

Zoe Haseman: The urgent need for us to tackle the climate crisis. Yeah.

Jens Nielsen: Yeah, so it's really a crucial [inaudible]

Zoe Haseman: Impacts of climate change and the risks that these pose to our society.

Jens Nielsen: We need specific plans and actions to drive the CO2 emissions down in the short term.

Zoe Haseman: The climate crisis is the world's most critical challenge right now.

Jens Nielsen: Hello and welcome to the Sparks Podcast Series. I'm Jens Nielsen.

Zoe Haseman: And I'm Zoe Haseman.

Jens Nielsen: And we'll be your host throughout this special edition podcast series, brought to you by the World Climate Foundation and Jacobs. Come with us as we take you on a journey around the world to explore how different countries are tackling their climate challenges, sparking ideas and inspiration. From clean energy innovations in Scotland to sustainable buildings in Dubai, we'll be interviewing global green leaders, financiers, and entrepreneurs about the policies, investments, and innovations that are accelerating our progress towards a resilient and sustainable world. Our podcast hopes to educate and inspire, sparking real conversations with the intention to collaborate, act, commit to real change

Zoe Haseman: From exploring carbon cutting technologies in Scotland to learning about how the impacts of climate change can affect the security of global health resilience, this special edition podcast series has highlighted new information and perspectives and has challenged what we thought we knew. In this final episode we discussed COP26 and the path ahead, and reflect on learnings from across the series. And to discuss how we can collaborate, act, commit to create a more resilient and sustainable world together.

Jens Nielsen: We are honored to be joined today by two very special guests who are at the absolute heart of driving change in shaping our future, especially when it comes to finance. Please join us in welcoming Kevin Berryman, President and Chief Financial Officer at Jacobs' and Marisa Drew, Chief Sustainability Officer and Global Head Sustainability Strategy Advisory and Finance at Credit Swiss International. Thank you both for joining us today.

Marisa Drew: Thank you.

Kevin Berryman: Thank you

Zoe Haseman: So let's get started with the big topic, COP26. So rather than go in and comment on the outcomes at global and international level around the Glasgow Climate

Pact, we know that there was some highs and some great progress made and also a few little areas of disappointment as well. But I think one area of more certainty following COP26 is what comes next for businesses. And the commitments made at a global and country level really have made it clear that the direction for business, there is only one and it is net zero and beyond.

The alignment around a global net zero transition creates a systematic shift that although still complex does remove the uncertainty that we've had before, and reduces some of that risk and makes investment by businesses a lot more appealing now, as all players across industry start accelerating in the same direction.

So while commitments are important, I would say one of the most common phrases I heard at the business events that I attended in Glasgow were really for this need for action and this urgency around implementation. What do you think are the top of the need for action and implementation list?

Marisa Drew:

Well I think you touched on it in your opening, which is how do you operationalize these net zero commitments? So this proliferation of commitments that we saw leading up to, during, and post COP where you have now really the vast majority of the financial services sector at scale and the largest companies of the world all committing, I think the biggest issue is how do you do it? Most I would say when we interact with our clients, most would tell you that Scope one and two, which is largely in your control, it's your own operations and your supply chain, who you buy from is in quotes relatively easy. But particularly when you're in a services firm like ourselves, the Scope three is very difficult because we have to... It's almost an iterative process. We need to identify, for instance, if we are providing lending capital to clients of all industries. Now if those clients are not on a same net zero journey then you ultimately are undermining your commitment, because you need to get down to these trajectories.

So we have to go through each and every one of our clients, determine where they are on this journey, and are they effectively in line with our own trajectory so that we can continue to bank and provide that capital to them? If they're not then some difficult discussions have to be made. And you multiply that by virtually every industry, because we cover every industry, and you can see how challenging this is. And in some cases, particularly for smaller companies who we service, they don't have the wherewithal or the resources, or sometimes the data, to even respond to the requests that we have about the trajectories and their process on net zero.

