



Transcript of the “Wenden bitte!” podcast:

Episode 18: “How effective is the Supply Chain Act?”

Introducing the subject and today’s contributors	2
Sound clip (brief subject overview)	3
General definition and purpose of supply chain legislation	3
The history of the Supply Chain Act	4
The German Act on Corporate Due Diligence in Supply Chains	5
Impact of the Supply Chain Act	6
Gaps in the German Supply Chain Act	9
The EU supply chain law	10
Supply chains from a consumer perspective	11
Green Claims Directive	11
Outlook and conclusion	13

Introducing the subject and today's contributors

Nadine Kreutzer:

Hello and a warm welcome to a new episode of the “All change please!” podcast, in which we discuss current issues around climate action and sustainability research. I’m Nadine Kreutzer and I’m joined by my co-presenter Mandy Schossig from the Oeko-Institut.

Mandy Schossig:

And hello from me.

Nadine Kreutzer:

Today, we will be looking at a highly topical policy issue that has been the focus of much discussion in the media. It can be summed up in a single German word that we can really get our teeth into.

Mandy Schossig:

Yes, absolutely: today’s topic is the *Lieferkettensorgfaltspflichtengesetz* – the German Act on Corporate Due Diligence in Supply Chains. So what’s it all about? In essence, the Act requires businesses to comply with human rights and environmental standards. At present, however, the legislation only applies in Germany. So of course, the question we have to ask is this: what can it achieve if it only applies to German companies? Is there, perhaps, a need for a law at the European level as well in order to close the gaps? That’s the subject of a very intensive debate right now.

Nadine Kreutzer:

So we want to know: how effective is the Supply Chain Act? And to provide some answers, Mandy, you’ve brought along Dr Peter Gailhofer, one of your colleagues from the Oeko-Institut, who has a wealth of expertise in this area.

Peter Gailhofer:

Hello.

Mandy Schossig:

Yes, Peter, you are the ideal person to talk about this complex issue. Peter Gailhofer is a lawyer and Senior Researcher in the Environmental Law and Governance Division where he works on the legal aspects of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and sustainable development. Hello, Peter. Thank you for making time to be here today.

Peter Gailhofer:

Hello again! It’s a pleasure to be here.

Nadine Kreutzer:

Peter, we are delighted that you are here to share your expertise with us today. And of course, what we want to know is how you come to be working at the Oeko-Institut. I think it’s fair to say that this isn’t the usual career path for a lawyer. Can you tell us about the link between the Institute and the law?

Peter Gailhofer:

Actually, we have several lawyers at the Oeko-Institut. I'm not the only one. I work in the Environmental Law and Governance Division – so law is right there in the name. There are five of us in total, all with different priority areas. But you are absolutely right, of course. Most people who study law do so with a very different aim in mind: to qualify as an attorney, join one of the big law firms and earn a lot of money. And not that I'm complaining, of course, but working at the Oeko-Institut isn't a path to great wealth. So the Institute tends to attract people who do this work out of conviction.

Mandy Schossig:

Well, we are very happy that your path led you to us. As for today's topic, we have quite a lot to discuss. But as always, before we start, here's a brief insight into the topic.

Sound clip (brief subject overview)

Germany's Supply Chain Act, which entered into force in 2023, obliges companies to take responsibility for ensuring compliance with human rights and environmental standards in their supply chains. The aim is to improve working conditions, prevent child labour and avert environmental risks. However, the provisions of the Act, especially the environment-related obligations, are frequently criticised for leaving loopholes, and many questions relating to the Act's implementation still appear to be unanswered. What can a German supply chain law actually achieve in terms of protecting the environment and human rights? A law of this kind is more effective if more major companies are required to fulfil the supply chain obligations that it regulates. That's why a European directive is currently being negotiated at the EU level. It will go further than the German law and close potential gaps. What form should an EU supply chain law take in order to oblige companies to do more to protect the climate and social standards along their supply chains?

General definition and purpose of supply chain legislation

Nadine Kreutzer:

To answer all these questions, we have Peter Gailhofer with us today, I'm pleased to say. Peter, let's start off, perhaps, by asking: what is a supply chain? What does it mean?

Peter Gailhofer:

Perhaps it's best to give a real-world example. Every company that manufactures products relies on specific raw materials or inputs. And these materials and inputs have to come from somewhere, and in our globalised economy, they are usually sourced abroad. The various steps in which these precursor products are manufactured, again from raw materials, constitute what is known as a supply chain. So the supply chain is the chain of products and inputs required to manufacture or sell goods here in Germany.

