

## EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board Consultation Survey 1

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.



## EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board Consultation Survey 1A - 1C, 2

### Consultation survey structure

#### 1. Overall European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) Exposure Drafts' relevance (Survey 1)

- 1A. Architecture
- 1B. Implementation of Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) principles
- 1C. Exposure Drafts' content

#### 2. European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) implementation prioritisation / phasing-in (Survey 1)

#### 3. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements (Survey 2)

- 3A. Cross cutting standards
- 3B Environmental standards
- 3C Social standards
- 3D Governance standards

---

### Respondent Profile

#### 1. Personal details

\* Organisation name

*50 character(s) maximum*

ClientEarth

\* First name

50 character(s) maximum

Maria

\* Surname

50 character(s) maximum

Petzsch

\* Email (this information will not be published or made public)

50 character(s) maximum

mpetzsch@clientearth.org

\* Country of origin

50 character(s) maximum

United Kingdom

\* 2. Type of respondent

- Academic / research institution
- Audit firm, assurance provider and/or accounting firm
- Business association
- Consumer organization
- ESG reporting initiative
- EU Citizen
- Financial institution (Bank)
- Financial institution (Other financial Market Participant, including pension funds and other asset managers)
- Financial institution (Insurance)
- National Standard Setter
- Non-governmental organisation
- Non-financial corporation with securities listed on EU regulated markets
- Non-financial corporation with securities listed outside EU regulated markets
- Public authority/regulator/supervisor
- Rating agency and analysts
- Trade unions or other workers representatives
- Unlisted non-financial corporations
- Other

\* 3. Size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more employees)
- Not relevant

**\* 4. User/Preparer perspective**

- User
- Preparer
- Both
- Neither

**\* 5. Subject to CSRD**

Separate non-financial corps subject to CSRD from those not subject to CSRD?

- Yes
- No

---

**EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board Consultation Survey 1A - 1C, 2**

## **1A. Overall ESRS Exposure Drafts' relevance – Architecture**

---

### **Cross-cutting and topical standards**

To facilitate a coherent coverage of the CSRD topics and reporting areas (as per Article 19a paragraph 2 and Article 19b paragraph 2 – see Appendix II) the Exposure Drafts (“EDs”) submitted for public consultation are based upon two categories of standards:

• **Cross-cutting ESRS** which:

1. Establish the general principles to be followed when preparing sustainability reporting in line with the CSRD provisions
2. Mandate Disclosure Requirements (“DRs”) aimed at providing an understanding of (a) strategy and business model, (b) governance and organisation, and (c) materiality assessment, covering all topics.

• **Topical ESRS** which, from a sector-agnostic perspective:

1. Provide topic-specific application guidance in relation to the cross-cutting DRs on strategy and business model, governance, materiality assessment
2. Mandate DRs about the undertaking’s implementation of its sustainability-related objectives (i.e. on its policies, targets, actions and action plans, and allocation of resources)
3. Mandate performance measurement metrics.

A full list of standards and whether they are cross-cutting standards or topical standards can be found in Appendix I.

**Q1: in your opinion, to what extent do the structure and articulation of cross-cutting and topical standards adequately support the coverage of CSRD topics and reporting areas?**

- Not at all

- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

We have concentrated our review on ESRS 1, ESRS 2, ESRS E1 - Climate change ("ESRS E1"), and ESRS E5 – Resource Use and Circular economy ("ESRS E5"). We have not assessed the ESRSs as a whole for adequacy or consistency with the final consolidated text of the CSRD, adopted in June 2022 ("CSRD final text").

## Alignment and interoperability with international standards and frameworks

- Article 19b paragraph 3a of the CSRD requires that "When adopting delegated acts pursuant to paragraph 1, the Commission shall take account of the work of global standard-setting initiatives for sustainability reporting, and existing standards and frameworks for natural capital accounting, responsible business conduct, corporate social responsibility, and sustainable development."
- ESRS EDs were drafted accordingly, with the objective of fostering as much alignment as possible considering the constraints imposed by other provisions included in articles 19a and 19b as per the CSRD proposal. Details of these provisions and how they are covered by the ESRS EDs can be found in Appendix I.
- The structure and organisation of the reporting areas was one aspect of alignment to which particular attention was paid. Thus, the two categories of standards are organised to cover the reporting areas in relation to governance, strategy, assessment/management of impacts, risks and opportunities, and targets/metrics (as considered by the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures - TCFD and source of inspiration for the IFRS Sustainability standards). A detailed mapping of the ESRS EDs disclosure requirements with TCFD recommendations and with IFRS Sustainability Exposure Drafts can be found in Appendices 5 and 6.

**Q2: in your opinion, to what extent is the TCFD framework of reporting areas (governance, strategy, risk management and metrics/targets) compatible with the structure of the ESRS?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

Structurally, the TCFD framework and ESRSs are different, but we consider they are broadly compatible. The ESRSs are stronger and require undertakings to go further in their reporting, including (as Appendix 4 ESRS identified) by clearer reference to alignment with limiting global warming to 1.5°C (i.e. putting in place a transition plan). Undertakings are also asked under the ESRSs to expand on a double materiality assessment. We strongly support the science-based approach in the ESRS E1 and, in particular, the exclusion of the use of carbon credits to achieve GHG emission reduction targets (subject to our detailed comments on ESRS E1 in response to this survey). Undertakings reporting under the TCFD framework should, in our view, be enabled to build on those disclosures when disclosing under these ESRSs.

**Q3: in your opinion, to what extent does the approach taken to structure the reporting areas promote interoperability between the ESRS and the IFRS Sustainability Exposure Drafts?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

We have not assessed interoperability between the ESRSs and IFRS Sustainability Exposure Drafts.

## Consideration given to EU policies and legislation

Article 19b paragraph 3 of the CSRD also requires that “When adopting delegated acts pursuant to paragraph 1, the Commission shall take account of:

1. the information that financial market participants need to comply with their disclosure obligations laid down in Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 and the delegated acts adopted pursuant to that Regulation - **Sustainable Finance Disclosure Requirements**;
2. the criteria set out in the delegated acts adopted pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2020/852 - **Taxonomy Regulation**;
3. the disclosure requirements applicable to benchmarks administrators in the benchmark statement and in the benchmark methodology and the minimum standards for the construction of EU Climate Transition Benchmarks and EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks in accordance with Commission Delegated Regulations (EU) 2020/1816\*8, (EU) 2020/1817 and (EU) 2020/1818 - **Benchmark Regulation**;
4. the disclosures specified in the implementing acts adopted pursuant to Article 434a of Regulation (EU) No 575/2013; **Prudential requirements for Credit Institutions and Investment Firms**;
5. Commission Recommendation 2013/179/EU; **European Commission recommendation on the life cycle environmental performance of products and services**;
6. Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council; **GHG allowance Directive**;
7. Regulation (EC) No 1221/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council; **EMAS regulation**.

**Q4: in your opinion, have these European legislation and initiatives been considered properly?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

**Q5: are there any other European policies and legislation you would suggest should be considered more fully?**

The explanatory memorandum of the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (“CSDDD”) states that the CSRD and the CSDDD are two initiatives closely interrelated that will lead to synergies. The CSRD and the ESRs will be critical for the effectiveness of the CSDDD, as the CSRD in particular covers the reporting stage of the due diligence duty.

Among other advantages, public reporting should allow consumers to better understand a company’s connection to actual and potential adverse environmental and human rights impacts. It should also enable users of these disclosures to test the effectiveness of the company’s due diligence. In order to be effective, reporting requirements should not include so-called “comply or explain” provisions, but rather specify in detail the elements that should be included in reports, including the steps described in article 19a.2(e) CSRD final text. EFRAG should notably emphasise the critical role of value chain transparency and the need for information about the undertaking’s upstream and downstream value chain.

## Coverage of sustainability topics

Article 19b paragraph 2 of the CSRD proposal defines the sustainability subject matters (referred to as sustainability topics or subtopics in the ESRs) that the sustainability reporting standards shall address when defining the sustainability information required by article 19a paragraphs 1 and 2 of the CSRD. The ESRs architecture was designed to cover all the detailed subject matters listed in article 19b paragraph 2 for environment-, social- and governance-related matters and to ensure that sustainability information is reported in a carefully articulated manner.

In terms of timing of adoption of European sustainability reporting standards, article 19b paragraph 1 of the CSRD requires the Commission to adopt:

- a first set of sustainability standards covering the information required by article 19a and at least specifying information needed by financial market participants subject to the [SFDR reporting obligations](#)
- a second set of standards covering information that is specific to the sector in which undertakings operate.

Also, article 19c of the CSRD proposal on sustainability reporting standards for SMEs requires the Commission to adopt SME-proportionate standards in a second set.

As a consequence, as per article 19b paragraph 1, are only included in this first set of ESRS Exposure Drafts:

1. the two cross-cutting standards on General principles (ESRS 1) and on General, strategy, governance and materiality assessment (ESRS 2);
2. the eleven topical (sector-agnostic) standards covering environment- (ESRS E1 to E5), social- (ESRS S1 to S4) and governance-related (ESRS G1 and G2) sustainability topics.

A detailed list of ESRS EDs can be found in Appendix I. And the detailed provisions of the CSRD and how they are covered by the ESRS EDs can be found in Appendix II.

