

**Global Compact** Network Austria

Summary Report

# 6th EU Peer Learning Group on Climate

20th & 21st May 2025 I Vienna

Implementing Credible Climate Transition Plans - From Commitment to Action

Global Compact Network Austria



Global Compact Network Georgia









AN,



**Global Compact** 

Global Compact Network Greece

Global Compact Network Portugal

Network Croatia



Global Compact Network Ukraine

**Global Compact** Network Serbia

Global Compact Network Denmark

Global Compact Network Italy

Global Compact Network Finland

**Global Compact** Network Ireland



Global Compact Network Spain



Global Compact Network UK



**Global Compact** Network Germany









**Global Compact** 

# INDEX

1 EU Peer Learning Group on Climate	3
2 6th EU Peer Learning Group on Climate	4
2.1 Speakers	5
2.2 Method	7
2.3 Participants	8
3 Key challenges	10
4 Ambition	13
5 Action	16
6 Accountability	19
7 Voices of participants & recommended sources	23



# 1 EU PEER LEARNING GROUP ON CLIMATE

The European (EU) Peer Learning Group (PLG) on Climate was established in 2019 as an exclusive knowledge-sharing platform with annual meetings of European companies in the field of climate action, and enables discussion, networking, and information exchange with peers and experts. To ensure all parties feel comfortable sharing within the peer learning experience, the meetings are held under the Chatham House Rule.

This meeting of corporate sustainability experts applies the partnership methodology (SDG 17) to address business challenges related to the net zero transition of companies. In the past, it has focused on topics such as carbon emissions reductions, value chain management, and regulatory developments. This is key in promoting corporate sustainability initiatives to support the 2030 Agenda and tackle global climate change.

Every year, this event becomes more relevant given the urgent transformation needed by European companies to adapt their strategies to combat climate change and address the regulatory developments set out by the European Union.

# 2 6th EU PEER LEARNING GROUP ON CLIMATE: Climate Transition Plans

On 20 & 21 May 2025 the Austrian Network hosted the 6th EU PLG on Climate in Vienna. 90 participants including UN Global Compact staff and 64 company representatives from 19 European countries met at Museumsquartier, Barocke Suiten. The main aims of the meeting were to enable participants to:

- Share experiences and best practices on key topics related to climate transition plans (CTPs) according to international frameworks and standards.
- Gain valuable insights from experts and peers by delving into approaches and best practices for voluntary and mandatory climate reporting standards.
- Connect with other climate specialists across the European region



# 2.1 SPEAKERS inspiration, information and peer learning

#### Presentation during the event

Over two days, key experts shared insights on important developments and relevant frameworks related to climate transition plans with the participants, highlighting the critical relevance of this topic.

- Kim Schoppink, European Regional Lead, Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi)
- Kate Ryan, Strategic Partnerships Manager, International Transition Plan Network (ITPN)
- Veronika Pountcheva, Board Member, International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB)
- Pedro Faria, Environmental Lead, <u>European Financial Reporting Advisory Group</u> (EFRAG)
- Leah Ramoutar, Director of Environmental Sustainability, Aviva
- Lucas Ribeiro, Senior Manager, Environment and Climate team, UN Global Compact



During a panel discussion, advanced companies shared their work and insights on CTPs, exchanging best practices and challenges faced in implementing effective strategies:

- Dylan McNeill, Senior Director Sustainability & ESG, ASM International
- Jakob Gamrot, Group Climate & Sustainability Manager, Grundfos
- Rafaela Ortner, Head of Group ESG Strategy, A1 Telekom Austria





2.2 METHOD

#### Overall purpose of workshops:

- Inspire greater ambition and implementation of more robust, meaningful plans
- Help participants understand how CTPs can embed and unlock impactful climate action, and connect key areas such as climate mitigation, adaptation, nature and biodiversity, just transition, circular economy, etc. to each other and their overall business strategy
- Facilitate peer discussion and learning to bring out key challenges, considerations, opportunities, insights, ideas, and new best practices

#### Format Workshop includes:

- Scene-setting company case studies: 1-2 companies per group to share on the topic
- Individual exercises to think about their organisation's current familiarity with the topic by filling in exercise templates
- Peer-learning discussions and group reflections using guided questions

The workshop design was inline with the principles of the ITPN framework (Ambition, Action, Accountability). The following chapters will go through the results of the workshops with leading European companies.





