

BEYOND SHORT-TERM PROFITS: Why the EU must defend the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive and the Green Deal

The EU Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD) is a crucial and effective step towards an economy that respects human rights, the environment and the climate, and that frames business activities in a way that is compatible within planetary boundaries. Both in Europe and the Global South, positive economic effects are expected alongside the enforcement of human rights and environmental standards.¹ In turbulent times, the CSDDD also creates an incentive for the European economy to pursue forward-looking specialization, where profits are no longer made at the expense of human rights and the environment.

As economists, we therefore decisively advocate for a swift and ambitious implementation of the CSDDD and oppose the Omnibus I package proposal of the EU Commission, which would significantly limit the effectiveness of the directive.

A civil liability regime across the EU for damages caused by companies, and revenue-linked fines are indispensable to steer economic activities towards sustainable paths and ensure the right of affected parties to compensation. Due diligence obligations must not be limited to direct suppliers, where the risks are generally lowest. The CSDDD also introduced an obligation for companies to put into effect climate transition plans: an imperative given the urgency of the climate crisis. Any backtracking on these points would represent a blow to future-proof and resilient value chains.

The Commission presents the Omnibus I package as part of a so-called "simplification revolution" within the framework of the *New European Competitiveness Deal*, which would rely "on trust in companies". The Commission claims to base its initiative, among other things, on a report of Mario Draghi commissioned by Ursula von der Leyen.² However, the main report does not even mention the CSDDD, while the annexed in-depth analysis only states in one single sentence, that "the EU's sustainability reporting and due diligence framework is a major source of regulatory burden", without providing any empirical evidence.³

As economists, we disagree with a concept of competition that accepts the externalization of social and environmental costs at the expense of nature, the climate, workers and other affected

¹ Jäger, J., Durán, G., Schmidt, L. (2023): Expected economic effects of the EU Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD). AK Wien, 2023. DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.18216.34560

² COM(2025) 81 final, Explanatory Memorandum, p. 2:
https://finance.ec.europa.eu/document/download/161070f0-aca7-4b44-b20a-52bd879575bc_en?filename=proposal-directive-amending-accounting-audit-csrd-csddd-directives_en.pdf.

³ Mario Draghi: The future of European competitiveness. Part A: A competitiveness strategy for Europe, September 2024, and: Mario Draghi: The future of European competitiveness. Part B. In depth-analysis and recommendations, September 2024, p. 318.

parties along global supply chains. Economically, legally, and ethically, it is not acceptable for the general public and future generations to bear the ecological and social costs of irresponsible corporate practices. Already, the costs of environmental destruction and the climate crisis are enormous. The longer we allow this destruction to continue, the more we harm ourselves and the European economy.

We also strongly disagree with the hypothesis that the CSDDD and other sustainability rules within the framework of the *European Green Deal* hinder the competitiveness of the European economy. The growth dip and the decline of the European economy in global competition are due to other structural and political factors:

- The energy price crisis following the Russian attack on Ukraine and the loss of Russian energy imports;
- The crisis of the export-oriented economic model due to a global decline in demand and geopolitical conflicts including drastically increasing US tariffs;
- The decline in domestic demand in Europe due to low-wage policies and the redistribution of welfare gains from bottom to top;
- Decades of investment backlog in public infrastructure and public services due to restrictive fiscal policies;
- Inadequate industrial policies in key and future areas such as renewable energy and electromobility;
- The shortage of skilled workers due to underfunding of education and training and overly restrictive immigration policies.

Unnecessary bureaucracy certainly is not desirable if it causes costs, slows down processes, hampers investments and does not have positive effects. However, as a study by the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW) shows, a major problem may also be the underfunding of public administrations, which extremely delays the processing of applications and approval procedures.⁴ Moreover, we call for a clear distinction between unnecessary bureaucracy on the one hand and necessary public regulations on the other, which are required to ensure product quality, occupational safety, health, and to protect consumer, labor and human rights as well as the environment and the climate.

Public regulations and their enforcement are generally associated with costs. However, these must be weighed against the benefits. The implementation costs of the CSDDD are very moderate. A study by the London School of Economics (LSE) commissioned by the EU Commission estimates the implementation costs of human rights and environmental due diligence obligations for large companies at an average of 0.009 percent of their revenues.⁵

The argument that the CSDDD would impose excessive burdens on companies is fundamentally flawed. Indeed, it overlooks the fact that companies can access the necessary data without

⁴ Alexander S. Kritikos, Sara Amoroso and Benedikt Herrmann: Verwaltungsqualität entscheidet mehr als Regulierungsdichte über Wachstumspotenziale von Unternehmen, DIW Wochenbericht 42/2023.

⁵ European Commission (2020): Study on due diligence requirements through the supply chain. Final Report. Brussel 2020.

incurring significant additional costs. The data are often already publicly available, also thanks to existing EU reporting frameworks.⁶ Furthermore, empirical evidence clearly demonstrates that limiting the scope to direct business partners (Tier 1) and excluding other partners— as proposed by the Commission— would severely undermine the effectiveness of the CSDDD. Finally, the legal risks under the CSDDD are clearly defined. Under the EU directive, companies would only be held civilly liable if firstly they would breach the well-defined due diligence and, secondly, this breach would cause damage.