Nadine Kreutzer:

And why do we need a law for something as fundamental as respect for human rights?

Peter Gailhofer:

There has been quite a lot of coverage of this issue in recent years, which you may have seen. Sadly, human rights abuses occur fairly often in supply chains, either because the resources are extracted under inhumane conditions or because the materials used harm the environment – some

of them may be banned in Germany, for example, but are still permitted elsewhere. And as a result, human rights abuses and damage to the environment often occur, particularly in cross-border, transnational supply chains.

Mandy Schossig:

So what are the problems that a supply chain law can address for the people concerned? If we look at human rights, which problems can this legislation solve?

Peter Gailhofer:

The Supply Chain Act protects a number of clearly defined rights, including employment rights – in other words, work-related human rights and the ban on child labour. They include workplace safety standards, as well as aspects that are particularly interesting from our perspective, such as conservation of soil, air and water resources and protection from expulsion.

Nadine Kreutzer:

What are some of the problems relating to the climate that the Supply Chain Act might be able to address or resolve?

Peter Gailhofer:

That's a very interesting question. In fact, the German Supply Chain Act does not include any climate-related obligations. It does not mention the climate explicitly as an asset to be protected, but it does refer to the air and the risks that may be posed by harmful air pollution. Does this include the climate? That's debatable. It's a classic lawyer's tale: we argue about everything and wherever there are two lawyers, there are at least three opinions.

The history of the Supply Chain Act

Mandy Schossig:

We will take a closer look at that in a moment. But first, can you tell us a little about the history of the Act? There were various incidents in the past to which this legislation in Germany was a response. How did it all come about? Can you break it down for us?

Peter Gailhofer:

Yes, there's potentially quite a lot of ground to cover here. The first efforts to establish fair and humane supply chains go back to the 1990s, to the time when people were becoming more aware of the emerging problems caused by globalisation. Initial approaches to regulate this issue by law at the international level were made in the early 2000s. But they soon ebbed away, at least as far as the supply chain obligations were concerned. Then from 2012, the [Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights](#) were adopted at UN level; these are known as the Ruggie Principles. They specifically address the responsibility of business enterprises to respect human rights and avoid human rights abuses in their supply chains.

Nadine Kreutzer:

Ruggie Principles?

Peter Gailhofer:

Yes, John Ruggie was the UN Special Representative who facilitated this process. The Principles are named after him.

Mandy Schossig:

As I recall, several major disasters occurred in a number of countries. Can you remind us what happened? And after that, policy-makers in Germany decided to take action. What were the key milestones?

Peter Gailhofer:

A significant moment for the debate in Germany was the collapse of the Rana Plaza factory in Bangladesh, which killed hundreds of people. The disaster was caused in part by the business practices of German companies whose products were being manufactured in the factory. This was one of the incidents which prompted a more intensive debate.

But environmental incidents and major environmental harm have always occurred along supply chains, so there has always been a reason to talk about the issue. Civil society has been calling for legislation for some time.

The German Act on Corporate Due Diligence in Supply Chains

Nadine Kreutzer:

Let's turn now to the Act on Corporate Due Diligence in Supply Chains here in Germany. What exactly does it regulate?

Peter Gailhofer:

The Act on Corporate Due Diligence in Supply Chains regulates business enterprises' due diligence obligations in relation to supply chains. The aim is to ensure that certain companies – mainly large enterprises – look more closely at what is happening in their supply chains. The law obliges them to analyse the potential risks that may arise for certain protected rights identified in the law; specifically, these are human rights and environment-related obligations. The companies are required to conduct risk analyses, which means looking at the nature and extent of the risks and taking appropriate measures to minimise them.

The Act establishes a comprehensive package of obligations, but ultimately, it is about looking at exactly where the risks arise, where the dangers lie and what can be done from a corporate perspective to minimise them. Companies must also follow specific procedures and comply with documentation and reporting obligations. As I said, there is a comprehensive package of obligations, but these are the key points.

Mandy Schossig:

Let's take human rights: you mentioned employment protection and workplace safety a moment ago. Which obligations have to be analysed and reported on?