**Q6: in your opinion, to what extent does the proposed coverage of set 1 adequately address CSRD sustainability topics?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have.

We have not assessed the ESRSs as a whole for how they address CSRD sustainability topics. Bearing in mind that limitation, we nonetheless note that ESRS E1 needs to be updated to ensure alignment with the CSRD final text, and we provide specific comments in response to the specific questions relevant to that ESRS E1.

**Q7: in your opinion, to what extent does the proposed coverage of set 1 (see Appendix I) adequately address SFDR reporting obligations?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

If you think this coverage and its implementation could be improved in any way, please specify how and to what specific SFDR indicator your comment relates

We have not assessed interoperability between the ESRSs and the SFRD.

## Sustainability statements and the links with other parts of corporate reporting

For clarity and ease of use, standardised sustainability reporting shall be easily identifiable within the management report (MR). To that effect, ESRS 1 – General principles (paragraphs 145 to 152) prescribes how to organise the information required by ESRS. It offers three options (paragraphs 148 and 149) for undertakings to consider when preparing their sustainability reporting:

- a single separately identifiable section of the MR;
- four separately identifiable parts of the MR:
  1. General information;
  2. Environment;
  3. Social;
  4. Governance
- one separately identifiable part per ESRS in the MR.

The first option is the preferred option. When applying the other two options the entity shall report a location table to identify where disclosures are presented in the MR.

In order to foster linkage throughout the undertaking’s corporate reporting, ESRS 1 also:

- prescribes that the undertaking adopts presentation practices that promote cohesiveness between its sustainability reporting and: (a) the information provided in the other parts of the management report, (b) its financial statements (FS), and (c) other sustainability-related regulated information (paragraphs 131 to 134)
- promotes the incorporation of information by reference to other parts of the corporate reporting in order to avoid redundancy (paragraphs 135 and 136)
- organises connectivity with the financial statements by prescribing how to include monetary amounts or other quantitative data points directly presented in the financial statements (paragraphs 137 to 143).

**Q8: Do you agree with the proposed three options?**

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

**Q9: would you recommend any other option(s)?**

If so, please describe the proposed alternative option(s)

ESRS 1 should formulate a recommendation which respects the CSRD final text, namely that information to be disclosed “shall be clearly identifiable within the management report through a dedicated section of the management report” (paragraph 19a(1), as amended).

In addition, within the dedicated section of the management report, undertakings should report on each of the ESRSs in the order in which they have been presented in the delegated act. The reason for this is that users of this information should be able to easily identify which standards an undertaking is reporting on and how, and if not, why not.

**Q10: in your opinion, to what extent do you believe that connectivity between the sustainability reporting and other parts of the management report has been appropriately addressed?**

- Not at all



- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

**Q11: in your opinion, to what extent does the incorporation of information in the Sustainability section by reference to other parts of the management report support cohesiveness throughout corporate reporting?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

**Q12: in your opinion, to what extent do the requirements and provisions on how to include monetary amounts and other financial statement-related quantitative data into sustainability reporting support connectivity with the financial statements?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

We strongly support paragraph 41 (asserting that in many cases disclosures will be better understood in the context of information in the financial statements) and section 5.2 (on Connectivity with Financial Statements) in ESRS 1.

In general, we consider that consistent and decision-useful disclosures across both narrative reporting and financial statements are paramount for users of sustainability (and especially climate) disclosures to be able to conduct a straightforward and efficient assessment of the credibility of undertakings' transition plans. To

that end, undertakings' disclosures should:

- (i) affirm that accounting assumptions are consistent with their sustainability disclosures;
- (ii) cross-reference to where in the notes to the accounts the approach to sustainability is explained; and
- (iii) on climate, confirm whether Paris-aligned assumptions are used in the accounts and if not, where a sensitivity to such assumptions is provided.

We recommend that these factors be considered in finalising the ESRs.

## 1B. Overall ESRs Exposure Drafts relevance – Implementation of CSRD principles

---

### Characteristics of information quality

Article 19a paragraph 2 of the CSRD proposal states that “the sustainability reporting standards referred to in paragraph 1 shall require that the information to be reported is understandable, relevant, representative, verifiable, comparable, and is represented in a faithful manner.”

As a consequence, ESRs 1 - *General principles* defines how such qualities of information shall be met:

- Relevance is defined in paragraphs 26 to 28
- Faithful representation is defined in paragraphs 29 to 32
- Comparability is defined in paragraphs 33 and 34
- Verifiability is defined in paragraphs 35 to 37
- Understandability is defined in paragraphs 38 to 41

**Q13: to what extent do you think that the principle of relevance of sustainability information is adequately defined and prescribed?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

While the relevance of the sustainability information for stakeholders is key, it should not supersede the fact that "materiality is to be understood as the criterion for the inclusion of specific information in sustainability reports" (see Paragraph 43, ESRs 1).

**Q14: to what extent do you think that the principle of faithful representation of sustainability information is adequately defined and prescribed?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully

- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

We support the neutrality point, but the language on “netting” in Paragraph 31 is unclear. We think that there could be several readings. It should be clarified that, in principle, the rule should be that no netted information is allowed, particularly where, as in ESRS E1, the presentation of information is expressly addressed (see for example disclosure requirement ESRS E1-3).

If the undertaking has no other option than to present netted information, then on top of the recommendations made under paragraph 31 last sentence, the company should also provide gross information to enable an informed comparison.

In addition to the current fundamental principles of information quality, we wish to highlight that sustainability information should, whenever possible and/or relevant to environmental reporting, be established by the best nature and climate science currently available. We think that this point should be either reflected throughout the rest of the principles or become a standalone principle.

This would achieve greater consistency with Recital (26) of the CSRD final text, which states that “It is especially important that plans related to climate are based on the latest science, including IPCC reports and reports by the European Scientific Advisory Board on Climate Change.”

**Q15: to what extent do you think that the principle of comparability of sustainability information is adequately defined and prescribed?**

- Not at all  
 To a limited extent with strong reservations  
 To a large extent with some reservations  
 Fully  
 No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

Consistency is the bedrock of comparability of information. Without prejudice to that position, in paragraph 34, ESRS 1, “Consistency” should not preclude the ability to use more up to date methods as they evolve.

**Q16: to what extent do you think that the principle of verifiability of sustainability information is adequately defined and prescribed?**

- Not at all  
 To a limited extent with strong reservations  
 To a large extent with some reservations  
 Fully  
 No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

**Q17: to what extent do you think that the principle of understandability of sustainability information is adequately defined and prescribed?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

We believe that Paragraph 38, ESRS 1, should be amended to add “comprehensive” in addition to the requirement that sustainability information be “clear and concise”.

In Paragraph 40, we think that in point (ii) the words “including information also provided in financial statements” should be deleted, as the matter is already correctly addressed under Paragraph 41.

## Double materiality

Double materiality is a principle that is central to the CSRD proposal and is represented accordingly in the ESRS materiality assessment approach that sustains the definition of mandatory requirements by the cross-cutting and topical standards. This is also true of the materiality assessment any undertaking is expected to perform, per ESRS 2 – *General, strategy, governance and materiality assessment*, to identify its principal sustainability risks, impacts and opportunities. This in turn, defines what sustainability information must be reported by the undertaking.

**Double materiality assessment** supports the determination of whether information on a sustainability matter has to be included in the undertaking’s sustainability report. ESRS 1 paragraph 46 states that “a sustainability matter meets the criteria of double materiality if it is material from an impact perspective or from a financial perspective or from both.” Further indications as to how to implement double materiality is given by ESRS 2 Disclosure Requirement 2-IRO 1, paragraph 74b(iii) and AG 68.

While recognising that both perspectives are intertwined the Exposure Drafts contain provisions about how to implement the two perspectives in their own rights.

**Q18: in your opinion, to what extent does the definition of double materiality (as per ESRS 1 paragraph 46) foster the identification of sustainability information that would meet the needs of all stakeholders?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
-

- Fully  
 No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

**Q19: to what extent do you think that the proposed implementation of double materiality (as per ESRS 2-IRO 1, paragraph 74b(iii) and AG 61) is practically feasible?**

- Not at all  
 To a limited extent with strong reservations  
 To a large extent with some reservations  
 Fully  
 No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

## Impact materiality

- A definition of impact materiality is given by ESRS 1 paragraph 49: “a sustainability matter is material from an impact perspective if the undertaking is connected to actual or potential significant impacts on people or the environment over the short, medium or long term. This includes impacts directly caused or contributed to by the undertaking and impacts which are otherwise directly linked to the undertaking’s upstream and downstream value chain.”
- A description of how to determine impact materiality and implement impact materiality assessment can be found in ESRS 1 *paragraph 51* and is complemented by ESRS 2 *Disclosure Requirement 2-IRO 1, paragraph 74b(iii), AG 64 and AG 68.*

**Q20: in your opinion, to what extent is the definition of impact materiality (as per ESRS 1 paragraph 49) aligned with that of international standards?**

- Not at all  
 To a limited extent with strong reservations  
 To a large extent with some reservations  
 Fully  
 No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

**Q21: to what extent do you think that the determination and implementation of impact materiality (as proposed by ESRS 1 paragraph 51) is practically feasible?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

## Financial materiality

- A definition of financial materiality is given by ESRS 1 paragraph 53: “a matter is material from a financial perspective if it triggers or may trigger significant financial effects on the undertaking, i.e., it generates risks or opportunities that influence or are likely to influence the future cash flows and therefore the enterprise value of the undertaking in the short, medium or long term, but it is not captured or not yet fully captured by financial reporting at the reporting date.”
- A description of how to determine financial materiality and implement financial materiality assessment can be found in ESRS 1 paragraphs 54 to 56 and is complemented by ESRS 2 Disclosure Requirement 2-IRO 1, paragraph 74b(iii), AG 65 and AG 69.

