is important to define clear and stringent criteria for what constitutes 'transition' to avoid potential loopholes that might allow for continued high emissions under the guise of transition.
6. Practicality and International Operability: While focusing on practicality and international operability, it's important to ensure that these aspects do not lead to a dilution of the taxonomy’s standards. The Australian taxonomy should aim to be a leader in sustainable finance, setting high but achievable benchmarks.
7. Regulatory Use Cases: The consideration of regulatory use cases for the taxonomy during its initial development phase is prudent. It would be beneficial to engage with a wide range of industry participants to understand how these use cases might impact different sectors and to identify any potential challenges or barriers to implementation.
8. Governance Arrangements: The maintenance of the taxonomy by an appropriate government body is crucial for its effectiveness and integrity. This body should have the necessary expertise in both finance and sustainability and should operate transparently and with accountability to stakeholders.
Overall, the development of a Sustainable Finance Taxonomy is a significant step towards aligning Australia’s financial markets with sustainability goals. It is important that the process remains inclusive, transparent, and dynamic, adapting to evolving sustainability challenges and opportunities.</td></tr>
<tr><td>What are the most important policy priorities and use cases for an Australian sustainable finance taxonomy? What are the key insights from international experience to date?</td><td>From a BCSDA perspective, the most important policy priorities and use cases for an Australian sustainable finance taxonomy, along with key insights from international experience, are as follows:
1. Policy Priorities:
• Transparency in Climate and Sustainability: Enhancing transparency on climate and sustainability issues is a primary focus. This involves establishing frameworks for sustainability-related financial disclosures and developing a sustainable finance taxonomy.
• Supporting Net Zero Transition: Another priority is supporting credible net zero transition planning, which aligns with global efforts to mitigate climate change.</td></tr>
</table>

- **Regulatory Measures Against Greenwashing**: The strategy emphasizes the need for regulatory measures to prevent greenwashing, ensuring that sustainability disclosures by firms and issuers of investment products are accurate and reliable.
- **Development in Collaboration**: The taxonomy development should involve collaboration between government and industry, backed by strong governance arrangements, and should be credible, science-based, and effectively incorporate transition finance.
- **Practicality and International Operability**: The taxonomy should focus on practicality, usability, and alignment with international standards, ensuring that it is operable and relevant on a global scale.

2. **Use Cases for the Taxonomy**:
   - **Guiding Investment Decisions**: The taxonomy can be used by investors to assess whether their investments support sustainability objectives and outcomes.
   - **Incorporation into Corporate Reporting**: Taxonomy criteria could be incorporated into corporate reporting requirements, transition planning frameworks, and labelling schemes for sustainable investment products.
   - **Regulatory Architecture**: Considering embedding the taxonomy in Australia's regulatory architecture to promote greater transparency and consistency in sustainability-related disclosures, financial products, and markets.
3. **Key Insights from International Experience**:
   - **Global Alignment and Interoperability**: International experience highlights the importance of aligning with global standards and ensuring interoperability of sustainable finance frameworks across jurisdictions. This is crucial for promoting cross-border sustainable finance flows and reducing compliance costs.
   - **Focus on Transition Finance**: International taxonomies often include transitional activities and investments that are necessary for a shift to net zero. This aspect is vital for economies like Australia, where transitional activities are crucial for future prosperity and managing a just transition.
   - **Evolution and Maintenance**: As sustainable finance markets evolve, the taxonomy will need to be regularly updated to reflect changes in technology, policy, and market factors. It should be overseen by an appropriate government body or agency with sufficient expertise in taxonomies, data, and the financial system.

Here are some international examples of sustainable finance taxonomies that were not referenced in Box 4, that we consider are worth mentioning:

1. **China**:

	• China issued the first iteration of its Green Bond Endorsed Project Catalogue in 2015, often referred to as the Chinese taxonomy. This taxonomy was a pioneering effort in defining sustainable finance in the region and has influenced subsequent developments in the field.[1] 2. **Japan**: • Japan launched its green bond guidelines in 2017, highlighting the country's commitment to aligning financial activities with environmental objectives. This approach has been integral in shaping Japan's sustainable finance landscape.[2] 3. **France and the Netherlands**: • France created the GreenFin label for retail investment funds in 2015, while the Netherlands has had a legislative approach to green lending since 1995 (Green Funds Scheme). These initiatives demonstrate the countries' long-standing commitment to sustainable finance.[3] 4. **Colombia and South Africa**: • Both countries have used the European taxonomy as a template for their own sustainable finance taxonomies, adapting it to local conditions and contexts. This shows the influence of the EU model and its adaptability to different economic and environmental settings.[4] 5. **Transition and Social Taxonomies**: • There is a growing trend towards the development of social and brown/transition taxonomies. For example, Canada and Japan are developing transition taxonomies focusing on climate change mitigation for companies operating in traditionally brown sectors. Meanwhile, the EU and South Africa are considering social taxonomies focusing on positive contributions to social objectives like health, human rights, equality, and non-discrimination[5]. These examples from different parts of the world illustrate the diverse approaches to sustainable finance taxonomy development, reflecting local priorities and environmental objectives. They underscore the trend towards more nuanced and comprehensive taxonomies that address a broader range of sustainability goals, beyond just climate change mitigation.
What are priorities for expanding taxonomy coverage after the initial focus on climate mitigation objectives in key sectors?	To expand the taxonomy coverage beyond the initial focus on climate mitigation objectives in key sectors, priorities could include:

[1] https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/134a2dbe-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/134a2dbe-en
[2] https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/134a2dbe-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/134a2dbe-en
[3] https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/134a2dbe-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/134a2dbe-en
[4] https://www.spglobal.com/esg/podcasts/how-sustainable-taxonomies-are-going-global
[5] https://gsh.cib.natixis.com/our-center-of-expertise/articles/sustainable-taxonomy-development-worldwide-a-standard-setting-race-between-competing-jurisdictions

	1. **Broadening Environmental Objectives**: Including criteria that address broader environmental concerns such as water conservation, pollution control, and biodiversity protection, as seen in taxonomies like Colombia's or Sri Lanka's.[6] 2. **Incorporating Social Dimensions**: Developing social taxonomies that focus on positive contributions to social objectives related to health, human rights, equality, and non-discrimination, as the EU and South Africa are considering. 3. **Aligning with Local Economic Priorities**: Customizing taxonomies to prioritize sectors that are important for local economies, which may differ from international models, ensuring relevance and effectiveness in driving sustainability in the local context. 4. **Ensuring Interoperability**: Creating taxonomies that can work seamlessly with international standards to facilitate cross-border sustainable finance flows, as seen in the approaches taken by South Africa and Colombia using the EU taxonomy as a base. 5. **Adapting to Technological and Policy Developments**: Ensuring that taxonomies remain relevant and up-to-date with the latest technological advancements and policy changes to accurately reflect the evolving landscape of sustainable finance. 6. **Sector Prioritization**: Focusing on sectors with high environmental impact, and developing criteria that address key issues like supply chain sustainability and deforestation.
What are appropriate long-term governance arrangements to ensure that the taxonomy is effectively embedded in Australia's financial and regulatory architecture?	For the long-term governance of a sustainable finance taxonomy in Australia's financial and regulatory architecture, it is important to consider: 1. **Establishment of a Dedicated Oversight Body**: A specialized agency or committee should be established to oversee the taxonomy's ongoing development and integration, with representation from government, industry, academia, and civil society. 2. **Regular Review and Update Mechanism**: Set up a mechanism for periodic review of the taxonomy to ensure it remains relevant and in line with international best practices, scientific advancements, and market developments. 3. **Alignment with International Standards**: Ensure the taxonomy aligns with international frameworks to facilitate global investment flows and interoperability. 4. **Legislative Backing**: Enshrine the taxonomy in legislation to give it formal status and integrate it into the country's financial and regulatory systems. 5. **Stakeholder Engagement and Transparency**: Maintain a transparent process with active stakeholder engagement to build trust and broad acceptance of the taxonomy. 6. **Integration with Financial Reporting and Disclosure**: Embed the taxonomy into corporate reporting requirements and financial disclosures to promote transparency and accountability.