So I'd say that's one of the biggest ones. So you had in financial services, Mark Carney likes to say he has 130 trillion of capital standing behind net zero commitments. But that's that last Scope three piece, I think that is one that presents the biggest challenge for us.

Zoe Haseman: Yeah understandable. Thanks, Marisa. And Kevin, what about you in terms of urgency, items of action and implementation?

Kevin Berryman: Yeah, I think Marisa hit it on the head relative to this how do you operationalize this? And Jacobs' is actually in a little bit of a unique position here because we are a services firm that actually execute against sustainable plans and projects for our clients. And so as we think about our way forward it's really important for us to drive this sense of urgency into our 55,000 employees around the globe. So it's almost a cultural people dynamic that we need to really aggressively affect. And I think that it's a change management issue that is important for us to drive towards. But the good news is it's an easy change, i.e. our employee base is already kind of in the boat and thinking that this is an important element. So we actually see it as being an important element of attracting talent and building talent and retaining talent long term.

If we have a very strong outlook on what we're trying to get accomplished in sustainability initiatives, as you know Zoe, we have an aggressive and ambitious plan to actually for every project we execute there is going to be some element of sustainability or ESG related dynamics incorporated into that. And some of our clients are less excited about having that being part of their agenda and some are very excited about it. But I think that philosophical change and our continuing transformation as a company in driving every single project to have some element of success or targeted outcome which positively influences climate change or the opportunity to get to the 1.5 centigrade challenges, I think it is a people related issue at the end of the day. And in getting that engagement and excitement level and ability to execute is really in our mind is about our people's heads and their ability to really go after it in a material way. And that will create the momentum that I think is so very important, and which Marisa was talking about.

Marisa Drew: Also, maybe Zoe I could add on to that a little bit in terms of other areas where implementation is going to be a hard graft coming out of COP. So on the areas that we did have agreement, and I think there were great hopes for a universal view on a price for carbon, for instance. So while I a hundred percent agree with Kevin this is a people issue, it's also a capital issue. And capital markets and capital flows are very efficient, so they will flow to where you create the most revenue or return opportunity.

And what we have ineffectively done globally is put a price on the negative effects of our activities. There is no universal price of carbon yet. There's a bid [inaudible] ask in the market. There's also an inability today to price those harmful effects. If we were able to do that then capital flows will follow where the money is. So those bad activities will become no longer sustainable because they're not profitable and then we don't have to create financial engineering, it's just market forces at work.

So in terms of the implementation, there was agreement to create this framework for carbon markets and carbon trading. Very complicated to execute because you have all sorts of inequities across borders. If you're buying a product from one country to another, have you priced that in effectively through the chain? Developing markets versus developed markets and all of those things that create hurdles. But I think there's an intent and a will now to put this into place, and with a pretty harmonious group of countries trying to agree to this. And so that is one of those key steps that needs to be done. We really need that.

And then the final one, which is near and dear to my heart, which was not technically COP26 because it was COP15, which was the biodiversity COP right before the main COP. I really deeply believe we need to be, as companies and financial services providers, be attuned and cognizant that we can't just be solving for CO2 emissions. We really need to think about our bio diverse resources and thinking about ways that we can reduce the activities that harm that, because they're intricately linked into global warming. And that's been a little bit of piece that's not particularly well understood. And the global focus has very much been on emissions, almost to the exclusion of biodiversity. Although it's coming up the agenda.

Zoe Haseman: Yeah absolutely Marisa [inaudible] good point. And I think that was one of the highlights for me at COP26 was just that, almost every time people talked about the carbon and the climate issues nature and biodiversity was right up there as part of that conversation. Very much a central theme throughout. So really positive to see that.

Jens Nielsen: That leads me to the next general question. So while recovering the socioeconomic disruptions of COVID-19 has been of paramount importance, ensuring that the climate agenda is spearheaded for the world to remain on a trajectory to achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement [inaudible] remains pivotal. From the significant number of bottom up commitments we witnessed at the World Climate Summit and COP26 in general driven by the private sector, it's evident that there's now remarkable momentum in capitalizing a fast transition to a resilient, clean and net zero economy. However, there are reservations as to how fast and at scientific scale this pace of change is moving. So in your opinion, do you think COP26 went far enough? Do you think it advanced the conversation enough to deem it a success?