**Q22: in your opinion, to what extent is the definition of financial materiality (as per ESRS 1 paragraph 53) aligned with that of international standards?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

**Q23: to what extent do you think that the determination and implementation of financial materiality (as proposed by ESRS 1 paragraphs 54 to 56) is practically feasible?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

## **(Materiality) Rebuttable presumption**

Central to the ESRS is the critical combination of two key elements:

- the mandatory nature of disclosure requirements prescribed by ESRS, and
- the pivotal importance of the assessment by the undertaking of its material impacts, risks and opportunities.

The combination of the two is designed to make sure that the entity will report on its material impacts, risks and opportunities, but on all of them.

The assessment of materiality applies not just to a given sustainability matter covered by a given ESRS (like ESRS E3 on biodiversity for example), but also to each one of the specific disclosure requirements included in that ESRS. However, this excludes the cross-cutting standards and related disclosure requirements, which are always material and must be reported in all cases.

When a sustainability matter is deemed material as a result of its materiality assessment, the undertaking must apply the requirements in ESRS related to these material matters (except for the few optional requirements identified as such in ESRS). Conversely, disclosure requirements in ESRS that relate to matters that are not material for the undertaking are not to be reported.

The (materiality) rebuttable presumption mechanism described in ESRS 1 paragraphs 57 to 62 aims at supporting the implementation and documentation of the materiality assessment of the undertaking at a granular level.

ESRS 1 paragraphs 58 to 62 describe how to implement the rebuttable presumption principles. In particular, “The undertaking shall therefore assess for each ESRS and, when relevant, for a group of disclosure requirements related to a specific aspect covered by an ESRS if the presumption is rebutted for:

1. all of the mandatory disclosures of an entire ESRS or
2. a group of DR related to a specific aspect covered by an ESRS,

Based on reasonable and supportable evidence, in which case it is deemed to be complied with through a statement that:

1. the ESRS or
2. the group of DR is “not material for the undertaking”.

Q24: to what extent do you think that the (materiality) rebuttable presumption and its proposed implementation will support relevant, accurate and efficient documentation of the results of the materiality assessment?

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

In relation to paragraphs 57 to 62 of ESRS 1, we would strongly support an amendment to the effect that mandatory disclosure requirements established by ESRS shall be material and, therefore, subject to full disclosure in accordance with the relevant ESRS. As currently drafted, this is a presumption only. We are concerned that undertakings are afforded too much leeway by being able to rebut that presumption, whereas the double materiality assessment already allows for sufficient analysis of material versus non material risks, impacts and opportunities. Instead of focussing on establishing materiality to enable effective and meaningful disclosures, undertakings may be led to focus instead on establishing that they have complied with a disclosure through a statement that it is “not material for the undertaking”. (para 55 onwards).

We appreciate that undertakings would have to use their best efforts to assess this rebuttable presumption before determining that information may be omitted. However, the rebuttable presumption as a whole appears to offer a way out of disclosing certain risks and impacts in the value chain (including on climate, for example), and an avenue for undertakings to seek to narrow the breadth and depth of their value chain reporting. We consider that complete and transparent value chain reporting is critical to decision-useful disclosures under these ESRSs, and so would recommend that the rebuttable presumption either be narrowed (for example, to much smaller undertakings for whom compliance with all ESRSs may be too onerous), or removed.

**Q25: what would you say are the advantages of the (materiality) rebuttable presumption and its proposed implementation?**

We have no comments in relation to this question.

**Q26: what would you say are the disadvantages of the (materiality) rebuttable presumption and its proposed implementation?**

We refer to our comments in response to question 24.

**Q27: how would you suggest it can be improved?**

We refer to our comments in response to question 24.



## Reporting boundary and value chain

ESRS 1 paragraphs 63 to 65 define the reporting boundary of the undertaking and how and when it is expanded when relevant for the identification and assessment of principal impacts, risks and opportunities upstream and downstream its value chain – as the financial and/or impact materiality of a sustainability matter is not constrained to matters that are within the control of the undertaking.

Paragraphs 67 and 68 address the situation when collecting the information about the upstream and downstream value chain may be impracticable, i.e. the undertaking cannot collect the necessary information after making every reasonable effort, and allows approximation based on the use of all reasonable and supportable information, including peer group or sector data.

Due to the dynamics and causal connections between levels within the undertaking's reporting boundary, material information is not constrained to one particular level. Paragraphs 72 to 77 prescribe how the undertaking shall consider the appropriate level of disaggregation of information to ensure it represents the undertaking's principal impacts, risks and opportunities in a relevant and faithful manner.

**Q28: in your opinion, to what extent would approximation of information on the value chain that cannot (practically) be collected contribute to the reporting of understandable, relevant, verifiable, comparable, and faithfully represented sustainability information?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

**Q29: what other alternative to approximation would you recommend in cases where collecting information is impracticable?**

**Q30: in your opinion, to what extent will the choice of disaggregation level by the undertaking as per ESRS 1 paragraphs 72 to 77 contribute to the reporting of understandable, relevant, verifiable, comparable and faithfully represented sustainability information?**

- Not at all

- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

## Time horizon

ESRS 1 paragraph 83 defines short-, medium- and long-term for reporting purposes, as

- One year for short term
- Two to five years for medium term
- More than five years for long-term.

**Q31: do you think it is relevant to define short-, medium- and long-term horizon for sustainability reporting purposes?**

- Yes
- No
- I do not know

Please explain why

**Q32: if yes, do you agree with the proposed time horizons?**

- Yes
- No
- I do not know

Please explain why

**Q33: if you disagree with the proposed time horizons, what other suggestion would you make? And why?**

---

## Disclosure principles for implementation of Policies, targets, action and action plans, and resources

In order to harmonise disclosures prescribed by topical standards, ESRS 1 provides disclosure principles (DP) to specify, from a generic perspective, the key aspects to disclose:

1. when the undertaking is required to describe policies, targets, actions and action plans, and resources in relation to sustainability matters and
2. when the undertaking decides to describe policies, targets, actions and action plans, and resources in relation to entity-specific sustainability matters.

DP 1-1 on policies adopted to manage material sustainability matters describes (paragraphs 96 to 98) the aspects that are to be reported for the relevant policies related to sustainability matters identified as material following the materiality assessment performed by the undertaking.

DP 1-2 on targets, progress and tracking effectiveness defines (paragraphs 99 to 102) how the undertaking is to report measurable outcome-oriented targets set to meet the objectives of policies, progress against these targets and if non-measurable outcome-oriented targets have been set, how effectiveness is monitored.

DP 1-3 on actions, action plans and resources in relation to policies and targets defines (paragraphs 103 to 106) the aspects that are to be reported by the undertaking relating to actions, action plans and resources in relation to policies and targets adopted to address material impacts, risks and opportunities.

**Q34: in your opinion, to what extent will DP 1-1 contribute to the reporting of understandable, relevant, verifiable, comparable and faithfully represented information on sustainability related policies?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

In order to be effective, reporting requirements should not include so-called “comply or explain” provisions, but rather specify in detail the elements that should be included in reports. Such “comply or explain” provisions will restrict the disclosure requirement and therefore potentially jeopardise the effectiveness of the directive. For this reason we would strongly recommend the deletion of paragraph 98.

**Q35: in your opinion, to what extent will DP 1-2 contribute to the reporting of understandable, relevant, verifiable, comparable, and faithfully represented information on sustainability-related targets and their monitoring?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations

- Fully  
 No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

In order to be effective, reporting requirements should not include so-called “comply or explain” provisions, but rather specify in detail the elements that should be included in reports. Such “comply or explain” provisions will restrict the disclosure requirement and therefore potentially jeopardise the effectiveness of the directive. For this reason we would strongly recommend the deletion of paragraph 101.

**Q36: in your opinion, to what extent will DP 1-3 contribute to the reporting of understandable, relevant, verifiable, comparable, and faithfully represented information on sustainability-related action plans and allocated resources?**

- Not at all  
 To a limited extent with strong reservations  
 To a large extent with some reservations  
 Fully  
 No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

In order to be effective, reporting requirements should not include so-called “comply or explain” provisions, but rather specify in detail the elements that should be included in reports. Such “comply or explain” provisions will restrict the disclosure requirement and therefore potentially jeopardise the effectiveness of the directive. For this reason we would strongly recommend the deletion of paragraph 106.