[6] https://www.spglobal.com/esg/podcasts/how-sustainable-taxonomies-are-going-global

	7. **Capacity Building and Education**: Invest in capacity-building initiatives to educate and train relevant stakeholders on the taxonomy and its implications.

Priority 3: Support credible net zero transition planning

To ensure that the taxonomy is effectively embedded in Australia's financial and regulatory architecture for supporting credible net zero transition planning, appropriate long-term governance arrangements could include:

1. **Aligning with Global Standards**: Aligning with international standards like the ISSB climate disclosure standards to ensure consistency and credibility in transition planning disclosures.
2. **Regulatory Oversight and Supervision**: ASIC's supervisory priorities and guidance informed by emerging international standards could help set clear expectations for disclosure.
3. **Sectoral Emissions Reduction Pathways**: National sectoral emissions reduction pathways, as part of Australia's 2050 Net Zero Plan, could offer policy guidance for corporate transition planning.
4. **Sustainable Finance Taxonomy**: Developing sustainability objectives within the taxonomy to provide metrics for target setting and tracking progress.
5. **Coordination with Industry and Investors**: Collaborating with industry stakeholders to identify opportunities to support credible transition planning and disclosure.
6. **Monitoring and Assessment**: Treasury, alongside the CFR, to provide updated recommendations on enhancing firm-level transition planning, considering the Australian climate policy landscape and international practices.
7. **Consultation and Review**: Considering responses to consultations before finalizing transition planning disclosure requirements or additional guidance.

These measures would collectively contribute to a robust framework for transition planning, supporting Australia's journey to net zero.

Leading international practices for sustainable finance taxonomy governance, as evidenced by efforts across various jurisdictions, also suggest the following key elements:

1. **Strong Political Commitment and Governance**: Taxonomies need support from financial regulators, supervisors, and a well-established governance structure to promote consistency, comparability, interoperability, and transparency of sustainable finance.[7]
2. **Standardization and Harmonization**: The ASEAN's Taxonomy for Sustainable Development and efforts by jurisdictions such as Indonesia, South Korea, South Africa, and Colombia to harmonize technical aspects using the EU taxonomy as a baseline demonstrate a push towards global standardization.[8]
3. **Adaptation to Local Contexts**: Jurisdictions are harmonizing methodology for Technical Screening Criteria while localizing features like metrics and verification processes to their economic development and financial systems, as seen in the UK, Thailand, Singapore, Mexico, and Chile.[9]
4. **Learning from Best Practices**: The learning curve from first and second movers in taxonomy development is critical for understanding technical aspects, governance mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement necessary for success.[10]

[7] https://www.ccap.org/post/sustainable-finance-taxonomy-a-key-financial-regulatory-tool-in-the-reform-of-the-financial-system
[8] ibid
[9] ibid
[10] ibid

5. **Interoperability for Cross-border Investments**: The G20 Sustainable Finance Report 2022 and the efforts by the International Platform on Sustainable Finance to develop a Common Ground Taxonomy between the EU and China are aimed at improving comparability and interoperability to facilitate sustainable investment flows and avoid greenwashing.[11] These practices can guide the development of long-term governance arrangements for Australia's sustainable finance taxonomy to ensure it is effectively embedded in the financial and regulatory architecture.	
What are key gaps in Australian capability and practice, including relative to ‘gold standard’ approaches to transition planning developed through the TPT and other frameworks?	Key gaps in Australian capability and practice in transition planning relative to international 'gold standard' approaches, such as those developed by the Transition Plan Taskforce (TPT) and other frameworks, can be identified in the following areas: 1. **Climate Skills Gap**: A survey by ISF and CSIRO Climate Science Centre highlights a significant gap in climate-related and sustainable finance skills within Australia’s financial system, which is essential for supporting the transition to net zero. 2. **Rapidly Evolving Skill Requirements**: The rate at which sustainable finance skills requirements are changing is a challenge, necessitating continuous upskilling to keep pace with evolving management and regulatory practices. 3. **Lack of System-wide Coordination**: There is no standardized approach or system-wide coordination for integrating climate skills in the financial sector, which could hinder the transition to sustainable practices. 4. **Time Constraints**: Finance professionals face time constraints that make it difficult to prioritize skills development and training in the area of sustainable finance. To address these gaps, initiatives like establishing a sustainable finance learning ecosystem and forming a Sustainable Finance Skills Partnership have been proposed to align Australia with international best practices.[12]
To what extent will ISSB-aligned corporate disclosure requirements improve the transparency and credibility of corporate transition planning? What additional transition disclosure requirements or guidance would be most useful in the medium-term?	The International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB)-aligned corporate disclosure requirements are anticipated to significantly enhance the transparency and credibility of corporate transition planning. They will enforce a standardized framework for disclosing firm-level targets and transition plans, thus making it easier for investors to compare and assess the sustainability commitments and actions of different companies. In the medium-term, additional transition disclosure requirements or guidance that could be useful may include: 1. **Sector-Specific Guidance**: Detailed frameworks for transition planning tailored to the unique challenges and opportunities of specific sectors. 2. **Best Practice Case Studies**: Illustrative examples of effective transition planning and disclosure from leading companies within and outside Australia. 3. **Granularity in Reporting**: Requirements for more granular reporting on progress towards targets, including interim milestones and investment in sustainable technologies.

[11] ibid
[12] https://www.uts.edu.au/isf/explore-research/projects/advancing-climate-skills-australian-financial-system

	4. **Integration with National Policies**: Alignment of disclosures with national climate policies and sectoral roadmaps to provide context and relevance to transition plans. 5. **Third-Party Verification**: Mechanisms for independent verification of reported information to increase accountability and trust in disclosed data. The development of such guidance, informed by international best practices and integrated with the evolving global sustainability disclosure landscape, would support the credibility and robustness of corporate transition plans.
Are there related priorities and opportunities for supporting enhanced target setting and transition planning for nature and other sustainability issues?	To support enhanced target setting and transition planning for nature and other sustainability issues, the following priorities and opportunities, as identified by international practices, could be considered: 1. **Biodiversity Performance Assessment**: The IUCN guidelines support businesses in assessing and managing their biodiversity impact, which includes establishing goals, selecting appropriate indicators, and incorporating these into corporate reporting. 2. **Strategic Approach to Sustainability**: The IUCN recommends a more strategic approach, linked to core indicators, which would allow businesses to have a more comprehensive understanding of their overall biodiversity performance, thereby improving decision-making and external disclosures. 3. **Alignment with Global Goals**: Companies are encouraged to align their biodiversity goals with international frameworks such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, which will help in tracking contributions to global conservation objectives.[13] Incorporating such frameworks into Australian corporate practices could close existing gaps by providing clear guidelines for biodiversity management and contributing to the broader sustainability agenda.
Priority 4: Develop a labelling system for investment products marketed as sustainable	
The development of a labelling system for investment products marketed as sustainable is an important step toward transparency. International practices such as the EU's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) and the UK's Green Finance Strategy set a precedent, providing clear frameworks for sustainability labels and disclosures. To enhance the effectiveness of Australia's approach, it could: • **Set Minimum Standards**: Define what constitutes a 'sustainable' investment to prevent greenwashing. • **Mandate Disclosure**: Require product issuers to disclose how sustainability is factored into investment processes. • **Align with Taxonomies**: Integrate the labelling regime with the Australian sustainable finance taxonomy for consistency. • **Continuous Consultation**: Engage with industry stakeholders and regulators to refine policy and legislative design.	
What should be the key considerations for the design of a sustainable investment product labelling regime?	In designing a sustainable investment product labelling regime, key considerations, drawn from international practices, should include: 1. **Mandatory Disclosure**: Implement mandatory disclosure requirements that define what constitutes a 'sustainable' investment product, as outlined by the EU SFDR, to prevent greenwashing and to ensure investors have access to consistent information.