Peter Gailhofer:

They can vary considerably. The problem with supply chain regulation is that it often addresses a very broad area, involving different industries, products, raw materials, manufacturing capabilities and production processes. So the law doesn't specify exactly which obligations any given enterprise has to comply with. It would be difficult to standardise that in workable legislation. Instead, the Supply

Chain Act regulates protected rights. It states which prohibitions may not be infringed and which protected rights may not be violated, and it is a matter for the businesses themselves to determine how they achieve this most effectively and identify which opportunities they have to bring influence to bear. In this respect, the Supply Chain Act is very flexible in design – intentionally so.

Mandy Schossig:

Okay, so what exactly are “human rights-related obligations”? What are we talking about, and what action must be taken?

Peter Gailhofer:

Let’s take the ban on child labour as an example. Here, in its risk analysis, the company must look at which products or raw materials are embedded in its supply chain. Which regions are they sourced from? Is child labour known to be used in these regions, and have any specific cases of child labour come to light? So here, they must look very carefully at the risks associated with the upstream producers and products to determine whether there are any indications that a direct supplier is using child labour.

Nadine Kreutzer:

And when it comes to the environment, is there an example of what the company should certainly be looking at in the manufacturing process?

Peter Gailhofer:

With environmental risks, a particular feature of the Act is that it lays down a limited number of environmental obligations. It makes reference to various international environmental laws – a manageable number – such as the Stockholm Convention, which bans certain persistent organic pollutants. And companies know which substances their products contain. So if a company knows that the use of one of these substances is restricted under the Convention, it has every reason to look at exactly where the product comes from and what it contains. Companies can ask about this in their contract negotiations with suppliers.

The analysis is about looking at whether there is an environmental risk that is regulated by the Act. As the next step, the company must attempt to solve any problems that it has identified.

Mandy Schossig:

Were these environmental factors considered from the start in relation to the law? Or was the Act initially intended to regulate human rights due diligence obligations, and then we or someone else came along and pointed out that the environment is relevant here, so shouldn’t we be thinking about that as well?

Peter Gailhofer:

These corporate due diligence obligations come from the field of human rights. John Ruggie designed them as human rights-related principles; the environment then came up in discussion and the legislative debates in 2015 or 2016 or thereabouts. In that sense, it is quite new and if I may be permitted to indulge in some self-promotion for a moment, the Oeko-Institut was one of the first institutions to conduct comprehensive research on environment-related due diligence obligations.

Impact of the Supply Chain Act

Nadine Kreutzer:

There are numerous companies here in Germany, from small bakeries to major corporations. Which companies have to comply with these obligations? Who does the Act on Corporate Due Diligence in Supply Chains apply to?

Peter Gailhofer:

Well, the Act on Corporate Due Diligence in Supply Chains ...

Mandy Schossig:

You two are having fun with that!

Nadine Kreutzer:

It's a tongue-twister!

Peter Gailhofer:

You put your finger on it there, asking about company size. The Act only applies to large companies; currently, it covers enterprises with at least 3,000 employees. In Phase II from next year, the threshold will be lowered to 1,000, but these are still relatively large enterprises.

Mandy Schossig:

And these are large companies that are based in Germany, if I have understood correctly.

Peter Gailhofer:

That's right; these are companies that are based in Germany or at least have a branch office here.

Mandy Schossig:

And what about companies that have branch offices in China or another country, for example? Does it apply to them as well?

Peter Gailhofer:

Not initially; that would pose problems from a legal perspective. We cannot make Chinese law here in Germany, and companies in China would hardly like it. However, they are included through the supply chain system. The mechanism underlying the Act is that companies are required to look at their supply chains and take action if they identify any risks. And so the legislation is relevant to overseas companies that have business relationships with firms in Germany.

Nadine Kreutzer:

In other words, the Act on Corporate Due Diligence in Supply Chains applies all along the value chain, is that right? Or are there any products from abroad that it may not apply to? What are we saying here?

Peter Gailhofer:

What we are saying is that the Act is directly applicable. The obligations set out in the Act apply to German companies. These companies are required to take a good look at their supply chains and minimise any risks that they identify. This means that they must address these obligations when negotiating contracts. If they identify a risk among their suppliers in China, they are obliged to write

it into the contract, along the lines of: “Hey there, please don’t use child labour or banned substances in your product manufacturing.” So although the law is directly applicable to German companies only, it has a cross-border effect. From a legal perspective, this mechanism is a very exciting aspect of supply chain legislation.