## Bases for preparation

Chapter 4 of ESRS 1 provides for principles to be applied when preparing and presenting sustainability information covering general situations and specific circumstances. Aspects covered include:

- general presentation principles (paragraphs 108 and 109);
- presenting comparative information (paragraphs 110 and 111);
- estimating under conditions of uncertainty (paragraphs 112 and 113);
- updating disclosures about events after the end of the reporting period (paragraphs 114 to 116);
- changes in preparing or presenting sustainability information (paragraphs 117 and 118);
- reporting errors in prior periods (paragraphs 119 to 124);
- adverse impacts and financial risks (paragraphs 125 and 126);
- optional disclosures (paragraph 127);
- consolidated reporting and subsidiary exemption (paragraphs 128 and 129);
- stating relationship and compatibility with other sustainability reporting frameworks (paragraph 130).

**Q37: is anything important missing in the aspects covered by the bases for preparation?**

- Yes  
 No

I do not know

If yes, please indicate which one(s).

Please share any comment you might have on the aspects already covered (make sure to indicate which one you are referring to)

## 1C. Overall ESRS Exposure Drafts relevance – Exposure Drafts content

---

For the purpose of the questions included in this section, respondents are encouraged to consider the following:

- when sharing comments on a given ESRS Exposure Draft, and as much as possible, reference to the specific paragraphs being commented on should be included in the written comments,
- in the questions asked, for each ESRS, about the alignment with international sustainability standards, these include but are not limited to the IFRS Sustainability Standards and the Global Reporting Initiative Standards. Other relevant international initiatives may be considered by the respondents. When commenting on this particular question, respondents are encouraged to specify which international standards are being referred to.

### ESRS 1 – General Principles

This [draft] Standard prescribes the mandatory concepts and principles to apply for preparation of sustainability reporting under the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) proposal.

It covers the applicable general principles:

1. when reporting under European Sustainability Reporting Standards;
2. on how to apply CSRD concepts;
3. when disclosing policies, targets, actions and action plans, and resources;
4. when preparing and presenting sustainability information;
5. on how sustainability reporting is linked to other parts of corporate reporting; and
6. specifying the structure of the sustainability statements building upon the disclosure requirements of all ESRS.

Most questions relevant for ESRS 1 are covered in the previous sections of the survey (section 1 Overall ESRS Exposure Drafts relevance – architecture and section 2 Overall ESRS Exposure Drafts relevance – implementation of CSRD principles).

**Q38: in your opinion, to what extent can ESRS 1 – *General principles* foster alignment with international sustainability reporting standards (in particular IFRS Sustainability Reporting S1 Exposure draft)?**

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations

- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvement or any other comment you might have

## ESRS 2 – General, strategy, governance and materiality assessment

This [draft] standard sets out the disclosure requirements of the undertaking’s sustainability report that are of a cross-cutting nature. Those disclosures can be grouped into those that are:

1. of a general nature;
2. on the strategy and business model of the undertaking;
3. on its governance in relation to sustainability; and
4. on its materiality assessment of sustainability impacts, risks and opportunities.

### Q39: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS 2 – General, strategy, governance and materiality assessment

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS 2 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

We comment on ESRS 2 where relevant under questions in relation to ESRS E1 - Climate change.

## ESRS E1 – Climate change

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify Disclosure Requirements which will enable users of sustainability reporting to understand:

1. how the undertaking affects climate change, in terms of positive and negative material actual or potential adverse impact;
2. its past, current, and future mitigation efforts in line with the Paris Agreement (or an updated international agreement on climate change) and limiting global warming to 1.5°C;
3. the plans and capacity of the undertaking to adapt its business model(s) and operations in line with the transition to a sustainable economy and to contribute to limiting global warming to 1.5°C;
4. any other actions taken, and the result of such actions, to prevent, mitigate or remediate actual or potential adverse impacts;
5. the nature, type and extent of the undertaking’s material risks and opportunities related to the undertaking’s impacts and dependencies on climate change, and how the undertaking manages them; and
6. the effects of risks and opportunities, related to the undertaking’s impacts and dependencies on climate change, on the undertaking’s development, performance and position over the short-, medium- and long- term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value .

This [draft] standard derives from the [Draft] Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify which information to disclose about climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation.

This [draft] standard covers Disclosure Requirements related to ‘Climate change mitigation’, ‘Climate change adaptation’ and ‘Energy’.

**Q40: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS E1 – Climate change**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS E1 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**



We strongly support the overall framing of EFRAG's ESRS E1 – Climate change (“ESRS E1”). As the global carbon budget continues in steep decline, the EU should also use ESRS E1 to procure that undertakings concretely deliver. Meeting Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emission reduction targets should in turn enable the EU to meet its own legally binding target (as part of its European Green Deal, and with the European Climate Law) of achieving climate neutrality by 2050, and to cut emissions by at least 55% by 2030 under its 2030 Climate Target Plan. A sufficiently robust framework should stimulate genuine transition, and stamp out ‘greenwashing’. A compromised framework risks achieving the opposite. The following elements are critical: Science-based, Paris-aligned ambition. Undertakings’ climate targets, emissions trajectories and plans must be mandatory and compatible with a 1.5 °C low or no-overshoot scenario by 2050, consistent with the Paris Agreement. On a cross-sector global basis, this implies absolute emissions reductions of 45% by 2030 (which corresponds to a linear annual reduction of 4.2%). The minimum expectations for ambition should evolve with the latest climate science. The finalised text of the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (“CSRD”) prescribes that in-scope undertakings shall include a description of their business model and strategy, including “the plans of the undertaking, including implementing actions and related financial and investment plans, to ensure that its business model and strategy are compatible with the transition to a sustainable economy and with the limiting of global warming to 1.5 °C in line with the Paris Agreement and the objective of achieving climate neutrality by 2050 as established in Regulation (EU) 2021/1119 (European Climate Law), and where relevant, the exposure of the undertaking to coal, oil and gas-related activities”. While we strongly support the science-based approach taken in ESRS E1, the corresponding requirement to disclose such a plan that standard should be consistent with the finalised CSRD text, and should be mandatory. See our comments in response to questions 23 and 25, Section 3b (Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements - Environmental Standards).

Undertakings should, further, disclose all climate forcing impacts, and not just the seven GHGs. The aviation sector, for example, causes significant warming effects from contrail formation (not a GHG, which are covered by the draft ESRS E1, and not ODS NOx or Sox, which are covered by the draft ESRS E2 - Pollution). To give a complete picture of climate forcing impacts, ESRS E1 should cover these kinds of impacts. See our comments in response to questions 23 and 25, Section 3b (Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements - Environmental Standards).

Carbon credits and GHG removals cannot be relied upon as ‘offsets’. If undertakings purchase carbon credits to achieve their GHG emissions reduction targets, transition will be undermined. GHG removals, carbon credits and avoided emissions (i) should be redefined and disclosed separately as other ‘contributions’, (ii) should not obscure the undertaking’s absolute emissions reductions, nor should they be applied in any way to an undertaking’s near and medium term emissions reductions (i.e. reductions up to 2030); and (iii) may only be applied to emissions as a contribution to address residual emissions (in other words, substantively in line with SBTi’s Corporate Net Zero Standard, an undertaking’s <10% total GHG emissions that it is not technically feasible to abate by 2050, in scenarios that limit warming to 1.5C with low /no overshoot). See in particular our comments in response to questions 34 to 36, Section 3b (Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements - Environmental Standards).

Paris-aligned lobbying. Undertakings’ direct and indirect lobbying must be aligned to the goal of halving emissions by 2030 and reaching global (net) zero by 2050. Undertakings should also disclose how their lobbying activities and trade association membership are so aligned.

Undertakings must take account of climate related risks and any commitments made in their transition plans in their accounts. Misaligned accounts may indicate greenwashing, and obscure financial risk.

Merely having a transition plan is not enough. It is crucial that undertakings (including financial institutions) deliver against their plans and are held to account for the quality and implementation of their transition plans by regulators, investors, NGOs and other stakeholders.

## ESRS E2 – Pollution

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify Disclosure Requirements which will enable users of the sustainability reporting to understand:

1. how the undertaking affects pollution of air (both indoor and outdoor), water (including groundwater) and soil, living organisms and food resources (referred to in this [draft] Standard as “pollution”), in terms of positive and negative material actual or potential adverse impacts;
2. any actions taken, and the result of such actions, to prevent, mitigate or remediate actual or potential adverse impacts;
3. the plans and capacity of the undertaking to adapt its strategy, business model(s) and operations in line with the transition to a sustainable economy concurring with the needs for prevention, control and elimination of pollution across air (both indoor and outdoor), water (including groundwater), soil, living organisms and food resources, thereby creating a toxic-free environment with zero pollution also in support of the EU Action Plan ‘Towards a Zero Pollution for Air, Water and Soil’;
4. the nature, type and extent of the undertaking’s material risks and opportunities related to the undertaking’s impacts and dependencies arising from pollution, as well as from the prevention, control, elimination or reduction of pollution (including from regulations) and how the undertaking manages them; and
5. the effects of risks and opportunities, related to the undertaking’s impacts and dependencies on pollution, on the undertaking’s development, performance and position over the short, medium and long term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value.

This standard derives from the (Draft) Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify the information that undertakings are to disclose about environmental factors, including information about ‘pollution’.

This standard sets out Disclosure Requirements related to pollution of air (both indoor and outdoor), water (including groundwater), soil, substances of concerns, most harmful substances and enabling activities in support of prevention, control and elimination of pollution.