[13] https://www.iucn.org/news/business-and-biodiversity/202103/iucn-unveils-new-guidelines-businesses-committed-improving-their-biodiversity-performance

	2. **Clear Labelling Criteria**: Establish clear criteria for sustainability labels, such as the investment threshold in sustainable assets or the incorporation of ESG considerations into the investment process, as seen in the Nordic Swan and Luxflag labels. 3. **Consumer Understanding and Trust**: The UK's approach to creating labels that reflect sustainability characteristics is designed to inform retail investors and build trust in the sustainable finance market. 4. **Alignment with Taxonomies**: Ensure that the labelling criteria are aligned with broader sustainability taxonomies and frameworks, which can help provide a comprehensive understanding of what each label signifies and how it relates to sustainability objectives. 5. **Regulatory Oversight and Supervision**: Consider the supervisory approach taken by the Central Bank of Ireland, which sets out expectations for financial services firms and examines fund disclosures for compliance with SFDR.[14] These considerations are aimed at enhancing transparency, comparability, and trust in sustainable investment products, thereby supporting informed decision-making by investors.
How can an Australian model build off existing domestic approaches and reflect key developments in other markets?	An Australian sustainable investment product labelling regime can build off existing domestic approaches and reflect key developments in other markets by: 1. **Integrating Best Practices**: Adopting the successful elements of international models like the EU SFDR, Nordic Swan, and Luxflag for clear criteria and transparency. 2. **Consultation and Adaptation**: Engaging with local industry stakeholders to tailor international standards to the Australian market's unique characteristics. 3. **Regulatory Alignment**: Aligning with international taxonomies, such as the EU Taxonomy Regulation, to ensure consistency and facilitate cross-border investment. 4. **Continuous Monitoring and Evaluation**: Implementing a dynamic approach that evolves with international best practices and addresses the unique challenges and opportunities within Australia.
Pillar 2: Financial system capabilities	
Enhanced transparency is central to the integration of sustainability in financial markets and economic decision making. However, for opportunities and risks to be managed effectively, transparency alone is not enough – sustainability-related considerations need to be practically embedded in the decision making and governance of firms, financial institutions and regulators. Driven by commercial realities, sustainability is already becoming a key consideration for financial market participants seeking to manage risks and position themselves for long-term success. Financial regulators are prioritising climate and sustainability issues and identifying how these intersect with their existing regulatory mandates and frameworks. Firms and financial institutions have developed new disciplines for integrating these issues into sound corporate risk management and governance. There has been considerable investment across the economy to build the new sustainability-related resources, data systems and expertise. The Government is seeking to support this momentum, to ensure that financial institutions and markets are well positioned to tackle long-term sustainability challenges. This section identifies three priorities for strengthening financial sector capabilities and governance practices:	

[14] https://kpmg.com/xx/en/home/insights/2022/02/green-product-labels-evolve.html

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">• Equipping Australia’s financial regulators to address key sustainability priorities, including increasing sustainability-related market supervision and enforcement and deepening analysis of sustainability-related systemic risks and responses.
• Supporting work across government to address data challenges and priorities that are most important for firms and institutions to better understand and manage sustainability issues.
• Ensuring that regulatory frameworks for sustainability governance are fit for purpose in key sectors and across the economy – ensuring that sustainability priorities can be properly factored in and managed by Australian investors and institutions. Reforms in these areas will ensure firms, financial institutions and regulators can strengthen their sustainability-related capabilities, and that our data, governance and regulatory frameworks position Australia to be a leader in green and sustainable finance.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Priority 5: Enhancing market supervision and enforcement</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">To enhance market supervision and enforcement in line with Priority 5 of Australia's proposed Sustainable Finance Strategy, the following measures could be considered, drawing from international practices:
1. Strengthened Regulatory Frameworks: Adopt mandatory climate disclosure requirements as a foundation for market supervision, similar to those implemented by the EU and UK.
2. Focus on Greenwashing: Like ASIC's enhanced focus, other global regulators have been actively targeting misleading sustainability claims. This could be bolstered by learning from enforcement actions taken in other jurisdictions.
3. Resource Allocation: Ensuring that ASIC is well-resourced, similar to the additional funding provided in 2023-24, to supervise sustainable finance effectively and address market misconduct.
4. Regulating ESG Ratings: Considering the regulation of ESG ratings providers, drawing on approaches taken by other jurisdictions, to improve transparency and comparability.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Are Australia’s existing corporations and financial services laws sufficiently flexible to address greenwashing? What are the priorities for addressing greenwashing?</td><td>Australia's existing corporations and financial services laws offer a framework to address greenwashing, but international practices suggest that there could be room for enhancement. ASIC's guidance (INFO 271) provides a robust starting point for regulating misleading sustainability claims. Key legal obligations already address misleading and deceptive conduct and disclosure requirements.

For addressing greenwashing, the priorities should include:
• Clarifying Labels and Terminology: Ensuring that product labels and sustainability terms used in marketing materials accurately reflect the substance and are not misleading.
• Disclosing Methodology and Metrics: Clearly explaining how sustainability factors are integrated into investment decisions and the use of sustainability metrics.
• Setting and Explaining Targets: Articulating sustainability targets, how they will be achieved, and how progress will be measured.

These principles align with international best practices and are in line with voluntary reporting frameworks like the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and standards proposed by the International</td></tr>
</table>

	Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB).[15] Incorporating these practices can help ensure Australian laws are sufficiently flexible and robust to address greenwashing effectively.
Is there a case for regulating ESG ratings as financial services?	Considering international regulatory developments and practices, there is a growing case for regulating ESG ratings as financial services. In the UK, HM Treasury is proposing new regulations that would require ESG ratings providers to become authorized by the Financial Conduct Authority, aiming to improve transparency and conduct in the ESG ratings market. The definition of ESG ratings is broad, covering any assessment of ESG factors, and the proposed regime is inclusive of overseas firms providing services to UK users. Proportionality is a key consideration, balancing the benefits of regulation against the potential impact on competition and innovation, particularly for smaller providers. Certain exclusions would ensure the regime's scope remains appropriate, such as not-for-profit entities and intra-group ratings.[16] For Australia, adopting a similar model could mean enhancing the regulatory framework to ensure that ESG ratings are reliable and not misleading, supporting informed investment decisions and helping to prevent greenwashing. This could involve defining ESG ratings, setting authorization and compliance requirements, and considering the territorial scope and proportionality of regulations. The Australian model could build on existing frameworks while reflecting these key developments in international markets.