Kevin Berryman: Look, I think there was a lot of great things, as I was following from afar, at COP26. And that there was an extraordinary amount of, I would call it momentum, that was built during the course of the get together. And so I think that that in itself was a very powerful thing. It was clear that there was an alignment relative to the importance of the dynamic. But I think it's clear that if you look at all the commitments that were made, we didn't get to the finish line, ultimately, and get as much as would be required to ultimately reach the objectives that we all have as it relates to the 1.5 degrees. So while really great

progress, it's going to be really important for those that are serious about their change agendas here is to take the actions necessary. Getting back to the points that we were just talking about earlier, operationalize it and make it happen.

If you think about the pandemic and the benefits that our company has seen, we have clearly said we are going to ensure that some of the benefits relative to travel on how remote working and virtual working has worked out in such a positive manner for us, [inaudible] are driving a strategy, which ultimately embeds that into our future. And taking the learnings and some of the myth busters that really came together over the course of this last 18 months, to really understand that we can operate better, we can operate in a more sustainable way, and we will do it.

So it really, it is about all of us collectively as individuals and as companies and institutions and regulatory bodies to continue to drive it forward. But it's a step, it's not the end game. And I think we've got to really leverage this momentum and continue to take actions, which actually helps support the journey.

Jens Nielsen: Thanks, Kevin. And what's [inaudible] Marisa?

Marisa Drew: So I live in a world where I'm on the one hand an internal optimist, on the other hand I guess I'm a pragmatist. And I think that expresses COP very much.

So there were some real bright spots. I did not expect the global pact on deforestation. So that to me was a bright spot. But certainly I think we universally agree that we fell short on poll, particularly at the last minute. Some of the language that was adjusted and in fact, our own climate envoy in the UK said, "We felt very bad that he... We disappointed the world a little bit." So it is a mixed bag.

And that I think typifies this global challenge. We have so many inequities and balances, it is a problem that requires a universal collective action. But at the same time, your starting points are so very different depending on where you are in the world. And your pressures on priorities as a world leader are going to be different from country to country and region to region. And I think that is expressly why we're sitting here saying we all know what we need to get to, but how do we do it in a way that is as least disruptive for our economies and our people while we have to put all this into place?

Jens Nielsen: So I gather the conclusion here is that it was a success, not the full way but it was a success?

Marisa Drew: Yeah. Or maybe, some of the leaders said, "This is just the beginning. So we came to an agreement. Now COP really is the launching point for the next decade to actually get it done." And I think that's probably the right way to look at it, is that this is we're at the starting gates of how to actually put all of these pledges into action. And the sense of urgency is clearly there. And I guess if

nothing else, that's the bright spot that everyone understands how critical it is.
[crosstalk]

Zoe Haseman: Time's going to tell how successful it was, to be honest, won't it? As to how much of it does get implemented and those commit... We actually see those commitments come to fruition.

So from the business perspective, COP26 confirmed a global shift in momentum that is now underpinned, but not a complete set. But more international policies and commitments, more robust financial backing, and more clarity around standards and reporting. And obviously this burning desire and really loud and clear voice from all stakeholders that there is only one way into the future. So with the direction set, the conditions primed and businesses are going to have to lead the way if they want to continue to prosper. In the context of COP26, what do you think are the most significant ways that we can really scale up now the action that's required from a public and private partnership perspective?

Marisa Drew: So what is different about this COP, speaking to your point about public-private partnerships, is that historically COP was really all about a convening of global leaders and policy makers. So it was very much in the public sector arena to come to an agreement and then figure out how we get there. I think what was different this time was the participation of the private sector. So you virtually had every major company and financial services provider participating in some way. So that's the good news, this recognition that this cannot... This is bigger than all of us. So it cannot be just the purview of our government, nor can it also just be in the lap of the private sector.