**Q41: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS E2 - Pollution**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS E2 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

## **ESRS E3 – Water and marine resources**

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify disclosure requirements which will enable users of the sustainability reporting to understand:

1. how the undertaking affects water and marine resources, in terms of positive and negative material actual or potential adverse impacts;
2. any actions taken, and the result of such actions, to protect water and marine resources, also with reference to reduction of water withdrawals, water consumption, water use, water discharges in water bodies and in the oceans, habitat degradation and the intensity of pressure on marine resources;
3. to what extent the undertaking is contributing to the European Green Deal's ambitions for fresh air, clean water, a healthy soil and biodiversity as well as to ensuring the sustainability of the blue economy and fisheries sectors, to the EU water framework directive, to the EU marine strategy framework, to the EU maritime spatial planning directive, the SDGs 6 Clean water and sanitation and 14 Life below water, and respect of global environmental limits (e.g. the biosphere integrity, ocean acidification, freshwater use, and biogeochemical flows planetary boundaries) in line with the vision for 2050 of 'living well within the ecological limits of our planet' set out in in the 7th Environmental

Action Programme, and in the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and the Council on the 8th Environmental Action Programme;

4. the plans and capacity of the undertaking to adapt its business model and operations in line with the transition to a sustainable economy as well as with the preservation and restoration of water and marine resources globally;
5. the nature, type and extent of the undertaking's material risks and opportunities related to the undertaking's impacts and dependencies on water and marine resources, and how the undertaking manages them; and
6. the effects of risks and opportunities, related to the undertaking's impacts and dependencies on water and marine resources, on the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short, medium and long term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value.

This standard derives from the [Draft Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive] stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify information to disclose about two sub-subtopics: 'water' and 'marine resources'.

**Q42: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS E3 – Water and marine resources**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements



**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS E3 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

## **ESRS E4 – Biodiversity and ecosystems**

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify Disclosure Requirements which will enable users of sustainability reporting to understand:

1. how the undertaking affects biodiversity and ecosystems, in terms of positive and negative material actual or potential adverse impacts;
2. any actions taken, and the result of such actions, to prevent, mitigate or remediate, actual or potential adverse impacts and to protect and restore biodiversity and ecosystems;
3. to what extent the undertaking contributes to (i) the European Green Deal's ambitions for protecting the biodiversity and ecosystems, the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, the SDGs 2 Zero Hunger, 6 Clean water and sanitation, 12 Responsible consumption, 14 Life below water and 15 Life on land, the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and (ii) the respect of global environmental limits (e.g. the biosphere integrity and land-system change planetary boundaries);
4. and the plans and capacity of the undertaking to adapt its business model and operations in line with the transition to a sustainable economy and with the preservation and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems globally in general; and in particular in line with the objective of (i) ensuring that by 2050 all of the world's ecosystems and their services are restored to a good ecological condition, resilient, and adequately protected and (ii) contributing to achieving the objectives of the EU Biodiversity Strategy at latest by 2030;
5. the nature, type and extent of the undertaking's material risks and opportunities related to the undertaking's impacts and dependencies on biodiversity and ecosystems, and how the undertaking manages them;
6. the effects of risks and opportunities, related to the undertaking's impacts and dependencies on biodiversity and ecosystems, on the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short, medium and long term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value.

This standard derives from the [Draft Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive] stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify information to disclose about 'biodiversity and ecosystems'. This standard sets out Disclosure Requirements related to the undertaking's relationship to terrestrial, freshwater and marine habitats, ecosystems and populations of related fauna and flora species, including

diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems and their interrelation with many indigenous and local communities.

**Q43: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS E4 – Biodiversity and ecosystems**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS E4 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

## ESRS E5 – Resource use and circular economy

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify Disclosure Requirements which will enable users of the sustainability reporting to understand:

1. the impact of the undertaking on resource use considering the depletion of non-renewable resources and the regeneration of renewable resources and its past, current and future measures to decouple its growth from extraction of natural resources;
2. the nature, type and extent of risks and opportunities arising from the resource use and the transition to a circular economy including potential negative externalities;
3. the effects of circular economy-related risks and opportunities on the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short-, medium- and long-term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value in;
4. the plans and capacity of the undertaking to adapt its business model and operations in line with circular economy principles including the elimination of waste, the circulation of products and materials at their highest value, and the nature's regeneration.

This [draft] standard derives from the [Draft] Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify information to disclose about 'resource use and circular economy'.

### Q44: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS E5 – Resource use and circular economy

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS E5 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

We consider there to be several overarching issues with ESRS E5. Fundamentally, the definition of circular economy included in Appendix A is not robust enough, nor an accurate reflection of the underlying circular economy principles. Furthermore, these principles are not properly reflected in the disclosure requirements of ESRS E5. We have provided detailed comments below in our feedback on ESRS E5, and the Ellen MacArthur Foundation has submitted a joint position paper to the consultation that we co-authored with several other organisations reflecting our position on these major issues with ESRS E5 in more detail. By way of summary:

- ESRS E5 does not state clearly enough the need to minimise all resource use. At several points, it gives the impression that undertakings should be shifting their resource consumption to renewable sources, rather than actually implementing systemic circular design in order to minimise the need for resource extraction altogether.

- Regenerative production of resources is referred to in a confusing and inconsistent manner in ESRS E5. Regenerative production must be properly defined to ensure that undertakings are not applying their own interpretation of the term. The production of renewable resources is associated with several, severe negative environmental outcomes where not carried out with sufficient safeguards. Only regeneratively produced renewable resources should be considered circular.

- ESRS E5 does not incorporate any reference to a hierarchy of circular strategies. Instead, it implies that all 'circular' strategies are of equal value (e.g. reuse and recycling) by grouping them together and not requiring disaggregated disclosures. ESRS E5 should directly refer to a hierarchy of circular strategies and reflect this hierarchy in the structure of the disclosure requirement, so as not to unfairly penalise undertakings investing in upstream (i.e. most circular) strategies.

- The inclusion of an entire disclosure requirement dedicated to information about waste (DR E5-6) is misplaced, and we are concerned it will give undertakings that are not familiar with circular economy concepts the impression that the circular economy is about waste management – which it is not. From a



circular economy perspective, waste represents a loss of resources to the economy, and it should be reflected as such under outflows. Whilst disclosures on waste outcomes are relevant in ascertaining the environmental impact of undertakings, this would be more appropriately covered in ESRS E2 on Pollution.

## ESRS S1 – Own workforce

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify Disclosure Requirements which will enable users of the sustainability reporting to understand:

1. how they affect the undertaking affects own workforce, in terms of positive and negative material impacts;
2. any actions taken, and the result of such actions, to prevent, mitigate or remediate actual or potential adverse impacts;
3. the nature, type and extent of the undertaking’s material risks and opportunities related to its impacts and dependencies on own workforce, and how the undertaking manages them and,
4. the effects of risks and opportunities, related to the undertaking’s impacts and dependencies on own workforce, on the undertaking’s development, performance and position over the short, medium and long term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value.

In order to meet the objective, this [draft] Standard also requires an explanation of the general approach the undertaking takes to identify and manage any material actual and potential impacts on its own workforce in relation to:

1. working conditions (impacts related to e.g. living wage, health and safety, social security, working hours, water and sanitation);
2. access to equal opportunities (impacts related to e.g. discrimination, including on the rights of workers with disabilities or on women workers, as well as impacts related to issues of equality in pay and work-life balance, precarious work);
3. other work-related rights, (impacts related to e.g. trade union rights, freedom of association and collective bargaining, child labour, forced labour, privacy, adequate housing).

This draft standard derives from the [Draft] Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify the information that undertakings are to disclose regarding social factors.

This [draft] Standard covers an undertaking’s “own workforce”, which is understood to include both workers who are in an employment relationship with the undertaking (“employees”) and non-employee workers who are either individuals with contracts with the undertaking to supply labour (‘self-employed workers’) or workers provided by undertakings primarily engaged in ‘employment activities’ (NACE Code N78). This [draft] Standard does not cover (i) workers in the upstream or downstream undertaking’s value chain for whom neither work nor workplace are controlled by the undertaking; or (ii) workers whose work and/or workplace is controlled by the undertaking but are neither employees, nor individual contractors (“self-employed workers”), nor workers provided by undertakings primarily ,engaged in “employment activities” (NACE Code N78); these categories of workers are covered in ESRS S2 Workers in the Value Chain.

**Q45: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS S1 – *Own workforce***

		To a limited extent with	To a large extent with		
--	--	--------------------------	------------------------	--	--

	Not at all	strong reservations	some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS S1 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

## **ESRS S2 – Workers in the value chain**

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify Disclosure Requirements which will enable users of the sustainability reporting to understand:

1. how the undertaking affects workers in its value chain through its own operations and its upstream and downstream value chain (including its products and services, its business relationships and its supply chain), in terms of material positive and negative actual or potential adverse impacts;
2. any actions taken, and the result of such actions, to prevent, mitigate or remediate actual or potential adverse impacts;
3. the nature, type and extent of the undertaking’s material risks and opportunities related to its impacts and dependencies on workers in the value chain, and how the undertaking manages them; and
4. the effects of risks and opportunities, related to the undertaking’s impacts and dependencies on workers in the value chain, on the undertaking’s development, performance and position over the short-, medium- and long-term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value.

