

The background of the slide features a large, yellow Caterpillar bulldozer working on a dark, hilly landscape. The bulldozer is positioned in the center-right of the frame, facing towards the left. The terrain is uneven and appears to be a mix of dirt and vegetation. The lighting suggests it might be late afternoon or early evening, with long shadows cast across the hillside.

# Implementing the Paris Agreement: The Role of Business

*Prof. Jacqueline Peel, Melbourne Law School*

*ANZSIL Annual Meeting, Wellington NZ*

*7 July 2018*

# Outline

1. Conventional approach: corporations as a *barrier* to climate action
  - Lawsuits against “carbon majors”
2. Paris Agreement – unprecedented business involvement in negotiations
3. Corporations as agent for achieving safe climate future?
  - Corp and securities law as a source of tools for promoting clean energy business practices necessary to implement Paris goals
  - Challenges with this approach

# Corporations – part of the problem or part of the solution?

- Conventional approach to view corporations as barrier to climate action
  - e.g. producers of/investors in fossil fuels, major emitters
  - corporate funded climate denial campaigns and lobbying
- Lawsuits seeking climate justice for “victims” of climate change have often targeted corporations, particularly those in the energy sector
  - Tortious and human rights claims pursued

# Carbon major lawsuits



# Paris negotiations – a new dynamic?

- Global business leaders offering support for international cooperation on climate change
- New business focused groups and coalitions



# Investor coalitions

- E.g. Climate Action 100+
  - Established by five investor organisations in Paris at the One Planet Summit hosted by President Macron in Dec 2017
  - five-year project harnessing the weight and influence of global investors to engage the world's largest greenhouse gas emitting companies on climate action
  - 280 investors with over US\$30 trillion in assets under management



# Corporate climate action motivated by financial risk

Physical	Transition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Acute risks – event driven eg greater occurrence of severe weather events</li><li>• Chronic risks - longer term shifts in climate patterns eg changes to rainfall, temperature and other factors</li></ul> <p><i>Leading to disruptions to operations, transportation, supply chains; damage to physical assets; and reduced resource availability.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Legal/policy</i> – compliance costs and potential litigation</li><li>• <i>Technology</i> – existing tech. investments written off, new investments &amp; operational changes</li><li>• <i>Market/economic</i> – viability of business model?</li><li>• <i>Reputational</i></li></ul> <p><i>Leading to lost revenue, reduced value of operating assets and investments, 'stranded' assets, reduced co. value</i></p>

# Recommendations of the TCFD

- Emerging best-practice international standards
- Core recommendations:
  - Disclosure of climate risks in mainstream financial reports
  - Include scenario analysis including 2 degrees C or lower temperature goal



# Corporate and securities law tools

- Requirements for corporate **disclosure** of material financial risks to business
- Engagement with shareholders and investors including through **shareholder resolutions**
- Enforcement of **directors' duties/ liability** for failure to fulfill obligations



# Noel Hutley SC opinion, Oct 2016

- Climate risks capable of posing foreseeable risks of harm to Aus co interests
- Risks relevant to Directors' duties of care and due diligence to extent that intersect with co. interests
- Company directors *can* and in some cases *should* be considering impact of climate change on business
- Conceivable that if failure to consider climate business risks could be found liable of breach of directors' duties under corporations law
- “It is likely to be only a matter of time before we see litigation against a director who has failed to perceive, disclose or take steps in relation to a foreseeable climate-related risk that can be demonstrated to have caused harm to the company (including, perhaps, reputational harm)”

# Liability for inadequate disclosure

## Peabody Coal



- Understatement of impacts of climate risk for business
- Claimed inability to predict financial impacts of future climate policy
- Misuse of IEA data about fossil fuel demand

<http://www.smh.com.au/environment/climate-change/ailing-coal-giant-peabody-reaches-settlement-over-misleading-climate-comments-2015109-gkusyh.html>

# Exxon Mobil



- Investigations by AGs in California and New York
- SEC investigation
- Shareholder class action lawsuit

<https://theconversation.com/should-oil-companies-like-exxon-be-forced-to-disclose-climate-change-risks-66961>

# CBA Lawsuit

- CBA shareholders sued CBA arguing CC poses material financial risks to bank's business that should have been disclosed to investors
- Proceedings discontinued after subsequent CBA annual report acknowledged climate as material financial risk and promised to undertake climate scenario analysis of business
- Bank ruled out lending to Adani Carmichael mine



# Could companies drive change?

- Highly variable practices – leaders and laggards
- Growing attention from regulators but appetite for law reform unclear
- Investor engagement as a driver
- Regulatory uncertainty continues to be cited as barrier to acceleration of clean energy strategies





# Q&A

- Research funding from ARC, DP160100225, *Devising a Legal Blueprint for Corporate Energy Transition* (Peel, Osofsky and McDonnell + Foerster)