Priority 6: Identifying and responding to potential systemic financial risks

To identify and respond to potential systemic financial risks related to climate and broader sustainability issues, an Australian model can build on existing domestic approaches and reflect key developments in other markets by:

1. **Enhancing Risk Assessment**: Continue and deepen the work on climate and sustainability-related financial risks through initiatives like the CFR’s Climate Vulnerability Assessment and scenario analysis for the insurance sector.
2. **Regulatory Coordination**: Strengthen the coordination among regulators, as seen with the CFR Climate Working Group, and align efforts with global initiatives like the NGFS.
3. **Building Analytical Capabilities**: Restore and enhance Treasury’s capability to model climate opportunities and risks to support whole-of-government assessment of climate risk.
4. **Engaging with Market Participants**: Work closely with financial institutions to understand their climate-related governance and risk management processes, including stress testing with climate scenarios.
5. **Public-Private Partnerships**: Collaborate with industry through partnerships like the Hazards Insurance Partnership to analyze physical climate risks and insurer responses.
6. **Monetary Policy Integration**: Consider the implications of climate change in monetary policy and financial stability, similar to the RBA's approach.

[15] https://www.whitecase.com/insight-alert/practical-guidance-avoiding-greenwashing-australian-response
[16] https://kpmg.com/xx/en/home/insights/2023/05/regulating-esg-ratings-providers.html

By taking these steps, Australia can create a robust framework for addressing systemic risks related to sustainability, aligned with international best practices and responsive to the unique Australian context.	
Are there specific areas where the Government or regulators could further contribute to market-wide understanding of systemic sustainability related risks, including climate-related financial risks?	To enhance market-wide understanding of systemic sustainability-related risks, including climate-related financial risks, governments and regulators could: 1. **Strengthen Climate Risk Assessments**: Leverage research and analysis to understand potential economic impacts, as emphasized by the work of financial regulators and institutions like the NGFS. 2. **Integrate Climate Risk into Financial Supervision**: Incorporate climate risk considerations into the prudential supervision and regulation of financial institutions to ensure comprehensive risk management, including conducting climate stress tests and requiring disclosures based on frameworks like TCFD. 3. **Expand Economic Modelling**: Build on the capabilities of treasury departments to model climate opportunities and risks, assessing the impacts of domestic and global climate policies on the economy. 4. **Public-Private Collaborations**: Engage in partnerships to analyse physical climate risks and responses, like APRA's collaboration with the Hazards Insurance Partnership managed by the National Emergency Management Agency.[17] 5. **Global Regulatory Coordination**: Align with international regulatory efforts to address climate risk comprehensively, which could include joining global forums and aligning with international standards and recommendations. These actions would contribute to a stronger systemic understanding of sustainability and climate-related risks, aligning with global efforts and enhancing financial stability.
Priority 7: Addressing data and analytical challenges	
To address climate and sustainability-related data challenges, the Australian Government and regulators can draw from international efforts: 1. **Strengthen Climate Information Architecture**: As per the IMF, there's an urgent need for high-quality, reliable, and comparable data, alongside a harmonized set of climate disclosure standards and a broadly agreed-upon global taxonomy. 2. **Close Data Gaps**: Address the lack of forward-looking and granular data, particularly for small and medium enterprises and in emerging markets, which hinders assessment of firms' climate risk and investment impacts. 3. **Improve Disclosure Standards**: Converge towards more standardized sustainability reporting, supported by international initiatives like the Network for Greening the Financial System and the IMF's Climate Change Indicators Dashboard, to enable better decision-making and financial stability risk monitoring from climate change. 4. **Consolidate Reporting Initiatives**: The International Financial Reporting Standards Foundation's development of global sustainability reporting standards aims to enhance transparency and comparability. 5. **Implement Uniform Standards**: Ensure consistent, timely, and uniform implementation of internationally agreed sustainability reporting standards, taking into account regional and institutional specifics.	

[17] https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2020/06/28/addressing-climate-as-a-systemic-risk-a-call-to-action-for-financial-regulators/

6. **Widen Standards' Scope**: Broaden the scope of sustainability standards to address environmental, social, and governance issues more comprehensively.[18] Australian models can integrate these elements to improve the availability and quality of sustainability-related data, enhancing financial sector decision-making and systemic risk assessment.	
What are the priorities for ensuring that data-related initiatives already underway are tailored to meet the needs of firms and investors?	Priorities for ensuring that data-related initiatives meet the needs of firms and investors include: 1. **Stakeholder Engagement**: Actively involve firms and investors in the development and refinement of data initiatives to ensure their needs are met. 2. **Standardization**: Align with international standards and frameworks to ensure consistency and comparability of data. 3. **Accessibility**: Make data available in a user-friendly manner, potentially through a centralized repository or platform. 4. **Quality and Reliability**: Ensure the data is high-quality, reliable, and verifiable. 5. **Education and Guidance**: Provide firms and investors with the education and guidance needed to effectively use and interpret sustainability data.
What key sustainability data gaps or uncertainties faced by financial institutions in Australia should be prioritised by the CFR?	Key sustainability data gaps or uncertainties faced by financial institutions in Australia that should be prioritized by the CFR include: 1. **Lack of Standardization and Consistency**: The absence of a globally agreed definition of "ESG" and standardized ESG reporting frameworks leads to various challenges, including voluntary and inconsistent data that is difficult to compare across businesses and jurisdictions. 2. **Interdependence and Unverified Data**: The reliance on self-assessed disclosures and varying interpretation practices by data collectors and providers leads to compromised, unverified, and inconsistent ESG data. 3. **Patchy and Outdated Data**: The quality and quantity of ESG reporting vary significantly, with data often being out of date, particularly for smaller public organizations. This lack of current data hampers the accurate assessment of businesses' ESG performance. 4. **Lack of ESG Data Competencies**: Financial services organizations often lack the necessary skills and tools to build their own ESG data analytics operations, which leaves them vulnerable to the weaknesses of the ESG data industry. 5. **No Single Source of Truth**: Financial institutions face challenges in finding comprehensive ESG data from a single provider, leading to difficulties in addressing inconsistencies and technical challenges of compiling multiple data sources.[19]

[18] https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2021/05/13/how-strengthening-standards-for-data-and-disclosure-can-make-for-a-greener-future
[19] https://kpmg.com/au/en/home/insights/2021/10/closing-gap-in-esg-data-quality.html