Several countries were new to participation in this year's PLG, bringing varied and unique perspective to the discussions. The 19 countries represented were: Austria, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland & Lichtenstein, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom. The UN Global Compact Networks from each country invited participating companies to join the PLG, bringing together a total of 64 companies.



in terms of progress on your Climate Transition Plan?"

#### Austria

A1 Telekom Austria AG AGRANA Beteiligungs-AG EVN AG Greiner AG MM Group Österreichische Post AG Palfinger AG PORR AG UNIQA Insurance Group AG

**Croatia** INA Group Privredna banka Zagreb d.d.

**Denmark** GRUNDFOS Novonesis (Novozymes A/S) Topdanmark VELUX A/S

Finland KONE Oyj

**Georgia** AIS LLC Bakhvi HPP RMG Cooper

**Germany** Ceconomy AG DOUGLAS Schwarz Group Siemens AG Siemens Energy

Greece HELLENIQ ENERGY OTE GROUP PPC Group Ireland An Post CRH Plc

**Italy** Iveco Group Moncler

**Netherlands** Ahold Delhaize -Delhaize Serbia ASM International NV

**Poland** Allegro.eu S.A Deloitte InPost Group

**Portugal** Altri EDP, S.A. TMG Automotive

**Serbia** Erste Bank Serbia Hemofarm AD

**Spain** Redeia Roca Group

Sweden Advania Sverige AB Duni Group Hexagon AB Livförsäkringsbolaget Skandia, ömsesidigt OX2 Scania CV AB

Switzerland & Liechtenstein Novartis

**Turkey** Borusan Holding Fiba Fiba Yenilenebilir Enerji Holding Koç Holding Kordsa Vestel Elektronik Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.

Ukraine Enamine Ltd I.P. Cert LLC INTERPIPE UKRAINE, LLC MHP SoftServe

#### UK

Aviva Coca-Cola Europacific Partners ScottishPower

# 3 **KEY CHALLENGES** for Companies in Developing a Climate Transition Plans

The participants were split into four groups based on their levels of maturity (Planning phase of CTP; In progress but not yet published; Published one version of CTP; Published two or more versions of CTP) and were asked to identify key challenges in developing and implementing CTPs. The following topics were highlighted across the discussions:

#### **Data Availability and Transparency**

- Lack of high-quality and consistent data, especially for Scope 3 emissions, remains a major barrier to effective planning.
- CSRD and upcoming regulatory frameworks are seen as potential enablers for improving data comparability and transparency
- Use of proxy data and inconsistent methodologies continues to create uncertainty in scenario development and target-setting.





#### Ambition, Targets, and Feasibility

- There is difficulty in setting ambitious but realistic climate targets, particularly when long-term goals (e.g., net-zero by 2050) must align with short-term financial constraints.
- The gap persists between ambition and actual implementation, especially when SBTs have not yet been established or sectoral guidance is lacking.
- Translating high-level ambition (e.g., "climate leadership") into concrete, actionable goals is challenging, especially with internal resistance or regulatory ambiguity.
- There is uncertainty about what to include/exclude in a transition plan and how granular the plan must be to be credible and actionable.

#### **Organizational and Cultural Barriers**

- Lack of internal alignment and competing business priorities delays climate action.
- There are significant difficulties in securing top management buy-in and engaging across all business units.
- It is challenging to define clear responsibilities and ownership of the CTP process.
- Fear of greenwashing accusations leads to reluctance around transparency.
- Short-term business needs often take precedence over long-term climate goals.



#### **Regulatory and Policy Landscape**

- Regulatory pressure is a major driver, especially for financial institutions with mandated KPIs and disclosure requirements.
- However, the lack of clear, sector-specific guidance on net-zero pathways presents a major gap.
- Companies seek greater alignment between corporate ambition and evolving policy frameworks, particularly in regions with lower regulatory maturity.
- Increased engagement with policymakers is needed to create enabling environments for transition.

#### **Market Readiness and Cost Considerations**

• Financial feasibility is a major concern. Key questions include "Who pays the bill?"—especially in capital-intensive or hard-toabate sectors like steel or chemicals.