So the talk at COP, for sure across all the events that I went to and the venues that I participated in were these discussions about how do we take these particular, either expertise or resources of actors in the private and public sector and bring them together in a way that is additive and complimentary?

And I think that one of the ways we can certainly scale up... Often when I'm in these meetings where the private sector is sitting side by side with perhaps an NGO or perhaps even in multi-development bank, we have operated for so long previously in silos, we were in our swim lanes. We didn't necessarily collaborate across the same project or in the same capital structure.

And so now what we are trying to do is this combined effort to attack a particular problem. The challenge there is because we've operated perhaps sometimes in silos, we don't speak each other's language. And so I think really a shared understanding of what each one brings to the table in pursuit of a common mission is the key to figuring out how then do we collaborate together? And one of the ways I think that we can amplify this is to use case study examples.

So there are emerging circumstances where you can say, "We brought multi development bank and a private bank and an NGO altogether in the same opportunity. And it worked, and we unlocked some hurdles and that allowed capital to flow. And let's use that as an example for the next one." And the next one ought to be bigger. And the next one ought to be bigger still. And that's how you start to get to scale, because a lot of the projects that we're involved in start out as almost experiments.

So for instance, at COP we announced the largest debt for nature swap. So this was a transaction where we got together with a nonprofit, so a conservation organization, a government, we had the DFC, which is the development arm in the US government, and credit [inaudible] all together to restructure the debts of an island nation. And the quid pro quo, if you will, for restructuring those debts was a commitment by the government to use a portion of proceeds of the underwriting to invest in nature conservation, marine conservation. Which ultimately becomes a very beneficial thing for that island nation, because as they are able to invest in conservation in their community, in their island, it's going to attract more tourist revenues, which feeds the possibility, which then creates this [inaudible] circle.

Now bringing all these actors together in one project or structure was enormously complicated. It took well over a year and a half. And part of that was COVID and what have you, but that's a great case study. And it's the largest one that's been done by a factor of 15. And the one that had been done previously, which was very small, was done back in 2014.

So now we've proved a little bit the pilot project that you can do something like this at scale. And I fully expect the next one to come behind to be bigger, maybe two or three times still. And so that's now mobilizing capitalist scale to attack a particular conservation project. And so if you can show those case studies the roadmap for people to follow, then I do think we're going to see some breakthroughs in some of the intractable areas.

Zoe Haseman: Yeah. Great example there. Thank you. Kevin, what about you? Any ideas to add to that on how we might scale up that action between public and private partnerships?

Kevin Berryman: It is absolutely critical that there is this partnership. It is going to take more than just the private sector or the public sector to ultimately reach the objectives that we all wish and hope for here. And Marisa is very right relative to the complexity factors associated with that.

So I think having the ability to engage and execute against these very complex projects with differing requirements amongst the various stakeholders needs to happen, then you need to manage through it in a way that ultimately reaches a successful conclusion. I think at Jacobs' we're actually right at the forefront and the center of that agenda. I think about a couple of the major projects and

programs that we've been involved in, we fundamentally were involved in doing the work on, well it still is ongoing, on the Thames River where we're attempting to clean up the river by adjusting the sewage structure of the London city, which is obviously dated.

And so by doing this, we're going to clean up the river and ultimately create a hopefully a more social, dynamic surrounding the river. So it can actually be more engaging part of the community of London. But that took 10 years of interaction with a variety of stakeholders, including financial institutions, insurance companies, and ultimately trying to figure out how to structure the financing involved associated with that project. And so that confluence of the various stakeholders was key to ultimately reach the ability to find a funding mechanism that allowed for us to execute against the project.

Say another example is actually [inaudible] 2020, where we were the program manager. We have a joint adventure with Mace where we ultimately interacted with them to create a fully sustainable city that used the principles of sustainable design in the design and construction and program management of that. We have an asset that will ultimately be able to be handed over to the local community, and it is a smart city and ultimately is the future of what a city could be. It obviously also took decades of effort and planning, relative to that effort as well.