In addition, independent studies indicate that many companies support supply chain laws while corporate lobbying associations often oppose them: In Germany, for instance, only seven per cent of companies reject mandatory due diligence, as a 2024 study by the *Handelsblatt Research Institute* commissioned by *Creditreform* based on a representative survey of 2,000 decision-makers in German companies revealed.⁷ 81 per cent of respondents stated that they already comply with or partially comply with the due diligence obligations. A third of respondents also see business opportunities in this, such as an increase in corporate reputation, higher quality of components for manufacturing, and improved resilience in the supply chain. Many companies of all sizes and industries have also explicitly endorsed the CSDDD in recent months and opposed any opening or postponement.⁸

Sustainability regulations are starting to have an impact, as evidenced in an independent study published by the EU Platform for Sustainable Finance.⁹ Compromising sustainability reporting regulation at this time would highly destabilize the legal framework and create uncertainty for investors and most likely halt progress achieved until now. It also risks undermining key initiatives like the *Clean Industrial Deal*.¹⁰ Indeed, private investors are essential in closing the huge investment gap of over 750 bn highlighted in the Draghi Report. Without parameters that can guide their investment decisions towards sustainable economic activities, a dangerous level of incoherence and unclarity could arise.

For these reasons, we call on:

- **The Commission, the EU Council, and the members of the European Parliament** to ensure a timely and ambitious implementation of the CSDDD and other regulations of the *European Green Deal*. The social and ecological transformation of the economy has become more necessary than ever in times of crisis, conflict and the rise of extreme rightwing parties.
- **Policymakers** to demonstrate their commitment to human rights and sustainability, reaffirm the EU's leadership in these areas, and ensure that the European economy is positioned to thrive in a future defined by sustainability and resilience.

⁶ FICSC-EUCSDDD. Data. <https://www.fh-vie.ac.at/en/pages/research/research-projects/ficsc-eucsddd>.

⁷ Sabine Haupt und Frank Christian May: Sorgfaltspflichten in der Lieferkette. Wo steht die deutsche Wirtschaft? Handelsblatts Research Institute und Verband der Vereine der Creditreform e.V. 2024.

⁸ <https://www.we-support-the-csddd.eu/>.

⁹ EU Platform on Sustainable Finance: A Compendium of Market Practices. How the EU's Taxonomy and sustainable finance framework are helping financial and non-financial actors transition to net zero, January 2024.

¹⁰ <https://www.unpri.org/download?ac=22691>.

SIGNATORIES

AUSTRIA

1.	Prof. Dr.	Johannes Jäger	University of Applied Sciences BFi Vienna
2.	Dr.	Rainer Bartel	JKU Linz
3.	Prof. Dr., Ph.D.	Michael Getzner	TU Wien
4.	Ao. Univ. Prof. Dr.	Andreas Novy	Vienna University of Economics and Business
5.	Dr.	Leonhard Plank	TU Wien
6.	Director	Werner Raza	Austrian Foundation for Development Research
7.	Prof. (FH) Mag. Dr.	Christian Reiner	Lauder Business School
8.	Prof. Dr.	Sigrid Stagl	Vienna University of Economics and Business
9.	Dr.	Sebastian Thieme	Katholische Sozialakademie Österreichs (Wien)

BELGIUM

10.	Professeur émérite	Isabelle Cassiers	Université catholique de Louvain
11.	Prof. Dr.	Ferdi De Ville	Ghent University
12.	Prof. Dr.	Clément Fontan	UcLouvain
13.	Prof. Dr.	Erik Paredis	Ghent University
14.	Prof. Dr.	Cathy Macharis	Vrije Universiteit Brussel
15.	Prof. Dr.	Kevin Maréchal	Université de Liège
16.	Prof.	Koen Schoors	University of Ghent
17.	Dr.	Norman Vander Putten	UcLouvain
18.	Prof. Dr.	Jonas Van der Slycken	Ghent University & Vrije Universiteit Brussel
19.	Dr.	Hielke Van Doorslaer	University of Ghent
20.	Dr.	Josefine Vanhille	University of Antwerp
21.	Prof. Dr.	Mattias Vermeiren	University of Ghent

FRANCE

22.	Prof.	Laurence Scialom	Université Paris Nanterre
23.	Ass. Prof.	Jézabel Couppey-Soubeyran	Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne University
24.	Prof. Dr.	Agnès Labrousse	Sciences Po Lyon
25.	Director of Research Emeritus	Pascal Petit	Sorbonne Paris Nord
26.	Researcher	Gaël Plumecocq	INRAE of Toulouse
27.	Prof. Dr.	Yamina Tadjeddine	Université de Lorraine
28.	Ass. Prof, Dr.	Christophe Thibierge	ESCP Business School