	Addressing these gaps requires a coordinated effort to improve the quality, reliability, and comparability of ESG data, which is crucial for informed decision-making and effective risk management in sustainable finance.
Priority 8: Ensuring fit for purpose regulatory frameworks	
To ensure that regulatory frameworks are fit for purpose in managing sustainability issues, the CFR should prioritize: 1. **Integration of ESG into Risk Management**: Financial institutions need to integrate ESG risks across their enterprise, including creating specific sustainability strategies, revising business strategies, and implementing updated regulatory frameworks. 2. **Managing Complex Interlinkages of ESG Risks**: ESG risks are complex and interlinked, influencing most financial and non-financial risks. Financial institutions should holistically embed ESG issues into their risk management frameworks, considering the multifaceted impact of ESG issues. 3. **Addressing Climate Risk Challenges**: Climate risks, both physical and transitional, are a dominant focus area. Financial institutions should assess and manage these risks in both their direct operations and their influence on customers' activities. 4. **Developing Comprehensive ESG Data and Reporting**: There's a need for high-quality, reliable, and comparable ESG data, a harmonized set of climate disclosure standards, and a broadly agreed-upon global taxonomy to support effective decision-making. 5. **Adapting to Evolving Regulatory Landscapes**: Keeping abreast of international regulatory developments, such as the EU's Sustainable Finance Action Plan and the EBA Action Plan on Sustainable Finance, and aligning domestic frameworks accordingly.[20] By focusing on these areas, the CFR can help ensure that Australia's regulatory frameworks effectively incorporate and address the complexities and challenges of sustainability-related risks.	
Do you agree that existing regulatory and governance frameworks and practices have adapted well to support better integration of sustainability-related issues in financial decision making? Are there barriers or challenges that require further consideration? This may include: – Corporate governance obligations, including directors' duties – Prudential frameworks and oversight, including in relation to banks and insurers – Regulation of the superannuation system and managed investment schemes	Existing regulatory and governance frameworks have shown adaptability in integrating sustainability-related issues into financial decision-making. However, challenges and barriers still exist: 1. **Corporate Governance Obligations**: Directors' duties must continually evolve to adequately encompass sustainability concerns, ensuring they are integral to corporate strategy and risk management. 2. **Prudential Frameworks and Oversight**: For banks and insurers, the evolving nature of climate risks requires ongoing refinement of prudential frameworks to ensure robust risk assessment and management. 3. **Superannuation and Managed Investment Schemes**: Regulations need to balance promoting sustainability with protecting investors' financial interests, especially in the context of long-term investment strategies and the transition to net zero. These areas require continuous monitoring and updating to keep pace with the evolving nature of sustainability risks and opportunities.
What steps could the Government or regulators take to support effective investor stewardship?	To support the conclusions with international practices: 1. **Develop Clear Guidelines**: The UK's Stewardship Code provides a good model, offering detailed guidance for institutional investors on responsible investment practices.

[20] https://kpmg.com/xx/en/home/insights/2021/03/esg-for-greater-resilience-at-financial-institutions.html

	2. **Encourage Transparency and Reporting**: The EU's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation mandates disclosure of sustainability risks and impacts, promoting transparency in investment decision-making. 3. **Promote Best Practices**: Organizations like the Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI) offer frameworks and resources to guide effective stewardship globally. 4. **Facilitate Collaboration and Dialogue**: The International Corporate Governance Network (ICGN) promotes dialogue between investors and companies on governance and sustainability issues. 5. **Provide Educational Resources**: The CFA Institute and other global financial education organizations offer training and resources on ESG and sustainability, aiding investors in developing stewardship skills.
Pillar 3: Australian Government leadership and engagement	
To enhance Australian Government leadership and engagement in sustainable finance: 1. **Australian Sovereign Green Bonds Program**: Like the European Union's green bond framework, this program can attract green capital and support market growth. 2. **Interoperability of Frameworks**: Emulate the EU's approach to ensuring its sustainable finance frameworks is interoperable with global standards, facilitating cross-border finance flows. 3. **Catalysing Sustainable Finance Markets**: Follow models like the EU’s Sustainable Finance Action Plan, focusing on sectors crucial for sustainable transition, and use special investment vehicles like the Clean Energy Finance Corporation to drive growth. 4. **International Engagement and Blended Finance**: Australia can position itself as a sustainability leader by actively engaging in international forums and initiatives, akin to the EU’s leadership in global sustainability discussions and finance commitments.	
Priority 9: Issuing Australian sovereign green bonds	
To effectively issue Australian sovereign green bonds, drawing from international practices and research: 1. **Address Knowledge and Capacity Gaps**: The World Bank report emphasizes the need for new issuers to understand the opportunities and challenges in mobilizing private capital for sustainable development, which is crucial for Australia as it plans its sovereign green bond program. 2. **Develop Comprehensive Frameworks**: Many countries have developed frameworks and national taxonomies to identify eligible assets for green bonds, a step that Australia could emulate to ensure the success of its program. 3. **Catalysing Private Sector Investment**: Sovereign issuances can increase liquidity, benchmark yield curves, and set best practices, thereby catalysing private sector investment in sustainability. This aligns with the World Bank's approach and could be a key benefit of Australia's sovereign green bond program.[21] By incorporating these lessons from international practices, Australia can effectively launch and manage a sovereign green bond program that aligns with global standards and attracts significant investment.	
What are the key expectations of the market around issuance of, and reporting against, sovereign green bonds? What lessons can be	The key expectations of the market around the issuance of and reporting against sovereign green bonds, along with lessons from comparable schemes in other jurisdictions, include:

[21] https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2022/11/07/sovereign-green-social-and-sustainability-bonds-set-to-grow-as-emerging-markets-focus-on-sustainability

learned from comparable schemes in other jurisdictions?	1. **Understanding Opportunities and Challenges**: New issuers must understand the opportunities to mobilize private capital for climate action and sustainable development goals. This involves addressing knowledge and capacity gaps to improve transaction quality and maximize outcomes. 2. **Developing National Taxonomies and Frameworks**: Many sovereign issuers (including Australia) are developing taxonomies and frameworks to identify eligible assets for green bonds, which is crucial for clarity and successful issuance. 3. **Catalysing Private Sector Investment**: Sovereign issuances can fund government investment programs and catalyse private sector issuances by increasing liquidity and setting best practices. This has been effective in mobilizing significant private capital, as seen with the World Bank's initiatives.[22] These insights suggest that for Australia to effectively issue sovereign green bonds, it should focus on developing a clear understanding of the financial instrument, structuring the bonds to meet market demand, and ensuring that the issuance aligns with broader sustainability goals and financial market conditions.
What other measures can the Government take to support the continued development of green capital markets in Australia?	The key expectations of the market around the issuance of, and reporting against, sovereign green bonds, and lessons from comparable schemes in other jurisdictions include: 1. **Addressing Knowledge and Capacity Gaps**: Emerging market issuances highlighted the importance of understanding opportunities and challenges in mobilizing private capital for sustainable development. New issuers, like Australia, need to comprehend how to maximize investor interest and outcomes in financial, environmental, and social aspects. 2. **Developing National Frameworks and Taxonomies**: Some countries have established task forces or developed national taxonomies to identify eligible assets for green bond issuance, indicating the need for clear frameworks and standards. 3. **Investor and Market Engagement**: Issuers and investors have expressed interest in sovereign thematic bonds. Understanding investors' concerns, ESG factors, and bond characteristics of interest is crucial for successful bond issuance. 4. **Catalysing Private Sector Investment**: Sovereign issuances can boost private sector issuances by increasing liquidity, benchmarking yield curves, and setting best practices. This approach has been effective in emerging markets, highlighting the potential for sovereign bonds to stimulate broader sustainable finance markets. These lessons and expectations suggest that Australia's sovereign green bond program should focus on developing a clear framework, engaging with investors to understand their needs and concerns, and leveraging the issuance to catalyse broader market development in sustainable finance.
Priority 10: Catalysing sustainable finance flows and markets	