In order to meet the objective, the [draft] standard requires an explanation of the general approach the undertaking takes to identify and manage any material actual and potential impacts on value chain workers in relation to impacts on those workers’:

1. working conditions (impacts related to e.g. living wage, health and safety, social security, working hours, water and sanitation);
2. access to equal opportunities (impacts related to e.g. discrimination, including on the rights of workers with disabilities or on women workers, as well as impacts related to issues of equality in pay and work-life balance, precarious work);
3. other work-related rights, (impacts related to e.g. trade union rights, freedom of association and collective bargaining, child labour, forced labour, privacy, adequate housing).

This draft standard derives from the [Draft] Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify the information that undertakings are to disclose regarding social factors.

This [draft] standard covers all workers in the undertaking’s upstream and downstream value chain who are or can be materially impacted. This also includes all non-employee workers whose work and/or workplace is controlled by the undertaking but are not included in the scope of “own workforce” (“own workforce” includes: employees, individual contractors, i.e., self-employed workers, and workers provided by third party undertakings primarily engaged in ‘employment activities’). Own workforce is covered in ESRS S1 Own workforce.

**Q46: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS S2 – Workers in the value chain**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS S2 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

## **ESRS S3 – Affected communities**

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify Disclosure Requirements which will enable users of the sustainability reporting to understand:

1. how the undertaking affects its local communities through its own operations and its upstream and downstream value chain (including its products and services, its business relationships and its supply chain), in terms of material positive and negative actual or potential adverse impacts;
2. any actions taken, and the result of such actions, to prevent, mitigate or remediate actual or potential adverse impacts;
3. the nature, type and extent of the undertaking’s material risks and opportunities related to the undertaking’s impacts and dependencies on affected communities, and how the undertaking manages them; and

- the effects of risks and opportunities, related to their impacts and dependencies on local communities, on the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short-, medium- and long-term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value.

In order to meet the objective, the [Draft] standard requires an explanation of the general approach the undertaking takes to identify and manage any material actual and potential impacts on affected communities in relation to:

- impacts on communities' economic, social and cultural rights (e.g. adequate housing, adequate food, water and sanitation, land-related and security-related impacts);
- impacts on communities' civil and political rights (e.g. freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, impacts on human rights defenders); and
- impacts on particular rights of Indigenous communities (e.g. free, prior and informed consent, self-determination, cultural rights).

This draft standard derives from the [Draft] Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify the information that undertakings are to disclose regarding social factors.

**Q47: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS S3 – Affected communities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS S3 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

## **ESRS S4 – Consumers and end-users**

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify Disclosure Requirements which will enable users of the sustainability reporting to understand:

1. how the undertaking affects the consumers and end-users of its products and/or services (referred to in this [draft] Standard as “consumers and end-users”), in terms of material positive and negative actual or potential adverse impacts connected with the undertaking’s own operations and upstream and downstream value chain, including its business relationships and its supply chain;
2. any actions taken, and the result of such actions, to prevent, mitigate or remediate actual or potential adverse impacts;
3. the nature, type and extent of the undertaking’s material risks and opportunities related to its impacts and dependencies on consumers and end-users, and how the undertaking manages them; and
4. the effects of risks and opportunities, related to their impacts and dependencies on consumers and end-users, on the undertaking’s development, performance and position over the short-, medium- and long-term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value.

In order to meet the objective, the [draft] standard requires an explanation of the general approach the undertaking takes to identify and manage any material actual and potential impacts on the consumers and /or end-users related to their products and/or services in relation to:

1. information-related impacts for consumers/end-users, in particular privacy, freedom of expression and access to information; .
2. personal safety of consumers/end-users, in particular health & safety, security of a person and protection of children; and
3. social inclusion of consumers/end-users, in particular non-discrimination and access to products and services.

This draft standard derives from the [Draft] Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify the information that undertakings are to disclose regarding social factors.

**Q48: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS S4 – Consumers and end-users**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS S4 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

## ESRS G1 – Governance, risk management and internal control

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify disclosure requirements which will enable users of the undertaking’s sustainability report to understand the governance structure of the undertaking, and its internal control and risk management systems.

This [draft] standard derives from the [Draft Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive] stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify information to disclose information about governance factors, including:

1. the role of the undertaking’s administrative, management and supervisory bodies, including with regard to sustainability matters, and their composition, as well as a description of the diversity policy applied and its implementation;
2. the undertaking’s internal control and risk management systems, including in relation to the undertaking’s reporting process.

### Q49: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS G1 – Governance, risk management and internal control

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS G1 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

## ESRS G2 – Business conduct

The objective of this [draft] standard is to specify disclosure requirements for the undertaking to provide information about its strategy and approach, processes and procedures as well as its performance in respect of business conduct.

This [draft] standard derives from the [Draft Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive] stating that the sustainability reporting standards shall specify information to disclose about business ethics and corporate culture, including anti-corruption and anti-bribery.

In general, business conduct covers a wide range of behaviours that support transparent and sustainable business practices to the benefit of all stakeholders. This [draft] standard focusses on a limited number of practices as follows:

1. business conduct culture;
2. avoiding corruption, bribery and other behaviours that often have been criminalised as they benefit some in positions of power with a detrimental impact on society; and
3. transparency about anti-competitive behaviour and political engagement or lobbying.

This [draft] standard is addressing business conduct as a key element of the undertaking’s contribution to sustainable development. This [draft] standard requires the undertaking to report information about its overall policies and practices for business conduct, rather than information for specific material sustainability topics.

**Q50: Please, rate to what extent do you think ESRS G2 – Business conduct**

--	--	--	--	--	--

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion
A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part H, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit ESRS G2 offers**

**For part I, please specify what European law or initiative you think is insufficiently considered**

**For part J, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comments and suggestions for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment**

## **2. ESRS implementation prioritisation / phasing-in**

## Application provisions

In order to facilitate the first-time application of set 1, ESRS 1 includes two provisions:

- Application Provision AP1 which exempts undertaking to reports comparatives for the first reporting period, and
- Application Provision AP2 which proposes transitional measures for entity-specific disclosures which consists in allowing the undertaking to continue to use, for 2 years, disclosures it has consistently used in the past, providing certain conditions are met, as described in paragraph 154.

### Q51: to what extent do you support the implementation of Application Provision AP1?

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

### Q52: to what extent do you support the implementation of Application Provision AP2?

- Not at all
- To a limited extent with strong reservations
- To a large extent with some reservations
- Fully
- No opinion

### Q53: what other application provision facilitating first-time application would you suggest being considered?

### Please explain why

## ESRS implementation prioritisation / phasing-in options

Set 1 proposes a comprehensive set of standards aimed at achieving the objectives of the CSRD proposal, with the exception of the standards to be included in Set 2.

Acknowledging the fact that the proposed vision of a comprehensive sustainability reporting might be challenging to implement in year one for the new preparers and potentially to some of the large preparers as well, EFRAG will consider using some prioritisation / phasing-in levers to smoothen out the

implementation of the first set of standards.

The following questions aim at informing EFRAG's and ultimately the European Commission's decision as to what disclosure requirements should be considered for phasing-in, based on implementation feasibility / challenges and potentially other criteria, and over what period of time their implementation should be phased-in.

**Q54: for which one of the current ESRS disclosure requirements (see Appendix I) do you think implementation feasibility will prove challenging? and why?**

Given the critical importance of implementation prioritisation / phasing-in, please justify and illustrate your response

**Q55: over what period of time would you think the implementation of such “challenging” disclosure requirements should be phased-in? and why?**

Given the critical importance of implementation prioritisation / phasing-in, please justify and illustrate your response

**Q56: beyond feasibility of implementation, what other criteria for implementation prioritisation / phasing-in would recommend being considered? And why?**

Given the critical importance of implementation prioritisation / phasing-in, please justify and illustrate your response

**Q57: please share any other comments you might have regarding ESRS implementation prioritisation / phasing-in**

---

**If you have other comments in the form of a document please upload it here**

---

## **Contact**

[Contact Form](#)

# EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board Consultation Survey 2

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.



## EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board Consultation Surveys 3A - 3D

### Consultation survey structure

#### 1. Overall European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) Exposure Drafts' relevance (Survey 1)

- 1A. Architecture
- 1B. Implementation of Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) principles
- 1C. Exposure Drafts' content

#### 2. European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) implementation prioritisation / phasing-in (Survey 1)

#### 3. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements (Survey 2)

- 3A. Cross cutting standards
- 3B Environmental standards
- 3C Social standards
- 3D Governance standards

---

## EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board Consultation Survey 2

### Respondent Profile

#### 1. Personal details

\* Organisation name

ClientEarth

\* First name

Maria

\* Surname

Petzsch

\* Email (this information will not be published or made public)

mpetzsch@clientearth.org

\* Country of origin

United Kingdom

**\* 2. Type of respondent**

- Academic / research institution
- Audit firm, assurance provider and/or accounting firm
- Business association
- Consumer organization
- ESG reporting initiative
- EU Citizen
- Financial institution (Bank)
- Financial institution (Other financial Market Participant, including pension funds and other asset managers)
- Financial institution (Insurance)
- National Standard Setter
- Non-governmental organisation
- Non-financial corporation with securities listed on EU regulated markets
- Non-financial corporation with securities listed outside EU regulated markets
- Public authority/regulator/supervisor
- Rating agency and analysts
- Trade unions or other workers representatives
- Unlisted non-financial corporations
- Other

**\* 3. Size**

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more employees)
- Not relevant

**\* 4. User/Preparer perspective**

- User

- Preparer
- Both
- Neither

#### \* 5. Subject to CSRD

Separate non-financial corps subject to CSRD from those not subject to CSRD?