GERMANY

29.	Prof. Dr.	Isabella Weber	University of Massachusetts Amherst
30.	Dr.	Julian Bank	Universität Duisburg-Essen
31.	Dr.	Tom Bauermann	Hans-Böckler-Stiftung
32.	Prof. Dr.	Silke Bustamante	HWR Berlin
33.	Dr.	Thomas Dürmeier	Goliathwatch e.V.
34.	Prof. Dr.	Trevor Evans	HWR Berlin
35.	Jun.-Prof. Dr.	Svenja Flechtner	Universität Siegen
36.	Prof. Dr. habil.	Lisa Fröhlich	Ispira Think Tank für nachhaltige Lieferketten
37.	Prof. Dr.	Eckhard Hein	HWR Berlin

38.	Prof. Dr. (i.R.)	Hansjörg Herr	HWR Berlin
39.	Dr.	Frank Hoffer	Global Labour University
40.	Dr.	Patrick Kaczmarczyk	Universität Mannheim
41.	Prof. Dr.	Jakob Kapeller	Universität Duisburg-Essen
42.	Dr.	Steffen Lehndorff	Institut Arbeit und Qualifikation / University of Duisburg-Essen
43.	Prof. Dr.	Martina Metzger	Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht Berlin
44.	Dr.	Zeynep Nettekoven	Europäische Akademie der Arbeit in der Universität Frankfurt am Main
45.	Prof. Dr.	Andrea Pelzeter	HWR Berlin
46.	Prof. Dr.	Sandra Rochnowski	Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht Berlin
47.	Prof. Dr. (i.R.)	Christoph Scherrer	Universität Kassel
48.	Prof. Dr.	Stefan Seuring	Universität Kassel
49.	Prof. Dr.	Christina Teipen	HWR Berlin
50.	Prof. Dr.	Markus Wissen	HWR Berlin

GREECE

51.	Board Member	Marica Frangakis	Nicos Poulantzas Institute
-----	--------------	------------------	----------------------------

IRELAND

52.	Co-Director	Tom McDonnell	Nevin Economic Research Institute
53.	Senior Research Officer	Michael Taft	SIPTU Trade Union

ITALY

54.	Full Professor	Leonardo Becchetti	University of Rome Tor Vergata
55.	Prof.	Marco Bellucci	University of Florence
56.	Full Professor	Mario Biggeri	University of Florence
57.	Associate professor	Sabrina Bonomi	eCampus University
58.	Full Professor	Marcella Corsi	Sapienza University of Rome
59.	Prof. PhD	Pasquale De Muro	Roma Tre University
60.	Full Professor	Rosario Faraci	University of Catania
61.	Prof. PhD	Elisa Giuliani	University of Pisa
62.	Prof. Emeritus	Benedetto Gui	Istituto Universitario Sophia
63.	Prof.	Laura Pennacchi	Fondazione Basso
64.	Prof.	Mario Pianta	Scuola Normale Superiore
65.	Full Professor	Luciano Pilotti	University of Milan
66.	Full Professor	Francesco Rullani	Ca' Foscari University of Venice
67.	Prof. PhD	Francesco Zirpoli	Ca' Foscari University of Venice

NETHERLANDS

68.	Prof. Dr.	Rutger Claassen	Utrecht University
69.	Prof.	Marleen Janssen Groesbeek	Avans UAS, Tilburg
70.	Prof. Dr.	Karen Maas	Open University Heerlen/Impact Centre Erasmus
71.	Director	Paul Schenderling	Postgroei Nederland
72.	Prof. Dr.	Hans Schenk	Utrecht University
73.	Chief Economist	Hans Stegeman	Triodos Bank
74.	Dr.	Tania Treibich	Maastricht University
75.	Prof.	Irene van Staveren	Institute of Social Studies, EUR

76.	Economic fellow	Rens van Tilburg	Institute for Environmental Studies VU University
77.	Dr.	Jens van 't Klooster	University of Amsterdam

PORTUGAL

78.	Prof. PhD	Ricardo Barradas	Iscte - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa
79.	Prof. Dr.	Helena Lopes	Iscte - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

SPAIN

80.	Prof. Dr.	Luis Buendía	University of León (Spain)
81.	Prof. Dr.	Beatriz Fernández Olit	Universidad de Alcalá
82.	Professor	Giorgos Kallis	ICTA/UAB
83.	Member	José Ángel Moreno	Economistas sin Fronteras
84.	Prof. Dr.	Orencio Vázquez Oteo	UNED

SWEDEN

85	Dr.	Felix Schulz	Lund University; University of Leeds
----	-----	--------------	--------------------------------------

SWITZERLAND

86	Prof. Dr.	Nicolas Pons-Vignon	University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland
87	Prof. em. Dr.	Peter Ulrich	Universität St. Gallen

UNITED KINGDOM

88.	Asst. Prof. Dr.	Richard Bärnthaler	University of Leeds
89.	Dr.	Benjamin Braun	London School of Economics and Political Science
90.	Prof. Ph.D	Magnus Ryner	King's College London