[22] ibid

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">To address the question regarding catalysing sustainable finance flows and markets, particularly in relation to the Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC) and the development of sustainable financial products, practices, and markets, the following references provide relevant data, research, legal opinions, and practices from international leading sources:
1. Green Technology and Bonds
• Zhang, J., Yang, G., Ding, X., & Qin, J. (2022). Can green bonds empower green technology innovation of enterprises? Retrieved from Semantic Scholar
• Schuetze, F., & Stede, J. (2020). EU Sustainable Finance Taxonomy – What Is Its Role on the Road towards Climate Neutrality? Retrieved from Semantic Scholar
2. Sustainable Finance Taxonomy
• Moneva, J., Scarpellini, S., Aranda-Usón, A., & Álvarez Etxeberria, I. (2022). Sustainability reporting in view of the European sustainable finance taxonomy: Is the financial sector ready to disclose circular economy? Retrieved from Semantic Scholar
• Schütze, F., & Stede, J. (2021). The EU sustainable finance taxonomy and its contribution to climate neutrality. Retrieved from Semantic Scholar
3. Energy Efficiency and Financing
• Fang, W., Farooq, U., Liu, Z., Lan, J., & Iram, R. (2022). Measuring energy efficiency financing: a way forward for reducing energy poverty through financial inclusion in OECD. Retrieved from Semantic Scholar
• Koutsandreas, D., Kleanthis, N., Flamos, A., Karakosta, C., & Doukas, H. (2022). Risks and mitigation strategies in energy efficiency financing: A systematic literature review. Retrieved from Semantic Scholar
4. Investment Strategies and Sustainability
• Richter, M. J. E. A., Hagenmaier, M., Bandte, O., Parida, V., & Wincent, J. (2022). Smart cities, urban mobility, and autonomous vehicles: How different cities need different sustainable investment strategies. Retrieved from Semantic Scholar
• Tu, C. A., & Rasoulinezhad, E. (2021). Energy efficiency financing and the role of green bond: policies for post-Covid period. Retrieved from Semantic Scholar
These references can be used to inform policies, investment decisions, and market development strategies aimed at enhancing the role of sustainable finance, and they showcase a variety of approaches taken by different countries and sectors.</td></tr>
<tr><td>What role can the CEFC play to support scaling up of sustainable investment in Australia, as part of a more comprehensive and ambitious sustainable finance agenda?</td><td>The Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC) can support scaling up sustainable investment in Australia as part of a more comprehensive and ambitious sustainable finance agenda by integrating and promoting environmentally and socially responsible investment strategies. CEFC can focus on investments that fully integrate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria, thereby supporting the transition toward sustainable development and finance. By doing so, CEFC can stimulate and support investment decisions that make finance grow more sustainable, playing a pivotal role in the transition towards a more responsible and sustainable economy.

Here are some key references that elaborate on strategies for sustainable investment and the role that organizations like CEFC can play:
1. Sciarelli, M., Cosimato, S., Landi, G., & Iandolo, F. (2021). Socially responsible investment strategies for the transition towards sustainable development: the importance of integrating and communicating ESG. The TQM Journal.</td></tr>
</table>

	2. Folque, M., Escrig-Olmedo, E., & Corzo Santamaria, T. (2021). Sustainable development and financial system: Integrating ESG risks through sustainable investment strategies in a climate change context. Sustainable Development. 3. Monasterolo, I., & Volz, U. (2020). Addressing climate-related financial risks and overcoming barriers to scaling-up sustainable investment. UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) Policy Briefs. 4. Kalirajan, K., Tran, H., Liu, Y., & Anbumozhi, V. (2019). Scaling up private investment in low-carbon energy systems through regional cooperation: Effective trade policy measures. Resources and Environmental Economics. 5. Chen, Y., & Volz, U. (2021). Scaling Up Sustainable Investment through Blockchain-Based Project Bonds. Political Economy - Development: Environment eJournal. These studies and policy briefs emphasize the importance of adopting innovative financial strategies and utilizing new technologies like blockchain to promote transparency and increase sustainable investments. They also highlight the need for collaboration between government entities, private investors, and international bodies to create an enabling environment that encourages the flow of capital towards sustainable development goals.
What are the key barriers and opportunities for the CEFC to support financing and market development in areas with significant climate co-benefits, including nature and biodiversity?	The Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC) can play a significant role in supporting financing and market development in areas with notable climate co-benefits, including nature and biodiversity. However, there are various barriers and opportunities that need to be addressed for effective engagement in these areas. Key references that discuss barriers and opportunities in the context of climate co-benefits, which can provide insights for the CEFC's role, include: 1. Jussila, J., Nagy, E., Lähtinen, K., et al. (2022). Wooden multi-storey construction market development – systematic literature review within a global scope with insights on the Nordic region. This study synthesizes key barriers and enabling factors for market growth in sustainable construction, which can be extrapolated to the CEFC's engagement in nature and biodiversity financing. Silva Fennica. 2. Dasandara, M., Ingirige, B., Kulatunga, U., & Fernando, T. (2022). Climate financing barriers and strategies: the case of Sri Lanka. The paper investigates barriers to climate financing and proposes strategies to address them, which are relevant for the CEFC in the Australian context. Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction. 3. Toxopeus, H., & Polzin, F. (2021). Reviewing financing barriers and strategies for urban nature-based solutions. This review discusses the barriers to financing urban nature-based solutions and strategies to overcome them, relevant for the CEFC's potential activities in urban areas. Journal of environmental management. 4. Mustaffa, A., Ahmad, N., & Bahrudin, N. (2021). A Systematic Literature Review on Barriers to Green Financing Participation Worldwide. The thematic analysis in this review provides insights into barriers to green financing, which CEFC could consider in its strategies. Social Science Research Network.

	5. Lou, J., Hultman, N., Patwardhan, A., & Qiu, Y. (2022). Integrating sustainability into climate finance by quantifying the co-benefits and market impact of carbon projects. This study could guide CEFC in incorporating sustainability and co-benefits into their financing models. Communications Earth & Environment. These references suggest that the key barriers to financing in areas with climate co-benefits often include the lack of experience, path dependencies on traditional practices, inadequate domestic funding, and regulatory challenges. The CEFC can leverage opportunities such as cost-efficiency gains from prefabrication, consumer and architectural demand for sustainable solutions, and digital technologies to enhance market participation and financing structures. Additionally, it is important for the CEFC to collaborate with government and private sectors to create an integrated approach to combat climate finance barriers and harness the financial and market development opportunities that exist in the domain of nature and biodiversity.

Priority 11: Promoting international alignment

The inquiry into promoting international alignment within sustainable finance touches on the need for harmonization of best practices and new standards to address the risk of fragmentation in the global market. This harmonization is crucial for firms navigating new rules across jurisdictions and for policymakers developing market-suitable frameworks that reduce compliance costs. The references provided examine the current state and proposals for international sustainable finance standards and their implications for alignment, transition finance, and regional engagement, particularly relevant to Australia's role in the Indo-Pacific region.

1. **Sustainable Finance Taxonomies and Regulatory Governance**: Schacherer (2023) discusses the role of sustainable finance taxonomies in global regulatory governance, highlighting the potential for these frameworks to harmonize sustainable finance practices and facilitate the adoption of new standards.
   - Fixing a Broken System? Sustainable Finance Taxonomies and Global Regulatory Governance
2. **EU Sustainable Finance Taxonomy and Climate Neutrality**: Schütze and Stede (2021) provide insights into how the EU sustainable finance taxonomy contributes to climate neutrality, which could be relevant for Australia as it seeks to align with global frameworks.
   - The EU sustainable finance taxonomy and its contribution to climate neutrality
3. **Credible Transition Plans for Coal Power Sector**: Liu et al. (2023) examine the disclosure frameworks for credible transition plans in the coal power sector, which is pertinent for Australia's advocacy for sophisticated transition finance approaches.
   - Credible transition plans for coal power sector: current disclosure framework and considerations for transition finance
4. **Enhancing ESG Frameworks for Climate Finance**: This policy brief by Yilmaz (2022) discusses the enhancement of ESG frameworks to scale up climate finance, a key element in promoting international alignment.
   - Enhancing Environmental, Social and Governance Frameworks to Scale Up Climate Finance Policy Brief
5. **Transition Bond Frameworks**: Shrimali (2022) discusses the goals, issues, and guiding principles for transition bonds, which are relevant for Australia's focus on transition finance.
   - Transition Bond Frameworks: Goals, Issues, and Guiding Principles

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">These references collectively underscore the importance of international cooperation, knowledge sharing, and the development of frameworks that promote consistent, transparent, and reliable sustainable finance practices. They also highlight the need for these frameworks to be adaptable to the specific needs of different regions, such as the Indo-Pacific, which is significant for Australia's engagement in the area. The references provide a basis for understanding how Australia can continue to support and contribute to the development of global standards that facilitate cross-border sustainable finance flows.</td></tr>
<tr><td>What are the key priorities for Australia when considering international alignment in sustainable finance?</td><td>Australia's key priorities when considering international alignment in sustainable finance are multifaceted and deeply integrated with the global financial landscape.