So this collaboration between, whether it's public and private or private institutions coming together to make these opportunities work, it has to happen for us to continue to make progress against [inaudible] the objectives we all hope for.

Marisa Drew:

If I also maybe make one more comment is that when I think about the roles of public versus private, stepping back more to macro level what you tend to find if there is something that's challenging, a project or an ambition that's challenging for the private sector, usually it is because the first dollars in are too risky for a traditional private funder, for their profile. It's either the returns are too low or the risk profile's too high. So this is where the public sector has a very big role to play, either being the catalytic capital that goes in first because they have that higher risk tolerance because that's part of their mandate, or they can provide some sort of credit support that takes some risk off the table that then allows the private capital to flow. So those two things then become, there's a multiplier effect.

So if I think about either multi development banks or others that can provide that sort of support or risk mitigation, that is one way as a model that I think we need to think about PPPs. The other way is in the policy making for regulators and policy makers to provide either incentives or disincentives through policy making that then allow the private sector to flow in. So for instance, we certainly know today that there are so many subsidies that subsidize industries and businesses that are hugely harmful and high carbon [inaudible]. If you

reduce those subsidies then those businesses probably are not profitable in their own right, and the capital will, as we said, flow to those greener alternatives where they are going to be more profitable. Equally, if you reversed or put subsidies towards something where you want the capital to flow, all of a sudden you make them very attractive from an investment proposition point of view.

So I think that's a place wherein this PPP construct, we need to urge more of that type of behavior. US is a wonderful example in the solar industry. When we put tax equity incentives in place for solar, it just exploded and it became a hugely financable industry and one of the largest success stories in renewables. So it's this kind of a thing where we need to think about what are the roles of public V private.

Zoe Haseman: Yeah. So Marisa, you mentioned earlier the Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero. There's \$130 trillion from, I think it was over 450 financial groups, directed at de carbonization. How does that, something like that, actually work in practice, in your view?

Marisa Drew: So slightly misleading, I don't want to overstate the case. So the 130 trillion that keeps getting referenced is representing 130 trillion of organizations, their assets under management. So it isn't, I think there's a slight misnomer that there's this big bucket of 130 trillion in a bank account somewhere that's just ready to go.

Now that having been said, there is an enormous amount of capital that it needs to be pledged. But I just, for the avoidance of doubt, it's not exactly as it may appear on the surface. But what can we do? So the [inaudible], which we are part of, is a collection of financial services organization. And there are subgroups in that. So you have a net zero banking alliance for the banking sector, one for asset management, one for insurance. But what this is saying is affiliations or collaborations are saying people within that sub-sector of the financial services industry are agreeing to collaborate on a key set of initiatives to mobilize capital at scale.

And so within each of those disciplines, there are a number of things that we observe as an industry or a subset of an industry that are problematic for the flow of capital. And so we are part of one of the work streams that was focused on voluntary carbon markets. So the way that this is working in practice is that if we can collectively have an agreement as financial institutions that this is the way forward on say a carbon trading market, and all of our organizations agree, it becomes a market adopted standard and then we can flow.

So that's maybe just one example. Another example of some work that we're doing as a group of financial services, large banks, is to influence policy making. Back to my earlier point, where could we collectively say, "These are things that if you as the G7 or G20 do it will create enabling conditions for us to be able to

provide more capital." So that's a little bit the spirit behind some of these affiliations and how it will work in practice.

Kevin Berryman: It's a step and it will be difficult relative to the continuation. But what I like about it is that it's a reinforcement of the initiatives and efforts by one portion of the stakeholder groups that they're looking to help support financing. I think this comment about capital and how it will flow into helping support initiatives that become a profitable endeavor, I think is an important one longer term.

Now there's a wide range of how you define success in sustainability, and that's coming together more clarity today than there has been ever as it relates to that. And I think setting the standards relative to these things is going to help support capital make a decision as it relates to what's happening, what's good, and who is performing and who is not. And I think that is one thing that is very clear in my mind, if I think about the amount of interaction that we've had with our shareholders relative to sustainability or ESG related matters.