- There are challenges and questions around passing costs to customers, particularly in markets with low demand for sustainable alternatives.
- High investment requirements for renewable energy are complicated by grid limitations and long lead times.
- Concerns over the cost burden for suppliers, especially in less mature markets, raise questions about who finances their transition.



#### Value Chain and Scope 3 Emissions

- Scope 3 emissions are widely seen as the most complex challenge, with data gaps and limited influence over external actors.
- Companies are exploring supplier engagement mechanisms, such as technical assistance or favorable financing terms.
- Circular economy models are recognized as important but are not yet widely adopted.



#### Long-Term Planning and Flexibility

- Plans targeting 2050 goals require continuous updates as assumptions and external conditions evolve.
- There is the need for adaptive scenario planning to navigate uncertainties and avoid rigid, obsolete strategies.
- Companies struggle to balance ambition with feasibility, particularly given changing geopolitical and regulatory contexts.

#### Nature, Biodiversity & Social Considerations

- Some companies are beginning to integrate biodiversity and social justice into their climate strategies, but this is still in the early stages.
- Land use impacts of renewables and community engagement are emerging as critical concerns.
- Companies acknowledge the need to treat nature-related goals with the same strategic intent as climate targets.





#### Defining the Right Level of Ambition

- **Regulatory & Market Alignment:** Companies are shaping ambition based on alignment with the EU Green Deal, national NDCs, and sector pathways.
- **Data & Scope Limitations:** Strong ambition is often constrained by poor Scope 3 data and limited influence over supply chains and the product use-phase.
- **Disconnect Between Vision & Plan:** Many firms express bold long-term climate visions (e.g., net-zero by 2050), but these are not always matched by what's written or operationalised in the plan.
- Narrative Gap: There's a growing need to create a compelling, coherent narrative explaining why a company is acting, not just what it aims to do.
- **Systemic Impact & Leadership:** Every company wants to be a "leader", but few define what leadership truly means in practice (e.g., influence, innovation, collaboration).
- **Infrastructure Dependency:** Reaching ambition depends heavily on external factors like grid decarbonisation, credible carbon sinks, and regional tech availability.



#### Managing Uncertainty & Dependencies

- **Resilience & Adaptability:** A resilient mindset, strong governance, and scenario planning (Plan A, B, C...) help manage unknowns.
- **Policy as Enabler:** Public support, regulation, and legislation (e.g., UK's Biodiversity Net Gain) are key levers for realising ambition.

- **Cost & Business Model Challenges:** High upfront costs, long payback periods, and required business model shifts make internal buy-in difficult. Balancing CAPEX with long-term value is a major hurdle.
- Internal-External Tension: Companies struggle with their honesty about their ambition gaps, especially if reduction levers are exhausted and reliance on unproven technologies remains.
- **Supplier Collaboration:** Ambition cannot be achieved in isolation. Companies must co-develop solutions with suppliers, but supplier capabilities are still limited, especially for biodiversity and circularity.



#### Balancing Short-, Medium-, and Long-Term Goals

- Vision vs. Execution: Setting long-term ambition is easier than implementing short-term action. Short-term wins are needed to sustain momentum and justify investment.
- **Trade-offs & Growth:** Companies face tension between growth and emission reductions, product diversity vs. emissions intensity, and short-term business targets vs. long-term climate goals.
- **Customer Expectations**: There is difficulty in aligning emissions reductions with customer usage patterns and demand. Companies are shifting the narrative to show how *sustainability benefits the customer*.

#### **Embedding Nature, Adaptation & Circularity**

- Still Fragmented: Nature, circular economy, and just transition are often addressed via standalone action plans, but not well integrated into the core ambition of the plan.
- **Need for Holistic Targets:** Holistic ambition needs to precede holistic action. Otherwise, companies work in silos or deprioritize non-climate environmental areas.
- Limited Supplier Knowledge: Suppliers often lack knowledge of biodiversity, nature, and adaptation topics, making joint action more difficult.

• DMA & CSRD Tension: In some cases, the Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) under the European Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) regulations can deprioritise biodiversity or water due to unclear links, which can hinder internal motivation to act.