- Yes
- No

## 3A. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements - Cross cutting standards (1/2)

---

For the purpose of the questions included in this section, respondents are encouraged to consider the following:

- when sharing comments on a given Disclosure Requirement, and as much as possible, reference to the specific paragraphs being commented on should be included in the written comments,
- in the question asked, for each ESRS, about the alignment with international sustainability standards, these include but are not limited to the IFRS Sustainability Standards and the Global Reporting Initiative Standards. Other relevant international initiatives may be considered by the respondents. When commenting on this particular question, respondents are encouraged to specify which international standards are being referred to.

A complete index of Disclosure Requirements and their corresponding Application Guidance can be found in Appendix I – Navigating the ESRS.

### DR 2-GR 1 – General characteristics of the sustainability reporting of the undertaking

The undertaking shall give general information about (i) its sustainability report, and (ii) the structure of its sustainability statement.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to give the necessary context of the sustainability reporting of the undertaking.



**Q1: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GR 1 – General characteristics of the sustainability reporting of the undertaking**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GR 2 – Sector(s) of activity**

The undertaking shall provide a description of its significant activities, headcount and revenue.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to allow an understanding of the distribution of the undertaking's activities by reference to a common sector definition.

**Q2: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GR 2 – Sector(s) of activity**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR 2-GR 3 – Key features of the value chain**

The undertaking shall describe its value chain.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of the value chain in which the undertaking operates, from the initial inputs into a product or service, in the upstream supply chain, to its downstream delivery to end-users, including ultimate disposal, recycling or reuse for physical products.

**Q3: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GR 3 – Key features of the value chain**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GR 4 – Key drivers of the value creation**

The undertaking shall describe how it creates value.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of the key drivers of value creation the undertaking is leveraging to contribute to the overall performance of the value chain it operates in taking account of the respective interests of all stakeholders.

**Q4: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GR 4 – Key drivers of the value creation**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GR 5 – Using approximations on the disclosure in relation to boundary and value chain**

Following the principle on boundaries and value chain of ESRS 1 when the undertaking has used peer group information or sector data to approximate missing data due to impracticability, it shall disclose:

1. Its basis for preparation for the relevant disclosure and indicators, including the scope for which an approximation has been used; and
2. The planned actions to reduce missing data in the future.



**Q5: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GR 5 – Using approximations on the disclosure in relation to boundary and value chain**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GR 6 – Disclosing on significant estimation uncertainty**

Following the principle of estimating under conditions of uncertainty in ESRS 1, the undertaking shall:

1. identify metrics it has disclosed that have a significant estimation uncertainty, disclose the sources and nature of the estimation uncertainties and the factors affecting the uncertainties, and
2. identify and disclose the sources of significant uncertainty and the factors affecting these sources of uncertainty when explanations of possible effects of a sustainability factor relate to possible future events about which there is significant outcome uncertainty.

**Q6: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GR 6 – Disclosing on significant estimation uncertainty**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GR 7 – Changes in preparation and presentation**

Following the principle on changes in preparation or presentation of ESRS 1, the undertaking shall explain changes in preparation and presentation by disclosing:

1. the description of the methodology used for the restatement;
2. the difference between the amount reported in the previous period and the revised comparative amount in case of quantitative metrics;
3. the reasons for the change in reporting policy; and
4. if it is impracticable to adjust comparative information for one or more prior periods, the undertaking shall disclose this fact and the reason why.

**Q7: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GR 7 – Changes in preparation and presentation**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GR 8 – Prior period errors**

Following the principles on errors in ESRS 1, if applicable, the undertaking shall disclose the following for prior period errors:

1. the nature of prior period errors;
2. for each prior period disclosed, to the extent practicable, the amount of the corrections; and
3. if retrospective restatement is impracticable for a particular period, the circumstances that led to the impracticability and a description of how and when the error was corrected.

**Q8: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GR 8 – Prior period errors**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GR 9 – On other sustainability reporting pronouncements**

The undertaking shall disclose if it also reports in full or in part in accordance with generally accepted sustainability reporting pronouncements of other standard setting bodies and non-mandatory guidance including sector-specific, in addition to its report prepared according to ESRS. It shall disclose if such reporting is included in its sustainability statements.



**Q9: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GR 9 – On other sustainability reporting pronouncements**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GR 10 – General statement of compliance**

The undertaking shall provide a statement of compliance with ESRS.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to inform the users about the compliance with ESRS requirements, following mandated disclosure requirements complemented by entity-specific disclosures.

**Q10: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR2-GR 10 – General statement of compliance**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers

For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately

For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached

Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to

---

### **3A. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements - Cross cutting standards (2/2)**

---

#### **DR 2-SBM 1 – Overview of strategy and business model**

The undertaking shall provide a concise description of its strategy and business model as a context for its sustainability reporting.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide relevant contextual information necessary to understanding the sustainability reporting of the undertaking. It is therefore a reference point for other disclosure requirements.

**Q11: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-SBM 1 – Overview of strategy and business model**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-SBM 2 – Views, interests and expectations of stakeholders**

An undertaking shall describe how the views, interests and expectations of its stakeholders inform the undertaking' strategy and business model.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of how stakeholders' views, interests and expectations are considered for the undertaking's decision and evolution of its strategy and business model.

**Q12: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-SBM 2 – Views, interests and expectations of stakeholders**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR 2-SBM 3 – Interaction of impacts and the undertaking’ strategy and business model**

The undertaking shall describe the interaction between its material impacts and its strategy and business model.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of material impacts on people and the environment and the adaptation of its strategy and business model to such material sustainability impacts.



**Q13: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-SBM 3 – Interaction of impacts and the undertaking’ strategy and business model**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-SBM 4 – Interaction of risks and opportunities and the undertakings’ strategy and business model**

The undertaking shall describe the interaction between its material risks and opportunities and its strategy and business model.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of material risks and opportunities related to sustainability matters that originate from or are connected to the undertakings’ strategy and business model and the adaptation of its strategy and business model to such material risks and opportunities.

**Q14: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-SBM 4 – Interaction of risks and opportunities and the undertakings’ strategy and business model**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GOV 1 – Roles and responsibilities of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies**

The undertaking shall provide a description of the roles and responsibilities of its governance bodies and management levels with regard to sustainability matters.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of the distribution of sustainability-related roles and responsibilities throughout the undertaking's organisation, from its administrative, management and supervisory bodies to its executive and operational levels, the expertise of its governance bodies and management levels on sustainability matters, and the sustainability-related criteria applied for nominating and selecting their members.

**Q15: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-GOV 1 – Roles and responsibilities of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GOV 2 – Information of administrative, management and supervisory bodies about sustainability matters**

The undertaking shall describe how its governance bodies are informed about sustainability matters. The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of how governance bodies and management level senior executives are informed about sustainability-related facts, decisions and/or concerns that are within their responsibility so that they can effectively perform their duties in that respect.

**Q16: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2- GOV 2 – Information of administrative, management and supervisory bodies about sustainability matters**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR 2-GOV 3 – Sustainability matters addressed by the undertaking’s administrative, management and supervisory bodies**

The undertaking shall provide a description of the sustainability matters that were addressed by its administrative, management and supervisory bodies during the reporting period.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide information on whether the administrative, management and supervisory bodies were adequately informed of the material sustainability-related impacts, risks and opportunities arising or developing during the reporting period. Equally what information and matters it actually spent time addressing, and whether it was able to fulfil its roles and responsibilities, as defined in its mandate and described under DR 2-GOV 1.



**Q17: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2- GOV 3 – Sustainability matters addressed by the undertaking’s administrative, management and supervisory bodies**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GOV 4 – Integration of sustainability strategies and performance in incentive schemes**

The undertaking shall provide a description of the integration of sustainability strategies and performance in incentive schemes.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of how members of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies are incentivised to properly manage the undertaking' sustainability impacts, risks and opportunities and, along with other employees, to take steps towards implementing the sustainability strategy of the undertaking.

**Q18: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2- GOV 4 – Integration of sustainability strategies and performance in incentive schemes**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-GOV 5 – Statement on due diligence**

The undertaking shall disclose its general assessment regarding how it embeds the core elements of due diligence.

**Q19: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2- GOV 5 – Integration of sustainability strategies and performance in incentive schemes**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-IRO 1 – Description of the processes to identify material sustainability impacts, risks and opportunities**

The undertaking shall provide a description of its processes to identify its sustainability impacts, risks and opportunities and assess which ones are material.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide information on (i) how the undertaking is organising its identification and assessment and (ii) what is in the scope of its identification and assessment of sustainability matters.