Over the last 24 months, in the last 12 specifically versus the prior five years, it's an extraordinarily different dynamic. And I think that in itself is an indication that there is this amount of desire to ultimately figure out who are providing the dynamics and the change relative to not only their own organizations but others as well to help support our objectives in this effort. And I think that the greater the clarity relative to how you measure the successes in this area, the greater and more simple it will be for capital to flow for those that are doing it, and capital to flow away from those that aren't.

And I think that is going to be a dynamic where I've seen an acceleration already. And I think this is another step where it will become clearer over time. And I think that's going to be an important element, because companies and CFOs will sit there and they'll start to react when capital flows don't come their way because they may not be performing in a manner that's considered to be appropriate.

Jens Nielsen: The role of finance at the scale is critical to ensure that we meet our targets by 2030 and 2050. And we can have all the right innovative solutions, technologies, plans, and pledges we need, but without the funding and financial backing, implementing these would be near impossible. So taking this into account, what's your perspective on where the biggest challenges and opportunities are in unleashing capital at scale?

Kevin Berryman: I think it gets back to one of the comments I was just making in terms of the consistency and how one determines the appropriate KPIs and how you measure them on a consistent basis. Because I think capital will figure it out ultimately longer term. But I think there is certainly been a certain bit of greenwashing that's occurring over the last several years. And providing clarity relative to the KPIs, being able to have that, then provides a scorecard. A scorecard that everyone understands it can execute against.

As we sit here today there's been a lot of progress in this regard, but we're not there yet. And I think the ability to have that clarity on KPIs, and I think the science based targets that are in place and getting greater clarity are an important element of that. So that institutions, whether they be public or private, have the ability to start to measure their progress, or not, as the case may be. And be rewarded or not if they're making progress against that. So I think the standardization of how we talk about things and how we measure our progress is an important element of the success going forward. And I think it still remains a challenge.

Jens Nielsen: Thank you. And Marisa?

Marisa Drew: I can pick up on the terminology of the language. And funnily enough I was just in a session this morning with numerous players across different subsets of financial services and advisory, and we were discussing this idea of is there a common understanding just in the finance industry as it relates to sustainable investments? So we've got some 30 odd trillion of assets under management that exists today that are deployed in sustainable investments. And I can tell you, there was complete disconnect on definitions: definition of responsible investing, sustainable investing, impact investing, exclusions, integration and all of this. And here we are in the midst of this enormity of enthusiasm for deploying capital in sustainable solutions and yet we don't even have a common definition for what sustainable investing is. So that is an impediment. Because for markets to scale, I'm a 30 year capital markets banker, you need to have common adopted standards. You need to have a same definitions. And that breeds confidence in the market and that creates capital flow.

So I think as a matter of urgency... And regulators by the way are beginning to really get on this topic about definitions. We have in the EU something called SFDR, there's a sustainable finance directive, which is saying if you are going to call something sustainable on your investment product shelf you need to have it be within a series of categories and that that has to be along a certain set of definitions. But that's one regulator covering one jurisdiction, and we've got multiple regulators and multiple jurisdictions all potentially going to give us different definitions or different guide rails. So I think that that harmony of understanding of taxonomy and of standard setting is very key. And so as Kevin said, we're not there yet. Although we're working hard at that.

I think the other area that I would point to is in terms of confidence in the markets. Measuring your outcomes and reporting on your outcomes in a transparent way is key, but so is commonality of information available to the market. So what is the frustration that I hear over and over again, particularly from institutional investors wanting to put capital to work in sustainable alternatives, is that if they want to just compare two companies side by side on their sustainability characteristics you don't have the same apples to apples information to make an informed choice on those metrics. Now one of the bright spots out of COP, which we haven't touched on yet, is an announcement

under the auspices of IFRS to try to bring together a whole disparate group of disclosure regimes. Most of, they're all voluntary today. But in the US you had SASB the Sustainable Accounting Standards Board. In Europe you have GRI, you have the Carbon Disclosure Project and so on.