Nadine Kreutzer:

Let’s take an example from car-making – let’s say we have a car manufactured in Germany with components or raw materials sourced from suppliers based in other countries. Does the law apply to the entire supply chain, or does this have to be specified in the contract?

Peter Gailhofer:

As to whether it applies to the entire supply chain, that’s a different question. But it must be integrated into the contractual relationship with suppliers based abroad. Another special feature of the German legislation is that it only applies to relationships with direct suppliers. This means that a company in Germany must make efforts to ensure that the firms with which the German company has a direct relationship are not violating any of the prohibitions. However, the subsequent links in the supply chain are not covered, and that is a major point of criticism, especially from civil society.

Mandy Schossig:

How realistic is it, though, for companies to require their suppliers to comply with these provisions? Can that be demanded of them?

Peter Gailhofer:

When you say “them”, do you mean the suppliers or the companies?

Mandy Schossig:

I mean requiring the companies to ensure compliance by their suppliers.

Peter Gailhofer:

That’s what underpins the legislation. That is the mechanism established by law. It is not unrealistic; I think it works. If a German company sources products from abroad, it looks at the quality and materials and checks that the products are the right size and that everything works with the components sourced from other regions of the world. Companies have always established this kind of quality assurance mechanism; that’s the nature of business. So why not include specific human rights criteria as well? All kinds of provisions can be written into a contract.

Nadine Kreutzer:

According to a popular myth, companies in the EU are at a competitive disadvantage compared with firms elsewhere because they have to comply with much tougher environmental and human rights rules. What’s your view? Is this a fair and accurate assessment?

Peter Gailhofer:

It’s an outdated argument that is levelled against any form of environmental regulation or, for that matter, against employment rights or minimum wages. You would have to ask a social scientist whether there is any empirical evidence for it. So far, we haven’t seen companies leaving Germany en masse due to the higher employment protection standards or minimum wages here. And anyway, this type of legislation has now been adopted by many other countries as well, although Germany

was one of the first to pass such a comprehensive law. But similar legislation is now in place in many other European countries and overseas. Over time, any competitive disadvantages will be eroded.

Mandy Schossig:

We have talked a lot about the due diligence obligations, but there are reporting obligations as well. Can you explain the difference between the due diligence and the reporting obligations?

Peter Gailhofer:

The package of obligations, which I mentioned before, also includes a reporting obligation. Companies should not only look at the risks and attempt to minimise them; they must also document their findings and describe the action they are taking. And they should then prepare a report, which they must make publicly available in order to build transparency into the process.

Nadine Kreutzer:

And who monitors this?

Peter Gailhofer:

In Germany, the BAFA – the [Federal Office for Economic Affairs and Export Control](#) – will monitor this process. It's a major public authority and will be responsible for enforcement.

Nadine Kreutzer:

And if a company has violated its obligations, what will the BAFA have to say about that? What action will it take?

Peter Gailhofer:

It has various options. The first step is to identify the violation. This is where the reporting obligation comes into play. The BAFA has a range of other verification options as well. For example, it may search premises and demand the handover of documents. And if violations are found to have occurred, financial penalties may be imposed. The legislation provides for a range of sanctions.

Gaps in the German Supply Chain Act

Mandy Schossig:

There is still some criticism of the legislation. Where do you see the German Supply Chain Act falling short?

Peter Gailhofer:

The first point concerns this complex problem of the supply chain itself, which we have just spoken about. In most of its provisions, the Act establishes due diligence obligations in relation to direct suppliers. This means that the other links in the supply chain are excluded for now and only come into play when the company really cannot look away. If it is found that there are genuine risks elsewhere, they really should be addressed, even if they are identified in upstream links in the chain. But for now, it only applies to direct suppliers. And that has been criticised – rightly so, in my view, because many human rights abuses and environmental problems do not arise with the direct supplier but occur at an earlier stage. That's one important point.

The second point – especially from an environmental perspective – is that the environment-related obligations are limited. Three or four international environmental conventions are mentioned, but otherwise, there is a yawning gap. The climate in particular is not mentioned – and of course that’s a problem at times like these.

Mandy Schossig:

It’s a good thing, then, that similar legislation is being discussed at EU level. Let’s look at this in more detail. What is being discussed? Can you give us an overview?