#### Strategic Integration of Ambition

- **Core Strategy Alignment:** CTP ambition must sit at the heart of business strategy and be flexible to shifts in operations or markets.
- **Incorporating Assumptions & Dependencies**: Making dependencies transparent allows companies to define what is required for the ambition to be achieved, and use this to advocate or collaborate more effectively.
- Advocacy as Risk Reduction: Calling for stronger regulation helps reduce uncertainty and supports companies in scaling ambition more credibly.
- **Data-Driven Business Case:** Stronger internal data and KPIs are needed to justify long-term ambition amid short-term pressures.
- **Avoiding 'Greenhushing':** Companies are reflecting on the risk of saying too little externally, especially when they know ambition gaps will remain. Being honest and transparent can be a strength, not a weakness.

5



#### **Organisational Alignment & Ownership**

- Local Accountability: Assign clear local ownership of climate actions to close the gap between central strategy and on-the-ground implementation.
- Global-Local Alignment: Centralised strategies (e.g., SBTi) must allow room for local adaptation.
- **Executive Priority:** Elevate climate to a top strategic concern, not just an ESG add-on.
- **Cross-Department Ownership**: Engage strategy, finance, procurement, R&D, legal, and operations in shared responsibility of the outcomes of the CTP.
- **Governance Tools:** Use scorecards, working groups, and reporting lines to CEOs to formalise ownership and enable tracking.





#### **Operational Action & Investment**

- **Green Operations:** Embed decarbonisation in infrastructure and everyday business practices.
- **Capital Allocation:** Prioritise investment in green assets and reduce fossil-related holdings.
- **Electrification Challenges:** Electrification is not always feasible due to infrastructure gaps or process limitations.
- Scope 1, 2, 3 Implementation: Scope 1 & 2 are more manageable; Scope 3 requires systemic change and major supplier engagement.
- Technology & Infrastructure: Invest in sustainable technologies, energy efficiency, storage, and circular solutions (e.g., product refurbishment, low-carbon materials) to reduce impact.

#### Data, Tools & Reporting

- **Improve Data Quality:** Investment in digital systems and automation; quarterly tracking and annual updates are best practice.
- Scenario Planning: Use predictive key models and risk-based approaches to prioritise key actions for the CTP.
- **CSRD & TPT:** There is the need for clear guidance on structure, frequency, and integration into reports, both standalone and as part of sustainability reports.
- Scope 3 Data Volatility: Frequent recalculations are needed as emission factors and methodologies evolve.





#### **Policy, Advocacy & Collaboration**

- **Coalitions for Impact:** Cross-industry alliances can amplify influence with regulators.
- Advocate for Enabling Policy: Companies should engage with policy that helps them achieve the goals of their CTP, eg., grid expansion, hydrogen, or bioenergy infrastructure.
- Balance Voluntary vs Regulatory Frameworks: Misalignment (e.g., biomethane accounting) needs resolution.
- **Structural Influence:** Advocate collectively for systemwide change - there is power in using a shared voice, especially for sector-specific needs.

#### Supplier & Value Chain Engagement

- **Beyond Tier 1:** Engage lower-tier suppliers that struggle with sustainability; offer support, training, co-investment, and data-sharing.
- **Incentivise Participation:** Include sustainability criteria in procurement, tenders, and contracts, and; consider financial incentives to support this.
- Circular & Low-Carbon Value Chains: Link decarbonisation with circularity goals.
- Workshops & Webinars: Facilitate dialogue, set clear expectations (e.g., SBTs), and build trust through consistent and meaningful engagement.

#### **Customer & Product Strategy**

- **Communicating Co-Benefits:** Frame sustainability as quality, durability, or innovation, not just "green".
- **Product Use-Phase:** While difficult to control, influence is possible through design and communication.

• Scope 3 & End-Users: Changing customer behaviour requires creative engagement.

#### **Social Considerations & Just Transition**

- **Social Impact Integration:** Consider worker transitions, retraining, and social protection mechanisms.
- Local Community Engagement: Companies have had success when they engage early, respond transparently, offer remedies, and share data (e.g., EIA results).
- **Community Dialogue:** Sensitive and ongoing engagement is essential to build trust.