Here are some referenced insights into what these priorities may include:
1. Developing a global ESG framework that includes sustainable energy transition concepts like the Circular Carbon Economy can be crucial for countries like Australia that are actively pursuing sustainable finance goals.
• Lauesen, L. M. (2019). Sustainable investment evaluation by means of life cycle assessment. Social Responsibility Journal.
2. Strengthening regional funding platforms and multilateral roles in resolving barriers to sustainable finance can be a priority to facilitate cross-border connectivity projects, which is crucial for regions to procure investments for infrastructure and connectivity projects.
• Ray, S. (2015). Investment Finance and Financial Sector Development. Banking & Insurance eJournal.
3. Encouraging private sector investment in renewable energy is essential, with government policies promoting innovations and reducing financial risks to investors. Trade policy measures could be influential in scaling up private investment in low-carbon energy systems.
• Kalirajan, K., Tran, H., Liu, Y., & Anbumozhi, V. (2019). Scaling up private investment in low-carbon energy systems through regional cooperation: Effective trade policy measures. Resources and Environmental Economics.
4. Leveraging the role of public transport and Bus Rapid Transit systems as tools of decarbonization can be a priority, as it contributes to reducing carbon emissions significantly.
• Mukhopadhyay, C. (2018). PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND BUS RAPID TRANSIT AS A TOOL OF DECARBONIZATION IN MALAYSIA. Working Paper Series.

These references suggest that Australia's approach to international alignment in sustainable finance involves not only developing and adhering to global frameworks and standards but also fostering regional cooperation, incentivizing the private sector, and implementing practical solutions for infrastructure development that contribute to sustainability goals.</td></tr>
</table>

Priority 12: Position Australia as a global sustainability leader

Australia's aspiration to position itself as a global sustainability leader is tied to its commitment to sustainable finance as a critical avenue for demonstrating climate ambition and credentials. As a resource-rich, advanced economy with globally integrated financial markets, the country has both significant opportunities and risks related to climate transition and adaptation. This observation underscores the potential for Australia to serve as a pivotal example of integrating sustainable finance into a whole-of-economy response to climate issues.

Here are several key references that comment on aspects related to Australia's position as a global sustainability leader:

1. Wilson, J. (2019). Diversifying Australia's Indo-Pacific infrastructure diplomacy. This paper discusses how infrastructure has become an emerging component of Australian diplomacy, particularly in the Indo-Pacific, and how it can diversify its infrastructure diplomacy to integrate with the emerging infrastructure systems of the region. Australian Journal of International Affairs.
2. Sooklal, A. (2022). The Indo-Pacific, an emerging paradigm for peace, cooperation, sustainable development, and mutual prosperity. This paper outlines how cooperation to enhance sustainable development must take precedence in the region to create a more equitable global community, a principle that aligns with Australia's sustainable finance aims. Journal of the Indian Ocean Region.
3. Nagy, S. (2022). US-China Strategic Competition and Converging Middle Power Cooperation in the Indo-Pacific. This article analyzes the strategic alignment of middle powers, including Australia, in response to great power competition, and examines the strategy each middle power is pursuing to protect their interests, which for Australia includes sustainable finance. Strategic Analysis.
4. Asaturov, S., & Martynov, A. (2022). Trends in international relations in the Indo-Pacific region. The paper discusses the complex multipolar system of international relations in the Indo-Pacific region, which includes Australia's role in maintaining the balance of interests through its engagement and leadership in sustainable finance. ScienceRise: Juridical Science.
5. Aswani, R., Sajith, S., & Bhat, M. Y. (2021). Realigning India's Vietnam Policy Through Cooperative Sustainable Development: a Geostrategic Counterbalancing to China in Indo-Pacific. This paper explores cooperative sustainable development as a strategic counterbalance in the Indo-Pacific, offering insights into how Australia's policies on sustainable finance could similarly serve as strategic tools. East Asia (Piscataway, N.j.).

The references suggest that Australia's role in promoting sustainable finance is recognized as part of its broader diplomatic and strategic engagement in the Indo-Pacific region. The country's efforts to advocate for sustainable finance practices, support innovative financing models, and contribute to global frameworks such as the ISSB standards are seen as integral to its leadership in sustainability and global climate action. These efforts are expected to help facilitate cross-border sustainable finance flows and enhance Australia's reputation as a destination for sustainable finance and investment.

What are other key near-term opportunities for Australia to position itself as a global leader in sustainable finance and global climate mitigation and adaptation?	Australia is navigating near-term opportunities to establish itself as a global leader in sustainable finance and climate mitigation and adaptation. The research and literature provided below offer insights into various strategies and practices that could enhance Australia's leadership role in these critical areas: 1. **Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation Strategies for Pasture-Based Industries**: This paper discusses climate change impacts on Australia's agricultural sector and adaptation strategies that could be applied. Sustainable finance could support such adaptation strategies, thereby contributing to global climate mitigation and adaptation efforts.

	• Climate change impacts and adaptation strategies for pasture-based industries: Australian perspective 2. **Housing Climate Adaptation Strategies for Wind Hazards**: The research evaluates the risk and economic viability of housing climate adaptation strategies for wind hazards, a consideration that sustainable finance could address in building resilience. • Risk and economic viability of housing climate adaptation strategies for wind hazards in southeast Australia 3. **Agronomic Adaptation Strategies for Wheat Yield**: This study looks at climate change impacts on wheat production and evaluates agronomic adaptation strategies, an area where sustainable finance could play a significant role. • Simulating Agronomic Adaptation Strategies to Mitigate the Impacts of Climate Change on Wheat Yield in South-Eastern Australia 4. **Urban Community and Critical Infrastructures for Flood Risk Management**: The paper provides an integrated framework for assessing flood risk and climate adaptation capacity of urban areas, a key area for sustainable finance investments. • Vulnerability assessment of urban community and critical infrastructures for integrated flood risk management and climate adaptation strategies 5. **Australia's Agricultural Future**: This report identifies opportunities and barriers for the agricultural sector in the context of complex social and political issues around rural and regional Australia, which are pertinent to sustainable finance. • Australia's agricultural future These references collectively emphasize the potential for Australia to leverage sustainable finance in addressing climate-related risks and opportunities, particularly in the agricultural sector, housing adaptation, and urban infrastructure resilience. The research suggests that Australia could focus on integrating sustainable finance into broader climate strategies, thus enhancing its position as a leader in both financial innovation and climate action.
What are some longer-term international sustainability goals for Australia where sustainable finance can play a role?	Australia has set various longer-term international sustainability goals where sustainable finance will play a crucial role. The literature points to several areas of focus: 1. **Multispecies Foresight for Urban and Regional Sustainability**: Strategies that include more-than-human perspectives can enhance urban and regional sustainability outcomes, suggesting that finance strategies should also consider biodiversity and ecosystem services. • Sheikh, H., Foth, M., & Mitchell, P. (2022). More-than-human city-region foresight: multispecies entanglements in regional governance and planning. Regional Studies.