The EU supply chain law

Peter Gailhofer:

Yes, there have been various discussions, reports and research at the EU level for quite some time. And last year, the Commission presented a proposal for a European supply chain law in the form of a directive on corporate due diligence. The Council of the European Union has put forward a counter-proposal. The European Parliament has also debated the issue and presented various counter-proposals. Its Committee on Legal Affairs held a vote and adopted a proposal of its own a couple of days ago. Hopefully, an agreement will be reached fairly soon so that the legislation is passed in 2023.

Nadine Kreutzer:

And what should be included in an EU supply chain law, in your view?

Peter Gailhofer:

Well, of course, it has to include human rights. But if the environment-related gaps could be addressed and filled by the legislation at the European level, that would also be very welcome. It was all looking very positive at the start. The Commission appeared to be striving for a high level of ambition, at least in its public statements, particularly in relation to the climate-related obligations.

In the debate and the drafts, however, it has all become rather diluted. Some of the gaps will undoubtedly remain, at least as far as the environment-related obligations are concerned. But in some respects, the European legislation goes further than the German law, and of course that is to be welcomed. Take the companies that will be covered: in Germany, only very large enterprises with more than 1,000 employees are included, but the European legislation will apply to companies with more than 250 staff.

Another quite exciting aspect from a legal perspective is that the European legislation includes a liability mechanism. The German law expressly excludes any scope for legal action by individuals who have been harmed by due diligence violations in other countries. This has been the subject of longstanding debate. The European legislation will include a provision on liability.

Nadine Kreutzer:

Isn’t the German legislation something of a paper tiger if there is no scope to bring legal action?

Peter Gailhofer:

Not necessarily. It is under discussion. The topic has arisen in the discussions on various occasions and from a civil society or, indeed, a “green” perspective, it is impossible to be too tough when it comes to sanctions. However, a formal enforcement mechanism can also be very effective; I’m

talking about a public authority that takes the matter seriously, keeps a close eye on the situation and imposes penalties for violations of the law. This type of enforcement mechanism is very effective. Nevertheless, from our perspective, it would have been good to have included a liability mechanism. It appeared in the earlier drafts, but was talked out as the process continued.

Mandy Schossig:

So this is one advantage of the EU legislation in comparison to the German law. What other advantages can be identified between the two? In other words, if we have legislation at the EU level, how would it be an improvement?

Peter Gailhofer:

It seems likely that there will be a climate-related obligation in the law. And that is one of the points that has been repeatedly criticised in the German legislation. It involves establishing an obligation that differs somewhat from the due diligence construct: it will require companies themselves to set out a reduction roadmap, backed by specific sanctions. Currently, the plan is still to couple managers' bonuses to their compliance with their reduction roadmaps. That's a good thing in itself. The clearer and more comprehensive, the better. At least it looks like a sensible arrangement.

Supply chains from a consumer perspective

Nadine Kreutzer:

We have talked a lot about everything that companies are required to do. But what can we do, as consumers and product purchasers, in relation to supply chain legislation?

Peter Gailhofer:

Supply chain legislation? As consumers, we don't have a lot of scope here. What we can do is try to elect the right people or apply pressure by protesting. When it comes to the supply chains themselves, we can make the right consumer choices and try to purchase products that are as sustainable and human rights-compliant as possible.

Nadine Kreutzer:

Is there any indication on the products themselves that the supply chain is impeccable, with good conditions maintained throughout? How do we recognise this as consumers?

Peter Gailhofer:

That's a very important question. The law itself does not make provision for any quality labels that would provide guidance for consumers. But we all know that there is an entire array of labels which are supposed to be "green" or claim that products have been manufactured in compliance with human rights, with an independent process to deal with these issues. The EU aims to address this as well and improve the provision of information to consumers, as well as their information rights.

Green Claims Directive

Mandy Schossig:

Speaking of consumer information, you and your colleagues are currently working on a project which deals with the Green Claims Directive. Could you explain what that means and why this directive is important?

Peter Gailhofer:

The [EU's Green Claims initiative](#) specifically addresses this problem. We have a plethora of labels and as consumers, we have no idea how to choose sustainable products. A package of measures is therefore planned in order to improve the situation. It is mainly about ensuring that companies that say they are selling sustainable products actually substantiate their claims. This is largely unregulated at present. Within certain limits, anyone can write whatever they like on their products; the limits are too broad, and that's what this initiative aims to address.

Mandy Schossig:

And it's also intended to provide us with more guidance, the key phrase being consumer rights.

Peter Gailhofer:

Yes, guidance at least in that we will be able to rely to a greater extent on the veracity of the claims.