#### Stakeholder Engagement & Prioritisation

- **Investor Concerns:** Political instability can reduce the willingness to invest in long-term strategies.
- **Middle Management Buy-In**: Often under-addressed; align operational KPIs with climate targets.
- Employee & Internal Communication: Use workshops, data stories, and personalisation to drive engagement.
- **Quantifying Impact:** Show the positive or negative emissions impact of actions to build accountability.



#### Action Prioritisation & Trade-offs

- Criteria for Prioritisation:
  - Impact
  - Feasibility
  - Cost-Benefit Analysis
  - Scenario Analysis (e.g., via TCFD)
- **Empowering Operations:** Let functional teams choose the most relevant actions for their team to increase buy-in.
- **Tackling Trade-offs:** Balance innovation, growth, product variety, and emissions reductions.

6

# ACCOUNTABILITY

### **Metrics & Targets**

#### Which metrics & targets are most relevant for your plan? How are you utilising the metrics & targets you already have?

- Validated science-based targets (SBTi) for both short and long-term timeframes across all scopes are key to the CTP.
- GHG intensity targets and specific KPIs (e.g., energy efficiency, electric vehicle share, etc.).
- Quarterly reporting to the CEO, often managed through GHG working groups.
- Use of tools like Position Green and SAP to align ESG and financial reporting.

Carbon metrics were generally viewed as clear, but participants emphasised the need to translate technical targets (e.g., tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e) into operational KPIs (e.g., litres of fuel, % of green electricity) for greater internal engagement and understanding.



#### What do you need to adapt or do differently for this process?

- **Ownership:** There is a need to improve ownership; currently, many organisations lack clear accountability structures for emissions data.
- **Cross-functional collaboration** (especially with finance, controlling, audit, and procurement) is still under development.
- **Target realism and credibility** emerged as a major concern: revising targets downward when they become difficult can undermine trust.

- **Incentives:** Many companies are working to link targets with incentives, especially in management remuneration, to maintain momentum.
- **Measuring non-carbon outcomes:** Challenges persist in measuring non-carbon outcomes, such as policy influence and advocacy effectiveness.

# To what extent do you need to embed these across the business, and how do you go about that?

- A common recommendation is to embed targets into departmental KPIs and performance reviews.
- This includes giving responsibility to operational teams, such as tracking the % of low-emissions vehicles or emissions per product line.
- Some companies introduced company-wide sustainability training to build a shared understanding, including "train-the-trainer" models.
- Others are experimenting with employee engagement strategies, such as sustainability coffee breaks or incentive-linked e-learning.



# How are you ensuring the reliability and accuracy of your data?

- Most companies are moving toward limited assurance for key metrics, but acknowledged difficulties in data sourcing, especially for Scope 3.
- Data comes from a mix of thousands of providers, handled by a few data controllers, e.g., finance teams or ESG departments.
- Use of external consultants and auditors is common.
- Accuracy challenges are often linked to emission factors from suppliers, lack of updated baselines, and estimation methodologies.
- Companies are validating existing data and working toward better documentation of assumptions and limitations.

# How often are you reporting on your plan's progress? How are you ensuring updates are made?

- Many organisations report quarterly to the CEO or sustainability committees.
- Target reviews are often annual, with division-specific updates linked to performance reviews and remuneration.
- There were discussions about when targets should be adapted ideally through clear governance rather than quietly lowering ambitions.
- Some participants argued for more transparent rules on when and how targets should be revised to maintain accountability.

#### (How) are carbon credits factoring into your plan?

There is broad scepticism about carbon credits as a credible path to reaching targets:

- Carbon credits should only be used for residual emissions, and only with clear proof of impact.
- The lack of robust regulation around carbon credits is considered a major risk.
- Some companies generate credits from avoided emissions, but noted this should be voluntary and not used to meet reduction targets.
- The EU Green Claims Directive is flagged as a warning for product-related credit usage.

#### Governance

#### Who owns the plan, and who else is involved?

Ownership of CTP is typically shared across multiple levels:

- Sustainability and ESG committees often coordinate the development and tracking of transition plans.
- Working groups support operationalisation, e.g., GHG task forces for Scopes 1, 2, and 3.
- ESG business owners, sustainability managers, and other functional leaders are involved in execution.
- Some companies have established a board subcommittee on sustainability to strengthen top-level engagement.