	2. **Sustainable Food and Land Systems**: Planning for sustainable food and land systems in Australia highlights the role of finance in supporting agricultural practices that are compatible with long-term environmental and economic goals. • Garcia, J. N., Marcos-Martinez, R., Mosnier, A., et al. (2022). Multi-target scenario discovery to plan for sustainable food and land systems in Australia. Sustainability Science. 3. **Biosolids-Derived Biochar**: The application of biosolids-derived biochar in land signifies the importance of financing sustainable agriculture and waste management to improve soil health and productivity. • Sinha, P., Marchuk, S., Harris, P., et al. (2023). Land Application of Biosolids-Derived Biochar in Australia: A Review. Sustainability. 4. **Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability**: A model of sustainability through environmental stewardship emphasizes the need for financial strategies that support long-term ecological balance. • Turnbull, J., Clark, G. F., & Johnston, E. (2021). Conceptualising sustainability through environmental stewardship and virtuous cycles—a new empirically-grounded model. Sustainability Science. 5. **Sustainable Humanitarian Logistics**: Frameworks for sustainable humanitarian logistics in disaster response underline the importance of financing in building resilient systems that can withstand and adapt to climate-induced disasters. • Oloruntoba, R. (2015). A Planning and Decision-Making Framework for Sustainable Humanitarian Logistics in Disaster Response. Engineering. These areas reflect Australia's commitment to integrating sustainable finance into its long-term sustainability strategy, particularly in urban planning, agriculture, waste management, environmental stewardship, and disaster resilience. Financing these initiatives will be key to achieving Australia's international sustainability commitments.
What are the key market, regulatory and institutional barriers to increasing private sector engagement in blended financing opportunities? How can these barriers be overcome?	The key market, regulatory, and institutional barriers to increasing private sector engagement in blended financing opportunities are multifaceted, and overcoming them requires a strategic approach. Here are several referenced insights addressing these barriers and potential solutions: 1. **Results-Based Blended Finance for Cities**: Lypiridis and Kuzio (2019) discuss the financing of climate-smart infrastructure in cities, emphasizing that well-targeted concessional funding can de-risk project financing and make non-bankable projects viable. They also highlight the need for technical assistance and capacity-building programs to support cities in improving their financing and accounting practices. • New Perspectives on Results-Based Blended Finance for Cities 2. **Nature-based Solutions in Latin America and the Caribbean**: Marsters et al. (2021) explore innovative financing models for nature-based solutions, highlighting the underutilization of these models despite their potential to generate attractive returns. The report outlines barriers to scaling these financing strategies and identifies approaches to overcome them.

	[Nature-based Solutions in Latin America and the Caribbean: Financing Mechanisms for Regional Replication] 3. **Pay-for-performance schemes for Building Renovations**: Anagnostopoulos (2023) addresses the barriers in retrofitting buildings for energy efficiency in the EU, suggesting that blending various sources of financing and providing proportionate support based on achieved results can enhance the effectiveness of public funds. [Pay-for-performance schemes: An innovative policy-driven approach for building renovations] 4. **Technical Assistance for Health Innovations**: Devadas et al. (2021) discuss the challenges faced by global health innovations in scaling beyond the proof-of-concept stage. They emphasize the importance of funds and technical assistance to unlock these barriers, suggesting that blended finance can facilitate market-driven high-impact solutions. [White Paper series: Technical assistance support for health innovations in low and middle-income countries] 5. **Sustainable Development Model for Water Security**: Nepal (2023) discusses the challenges in financing water services in developing countries like Nepal. The study suggests innovative ways to solve sustainable financing for water services, such as blended finance and leveraging services. [An Approach of Sustainable Development Model for Water Security in Growing Cities] These references collectively suggest that overcoming barriers in blended financing involves innovative financing models, result-based approaches, technical assistance, and capacity building. Encouraging private sector participation requires adjusting regulatory frameworks, developing more effective use of public funds, and leveraging private investments through blended finance mechanisms.
What are other means to mobilise private sector finance toward sustainability solutions in the Indo-Pacific region?	To address the question regarding mobilizing private sector finance toward sustainability solutions in the Indo-Pacific region, several studies and reports offer valuable insights and strategies: 1. **China-BRI, EU-Indo-Pacific Cooperation and Asia**: Discusses the roles of Belt and Road Initiatives and EU investment policies in Asia's development, including sustainable development under BRI and Indo-Pacific cooperation. [Read more]. 2. **Public–Private Partnership Investment in Energy and Technological Innovation for Environmental Sustainability in East Asia and Pacific Region**: Highlights the significance of public–private partnerships in promoting environmental sustainability in the East Asian and Pacific region, focusing on renewable energy consumption and technological innovation. [Read more]. 3. **Private Sector Investment in the Clean Energy Sector in the Pacific Islands**: Delves into the critical role of private sector partners in supporting small island developing states, emphasizing the importance of private financing in renewable energy sector development. [Read more].

	4. **Sustainability Initiatives by Private Sector in Asia Pacific with a Focus on Timber Product**: Examines sustainability initiatives taken by the private sector, particularly in timber products, and identifies challenges and opportunities for private sector engagement in promoting sustainable management practices. Read more. 5. **The Role of Institutional Investors in Financing Development in Asia and the Pacific**: Discusses the role of institutional investors in financing development projects in Asia and the Pacific, highlighting the need for stable macroeconomic environments and strong legal frameworks to support private sector investments. Read more. 6. **Financing Sustainable and Resilient Food Systems in Asia and the Pacific**: Explores innovative financing solutions for addressing food security and nutrition gaps in the Asia-Pacific region, emphasizing the integration of sustainable management of natural resources and economic dimensions of food supply chains. Read more. 7. **Engaging Private Sector and Mobilizing Private Finance through Mitigation Actions in Developing Countries**: Provides an overview of engaging the private sector in mitigation actions in developing countries, discussing the importance of the private sector for low carbon transition and identifying opportunities for engaging private sector in mitigation actions. Read more. 8. **Financial Instruments for Adaptation: Mobilizing Public Budgets and Private**: Discusses the use of financial tools like green bonds and debt for climate or nature swaps as innovative financial tools to secure funding for adaptation projects without increasing the country's debt service burden further. Read more. 9. **Green Finance: A Roadmap to Green and Sustainable Economy**: Clarifies the concept of green finance and identifies pathways that could lead nations towards stronger sustainability, emphasizing the importance of green finance products like carbon financing, green bonds, and sustainability loans. Read more. 10. **ESG, Green Growth and Employee Capitalism: G7 Roadmap for the Fifth Industrial Revolution**: Looks at asset ownership and EESG-driven investment in relation to green bonds and sustainability-linked bonds, highlighting their role in funding additional infrastructure projects and inducing issuers, institutional investors, and governments to adopt EESG-informed approaches. Read more. These studies collectively suggest that **a combination of public–private partnerships, innovative financing models, and engagement of private sector in sustainability initiatives** are key strategies for mobilizing private sector finance toward sustainability solutions in the Indo-Pacific region.