So all of these different initiatives, which are all trying to get at the same thing, which is disclosing in a transparent and hopefully consistent way, sustainability information and the IFRS is gathering all of these together under one umbrella. And I think we'll in due course create what will be tantamount to a new form of accounting, which will be around sustainability. And I think would be another milestone for the investment community to get their arms around.

Zoe Haseman: Indeed, a milestone that we're waiting for with bated breath, I think. We started this for podcast series back in Glasgow, the home of innovation, and circled globe and landing back in Glasgow for the all important event that was COP26. And we've spoken with so many impactful and influential leaders across the world, discussing how we can all collaborate, act, and commit to real change. And I think one of the things, when I look back on it, that has made me feel really good about this is that every single person that we've spoken to believes that we have everything that we need at our fingertips to be able to meet the climate challenge. It wasn't really doom and gloom from any of our conversations, but there was a healthy realism about the size and the scale of the challenge, absolutely. But everyone brought ideas and solutions and had hope.

And I think when the scale of the challenge feels as overwhelming as it does at times, being able to talk about some of the practical solutions that are being deployed now is really reassuring. And on that I just wanted to reflect back to our very first episode Jens, if you can remember that far back, where we spoke with Faisal Ghani. That was in episode one about his flat packable solar thermal collector technology startup called SolarisKits, which was just a brilliant example of technology and solutions in action.

And we weren't alone at being mightily impressed by this climate solution, because Pfizer had the opportunity to pitch SolarisKit during COP26 for Scotland's Net Zero EDGE award. And he actually won the largest prize there of a hundred thousand, which will allow him to further accelerate and scale his solution. So congratulations to SolarisKit and Faisal for that. But Jens, what was it that most resonated with you or surprised you so far on this journey we've been on together?

Jens Nielsen: Having been engaged at the COP for more than 10 years, I would say that for me what really made COP26 and the lead up to COP26 [inaudible] is the safeguarding of the 1.5 degree threshold for global warming, and the full support in finding and wanting to find financial and technology solutions for that.

But I think we're still lacking concerted policy signals from governments around the world for green [inaudible] transition. For also covering the emerging and developing markets. This Sparks Podcast Series has been a truly remarkable journey, drawing insights from some highly talent guests from the fields of innovation, policy, and investments. Sparking ideas and inspirations in the run up to the COP26. So I'm also optimistic, but we are still not there I would say. And then I want to go back to our guests. Now that the dust has settled on Glasgow, what resonated or surprised you?

Marisa Drew:

Certainly what resonated, and you've touched on it, is enthusiasm and the intent and how pervasive it was across the public and private sector. What gives us hope and enthusiasm that if you have the will, I'm a big believer in the power of human ingenuity and the power of collective action. And so the second piece of it, of course, was this idea that we will form partnerships, we will collaborate both within industry. Historically, which in many cases we're used to operate in a very provincial way i.e we're our fiercest competitors. So we couldn't possibly collaborate because we're in each other's home zones. And yet now we say across financial services or whatever industry, this is all bigger than any one of us so we must collaborate for a common solution. And then you have the same thing again, across public and private, which we touched on.

So I guess those are the things that resonate with me the most. And I also think what resonated with me is in some cases the boldness of the commitments. So to put yourself out there to say, "I'm going to commit to net zero using science based targets, which is a third party who's going to hold me to account. It's not me saying if I'm on the right track, it's somebody else going to hold me to account." That tends to be an uncomfortable place for most of us, right? Because we don't even know... There is no roadmap. We don't know how to figure it out. And so that's, I think, a bold statement of intent. And even some of the commitments were relatively bold. We've been trying for a very long time to get to some agreement on deforestation and yet it's been really tricky. And here at this COP we got that [inaudible].

So I do want to leave us in a position of hope and optimism for those reasons we just said, that power of will and ingenuity should get us there. But we just can't let ourselves rest on the fact that this is too big or too hard. And we also have got to remind ourselves every single day about the timetables. We can't be sitting around at a COP six or seven years from now saying we still have another pledge that hasn't been implemented. So that's the, I guess, point and counterpoint of it for me.