Nadine Kreutzer:

Is it possible to link corporate due diligence obligations with consumer information in some way? Is there any scope for that?

Peter Gailhofer:

That is a good question, and it's an important question. I think it is very important to link the two, simply because it will be very difficult to enforce these due diligence laws effectively. It will always depend on an authority – in Germany, the BAFA – enforcing them adequately and effectively. Or if there is a complaints mechanism, injured parties from other countries must have genuine opportunities to take legal action. And there is also a lack of enforcement mechanisms across the board. So consumer rights mechanisms could conceivably give the whole thing a bit of a push.

Nadine Kreutzer:

As concerned citizens, what should we now be focusing on in relation to the EU supply chain law? What should we look out for in the coming days and weeks, in the press and in the reporting, in order to stay up to date on this issue? What are the next major steps?

Mandy Schossig:

I should add that we are recording on 27 April because you mentioned a couple of days ago that there will be a few days between recording and release.

Peter Gailhofer:

For anyone interested in this topic, it is certainly worth keeping an eye on the trilogue process. Negotiations are currently under way between the governments; this means that the Commission, the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union are discussing precisely what will be included in the law. And here, the devil is in the detail. Which companies will be covered? Which sanction mechanisms will be established, and how far will the obligations go?

For example, it has just been announced that product use will be excluded from the risk analysis. So companies will not need to consider the post-manufacturing stage; in other words, what happens

once the products are in use. But this may be highly relevant in many cases, such as chemicals or pesticides. The use of some products may cause harm to health or the environment. And excluding this would leave a lamentable gap in the legislation. It is a complex issue but for anyone interested, the debate and the policy-making process are very exciting.

Outlook and conclusion

Mandy Schossig:

We will keep that in mind. And as we know, we always end the show with the Chancellor question. We now have the German Act on Corporate Due Diligence in Supply Chains. But if you were Chancellor, what action would you take in order to oblige businesses to build more sustainability into their supply chains?

Peter Gailhofer:

Oh, that's a very difficult question. The more you look at it, the more you realise that it's an incredibly complex topic and that there are many potential areas where leverage must be applied. But in the context of this specific law, what I think is very important is to include provisions on liability – because it is an unacceptable situation if people who are injured or fall sick or die more or less as a direct result of decisions made by German companies have no legal comeback and cannot seek compensation. In my view, liability is an ethical imperative. There shouldn't be these gaps in the law.

Mandy Schossig:

OK, so you are the Chancellor and you have amended the law – which is not how it works, as we know – who would be able to bring legal proceedings? As a private individual, can I come along and sue? How does this usually work?

Peter Gailhofer:

The usual approach is that if you suffer some kind of harm here in Germany, you find an attorney and go to court and you sue the person who injured you. And in principle, that applies on a cross-border basis as well. However, there is a whole series of obstacles which this kind of law should eliminate. Unfortunately, the German law doesn't do that.

Nadine Kreutzer:

So we need to keep an eye on the trilogue. Are there any other sources that you can recommend? The Oeko-Institut website is always one, of course, but are there any other websites that you would say are worth looking at if anyone is interested in supply chains or would like to follow up on the issue?

Peter Gailhofer:

In Germany, there is an active NGO network, the [Initiative Lieferkettengesetz](#), which provides information on the latest developments. They also issue press releases and are involved in the debate. That is one option.

Nadine Kreutzer:

We will include a link for you all in our shownotes.

Mandy Schossig:

Yes, exactly. Thank you so much, Peter, for breaking down our questions on this complex topic and providing some answers. It's much appreciated.

Peter Gailhofer:

You're very welcome, it was a pleasure.

Nadine Kreutzer:

Many thanks.

Mandy Schossig:

Next time, we will be discussing another type of transition, this time with a focus on land use. We will be looking at our farming system and examining the climate targets in this context. After all, how we use our land has a major impact on the climate and the environment. Hannes Böttcher has already reported on this in our episode on forests. So next time, we will be looking at how we can manage our arable land sustainably. We will also be discussing the role of livestock farming and how agriculture and biodiversity go together.

Nadine Kreutzer:

If you have any questions on the topic ahead of the broadcast, please send them to podcast@oeko.de. We are always very pleased to receive your comments and feedback and perhaps even a short review on your favourite social media channel. We'll be back soon to talk about farming. Until then, thank you for listening!

Mandy Schossig:

See you soon.

Nadine Kreutzer:

Goodbye for now.