#### What's working? What's difficult?

#### Working:

- Embedding governance in business units with specific emissions targets.
- Direct reporting lines from ESG teams to executive leadership (e.g., CEO via risk management).
- Use of steering committees and structured reporting pathways for decision-making.

#### Challenges:

- Limited influence of ESG committees that operate only at the director level.
- Reliance on "friendly, interested people" rather than institutionalised accountability.
- Lack of clear processes for target allocation across departments.

# Are there internal tensions (e.g., between ESG & legal teams)? How are you handling that?

- Cross-functional misalignment, especially between ESG and legal, or procurement and sustainability can be challenging.
- Differences in regional ambition levels and timelines create friction.
- Conflicts between climate objectives and traditional procurement or finance processes can be difficult to navigate.

Solutions include:

- Cross-departmental workshops for joint scenario planning and problem solving.
- Merging teams or fostering regular dialogue between business functions.
- Creating shared KPIs and integrating ESG considerations into contracting and procurement practices.



#### How have you aligned Board governance with transition goals?

- Companies are actively working to raise the visibility of sustainability issues to the board level.
- Some companies have established board subcommittees or direct reporting from sustainability units to the board.
- There is a push to integrate ESG KPIs into strategic planning and performance evaluations.

#### What skills and training are supporting the implementation of your plan?

- Investments in training programs for sales, sourcing, procurement, and management are espacially important.
- Creation of internal sustainability academies, e-learning platforms, and "train the trainer" models can be useful.
- Competence centers facilitate knowledge-sharing across subsidiaries.

# How do you handle conflicts between the goals of the transition plan and existing governance structures/processes?

- Aligning ESG KPIs with strategic business planning and performance assessments is key.
- Embedding transition targets into financial planning helps overcome structural resistance.
- Conflicts are reduced when ESG goals are seen as core to business success, not external obligations.

#### How flexible is your plan? Can it be adapted? How do you protect what is critical?

- Flexibility is essential: targets may need to evolve, but this should be done transparently.
- Acknowledging that adaptation is necessary builds credibility, as long as changes are clearly communicated and justified.
- Key elements, including long-term vision and core mitigation levers, are protected through scenario planning and regular alignment reviews.

#### **Cross-cutting Themes**

- Tensions between environmental and financial metrics were frequently mentioned. Without strong financial incentives, many feared climate targets would be deprioritised.
- There is a need to align climate targets with business value and strategy: sustainability must not be an add-on.
- There was a shared concern about climate fatigue, particularly given geopolitical uncertainties and growing skepticism about achieving the 1.5°C goals.
- Despite data and methodological challenges, there was consensus that making targets public and linking them to compensation is key to creating real accountability.

# 7 Voices of participants & recommended sources

One of the biggest highlights of this programme has been the opportunity to engage in open, supportive discussions with peers who bring diverse perspectives and experiences. I've particularly valued the collaborative environment that encouraged us to share both successes and challenges without fear of judgment. This not only deepened my understanding of the topics covered but also helped me develop more confidence in expressing my own ideas. Another standout moment was working on group tasks that required problem-solving and critical thinking. These sessions pushed me to step out of my comfort zone and practice skills such as active listening, constructive feedback, and consensus building. The real-time insights I gained from others have been both inspiring and immediately applicable to my own professional context.

Mariana Oryniak, SoftServe

I was really impressed by the inspiring speakers, the dynamic and productive group work, and especially the insightful and memorable debate between Dylan, Jakub, and Raffaela. **Maryna Bereznytska, I.P.Cert** 

# 66 \_\_\_\_\_

Panel discussions, external speakers (A1, ASM international, Grundfos representatives), great structure of company representatives. Overall great experience and very well prepared by UN Global Compact. Congratulations on a greatly prepared event!

#### Sources

- Transition Plan Taskforce's (now housed with the IFRS Foundation) Disclosure Framework
- TPT Transition Planning Cycle Guidance
- IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures-TPT Disclosure Framework Technical Mapping
- TPT Disclosure Framework-European Sustainability Reporting Standards Comparison
- Turning theory into action: A practical guide to climate transition plans in austrian companies



**Global Compact** Network Austria Wiesingerstrasse 6/8, 1010 Wien office@globalcompact.at www.globalcompact.at