Jens Nielsen:

Thank you, Marisa. And you Kevin?

Kevin Berryman:

A lot of similar things, I would say from my perspective. Certainly a word I would use is momentum. Marisa used, "Will, a collective will." And I think there is an extraordinary amount of that and momentum that has been built. I think there is the swell of desire in understanding as to why it's so important for us to

continue this journey. And I think that will translate... And I know it is for Credit Swiss it sounds like, and certainly for Jacobs' that we will take our steps to ultimately drive an agenda that we feel is aligned with our objectives and our commitments that we are making as organizations to make that happen.

And I think there's more of a ground swell of that collective will to make it happen across I would call it a greater proportion of the private institutions around the world that are recognizing that this is a thing that is going to be necessary to do, to be successful in terms of access to capital, in terms of shareholder views, in terms of a variety of ways that companies measure their successes.

So I think there is this ability to garner that momentum and ultimately deliver. We just have to remain committed to it, but we got to stay at it. And the commitment levels of the organizations have to be strong, because it won't always be so easy. And we all know the collective ability to work together on these types of things. So commitment, will, and momentum, and let's make sure that it continues to happen.

Zoe Haseman: Right. So on that, how do you envisage the next five to 10 years? What do you think is a likely scenario?

Kevin Berryman: I think there will be ebbs and flows relative to this way forward. And I think what we just have to do is stay committed to it. I think about what we can do at Jacobs' and think about the things that we can help drive with our client base and the objectives we're establishing for ourselves and our commitments that we're making. So I think we have the ability to make a difference in the world. And so there's an aspect of that, which gives me great excitement and optimism for our future as a company and our ability to help support the global efforts in this regard. And I think if that commitment level across the organizations in general are strong, we will make good progress.

Zoe Haseman: Thanks Kevin. Marisa?

Marisa Drew: On my side I think what I would expect to see over the coming decade or so is that we will have real technological breakthroughs in the hardest to abate sectors. I mean I am a firm believer that we will find a breakthrough for green aviation fuel, as an example, which is one of those areas which is exceptionally hard as we still all fly on planes and want to get from here to there and don't have a way to do it in a green fashion.

So I think we're going to see a lot of that happening. And I actually start to... seeing a lot of the early seeds of those spaces with a great hope. And they will get funded, no doubt in my mind. I also think that we will see the transition of mature industries, which is a big piece of this equation. It can't all be about the technological disruption.

And I think what will happen is there will be a great divide in terms of valuations of companies and where the capital flow, as we talked about earlier, between those that are really transitioning and those that sort of want to pretend it's not happening. That divide is going to reallocate capital, and it's also going to mean whether those companies are going to be around or they'll get disrupted out of business.

And then finally I think out of necessity we will see policy making get much sharper and more harmonious. I think there's just, it's not going to be possible for us to continue to operate with different agendas around the world which don't bring together priorities that focus first on climate mitigation. And in part of that, we didn't get to talk about that so much in this session, but the idea of bridging inequities. Because if we're only doing this in the wealthy west those who are in developing markets who have less resources are going to be disproportionately affected, and then they won't be able to do their part because they won't have the capability, the capacity to do it and that's not going to work.

So I actually think that recognition will be put into practice in a much more robust way over the next decade. I see that in the circles I operate in as well.

Jens Nielsen: Unfortunately, that's all we have time for today. Marisa and Kevin, we are absolutely delighted to have you as our guest on this final Sparks Podcast episode. Finance is the key to achieving the positive change we need. And we look forward to joining you on this journey and seeing the wonderful impacts you are both making across your businesses. Thank you so much.

Marisa Drew: Thank you.

Kevin Berryman: Thank you.

Jens Nielsen: As always, thank you to you our wonderful listeners for joining us for another exciting episode. We hope you enjoyed the podcast series and that you too are helping to create positive change for future generations.

I would also like to extend my thanks to all guest speakers on this fantastic Sparks Podcast Series, sparking real conversations with the intention to collaborate, act, commit to real change.