**Q20: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-IRO 1 – Description of the processes to identify material sustainability impacts, risks and opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR 2-IRO 2 – Outcome of the undertaking’s assessment of material sustainability impacts risks and opportunities as identified by reference to and in compliance with sector-agnostic and sector-specific level ESRS**

The undertaking shall provide a description of the outcome of its assessment processes by reference to mandatory disclosures under ESRS.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to give a clear statement of sustainability matters, as addressed by all ESRS, that are material for the undertaking, and to give relevant explanations on (i) how the undertaking related to the material impacts, risks and opportunities identified by its assessment, (ii) when the undertaking has or will put in place initiative to modify its strategy and business model, in order to reduce or eliminate the risk or to benefit from the opportunity and/or in order to prevent and mitigate negative material impacts and enhance positive material impacts (see DR 2-SBM3 and 4), why this was the case and (iii) if and why certain mandatory disclosures are not material under the undertaking’ specific facts and circumstances and therefore disclosed as such.



**Q21: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-IRO 2 – Outcome of the undertaking’s assessment of material sustainability impacts risks and opportunities as identified by reference to and in compliance with sector-agnostic and sector-specific level ESRS**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR 2-IRO 3 – Outcome of the undertaking’s assessment of material sustainability impacts risks and opportunities that are not covered by and ESRS (entity-specific level)**

The undertaking shall provide a description of the outcome of its assessment process in relation to material impacts, risks and opportunities that are not addressed under mandatory disclosure and require entity-specific disclosure.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide information (i) about all material impacts, risks and opportunities of the undertaking resulting from the undertaking’s specific facts and circumstances for which relevant disclosure requirements do not exist, and (ii) when the undertaking has or will put in place initiatives to modify its strategy and business model, in order to reduce or eliminate the risk or to benefit from the opportunity and/or in order to prevent and mitigate negative material impacts and enhance positive material impacts (see DR 2-SBM 3 and 4), about such impacts, risks and opportunities. For each sustainability matter in the scope of sustainability reporting, the undertaking shall assess which material impacts, risks and opportunities are not covered by ESRS and shall give rise to entity-specific disclosure.

**Q22: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR 2-IRO 3 – Outcome of the undertaking’s assessment of material sustainability impacts risks and opportunities as identified by reference to and in compliance with sector-agnostic and sector-specific level ESRS**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

---

## **3B. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Environmental standards (1/5)**

---

For the purpose of the questions included in this section, respondents are encouraged to consider the following:

- when sharing comments on a given Disclosure Requirement, and as much as possible, reference to the specific paragraphs being commented on should be included in the written comments;
- in the question asked, for each ESRS, about the alignment with international sustainability standards, these include but are not limited to the IFRS Sustainability Standards and the Global Reporting Initiative Standards. Other relevant international initiatives may be considered by the respondents. When commenting on this particular question, respondents are encouraged to specify which international standards are being referred to.

A complete index of Disclosure Requirements and their corresponding Application Guidance can be found in Appendix I – Navigating the ESRS.

### **DR E1-1 – Transition plan for climate change mitigation**

The undertaking shall disclose its plans to ensure that its business model and strategy are compatible with the transition to a climate-neutral economy and with limiting global warming to 1.5 °C in line with the Paris Agreement.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the transition plan of the undertaking and its compatibility with limiting global warming to 1.5°C.

**Q23: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-1 – Transition plan for climate change mitigation**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We strongly agree with the requirement under paragraph 13 that an undertaking disclose its plans to ensure that its business model and strategy are compatible with the transition to a climate-neutral economy and with limiting global warming to 1.5 °C in line with the Paris Agreement. ESRS E1, as a whole, will need to be updated to reflect the final text of the CSRD. In particular, paragraph 19a(1).

For consistency, we also strongly recommend deleting AG 2. In our view, this risks allowing undertakings to delay credible and science-based transition plans. This risks undermining ESRS E1's stated objectives; in particular paragraphs 1(a) to (d). Allowing a delay in the disclosure of transition plans would also, ultimately, undermine European investor efforts to efficiently (re)allocate capital needed to achieve a sustainable economic transition, and to protect society from the catastrophic societal and economic costs of climate change in the longer term. In the circumstances, AG 2 must be removed in its entirety.

We would recommend clarifying under DR E1-1 paragraphs 15(a) and (b) that undertakings must refer to their "absolute GHG emissions reduction targets" in their transition plans when providing the information required by paragraph 13.

Under paragraph 15(b), we caution against reliance, or overreliance, on "the adoption of new technologies" to achieve GHG emission reduction targets. To the extent that such technologies are still in development, have yet to be scaled up and/or therefore cannot reasonably be considered viable means for reducing emissions, we strongly caution against undertakings being allowed to rely on their adoption. Such technologies are likely to be risky and unproven.

Reinforcing earlier findings on the risks entailed in pathways premised on technological removal measures, or "negative emissions", the IPCC Working Group II Report makes clear that the scaling up by 2050 of risky and unproven technologies, such as Solar Radiation Modification (SRM) and Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR), is "implausible" [WGI Ch. 4, 4.6.3.2 at 4-80]. These kinds of technologies "may not only fail to meet their climate objectives, but also may introduce significant risks and unintended consequences for human and natural ecosystems, exacerbating the impacts of warming and undermining adaptation" [WGII SPM B. 5.4, B.5.5 at SPM-19-20; WGII TS.C.11.10 at TS-40].

In the circumstances and given the scale of absolute emissions reductions required in the short to medium term, we consider that (i) undertakings should avoid relying on the adoption of new technologies for achieving disclosed GHG emissions reduction targets up to 2030; (ii) reliance should be limited to technology that can reasonably be shown to be realistic, feasibly scalable and safe; and (iii) in the case of GHG removal technology such as CDR/SRM/carbon capture and storage, reliance should be limited to addressing residual emissions (in other words, substantively in line with SBTi's Corporate Net Zero Standard, an undertaking's <10% total GHG emissions that it is not technically feasible to abate by 2050, in scenarios that limit warming to 1.5C with low/no overshoot).

Under paragraph 15(d), with respect to disclosures of locked-in GHG emissions from key assets and products, if and how these can jeopardise the achievement of GHG emission reduction targets and drive transition risk, and the plans to manage GHG- and energy-intensive assets and products, we consider that undertakings should in addition disclose:

- (i) their involvement in any activities known to be incompatible with the Paris Agreement (e.g. according to the IEA);
- (ii) the associated risks; and
- (iii) plans to manage each such activity exposure, including by phase-out.

Finally, we would support the disclosure of how transition plans consider Just Transition principles where relevant to a specific undertakings' operations and value chain. This is appropriate given the impact that transition plans can have on workers.

## **DR E1-2 – Policies implemented to manage climate change mitigation and adaptation**

The undertaking shall disclose its policies related to climate change mitigation and its policies related to climate change adaptation.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking monitors and manages its GHG emissions, climate-related physical and transition risks and opportunities throughout the value chain.



**Q24: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-2 – Policies implemented to manage climate change mitigation and adaptation**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

As to paragraph 18, we agree that Disclosure Requirement E1-2 should follow the principles defined in ESRS 1 Disclosure Principle 1, and that policies disclosed should identify people involved as indicated by paragraph AG 23. In addition, in line with paragraph 16 of ESRS 1 we strongly recommend that when undertakings disclose climate-related policies, they specifically identify in the disclosure the relevant “accountable person in oversight” who is responsible for achieving climate-related objectives and targets. We also recommend that the relevant individual(s) be identified when disclosing on climate-related remuneration (under ESRS 2-GOV-4 - Integration of sustainability strategies and performance in incentive schemes).

While we strongly support ESRS E1 overall, it is crucial that undertakings deliver against their climate-related transition plans and are held to account for the quality and implementation of their transition plans by regulators, investors, NGOs and other stakeholders. To enable regulators, investors and other users of these disclosures to hold undertakings accountable for failures, individuals responsible for undertakings' commitments must also be clearly identified. The ESRS framework must be designed from the outset to support this and ensure prompt accountability.

### **DR E1-3 – Measurable targets for climate change mitigation and adaptation**

The undertaking shall disclose the climate-related targets it has adopted.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the targets the undertaking has adopted to support its climate change mitigation and adaptation policies and address its material climate-related impacts, risks and opportunities.

**Q25: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-3 – Measurable targets for climate change mitigation and adaptation**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

Undertakings must prioritise absolute emissions reductions (per paragraph 24(b)), and emissions intensity targets should only be an optional additional metric, reported separately to ensure absolute targets (and progress against them) are clear, comparable, and decision-useful indicators of Paris alignment.

We strongly agree with the exclusion of reliance on GHG removals, carbon credits or avoided emissions as a means to achieve GHG emissions reduction targets.

Paragraph 24(e) should require undertakings to disclose GHG emission reduction targets in five year rolling periods, set and disclosing target values for at least the years 2025, 2030 and 2050. Sector-specific pathways should be used in addition, to support achieving targets faster and/or more efficient emissions reduction.

Poorly self-judged or misused pathway adoption increases the risk that users are misled, and carbon budgets are overshot. To prevent this, undertakings must be required to explain why they consider a chosen sector-specific pathway to be appropriate (independent and science-based, by reference to strategy, business model, value chain, and product line(s)). AG 30(b)(i) must reflect this.

Finally, undertakings should consider and disclose against the transition risks associated with their chosen sector-specific pathway.

Paragraph 24(f) disclosures should allow comparisons of how an undertaking's plans (and progress) measure up against Paris pathways. An undertaking should also disclose clearly how its targets compare to those set by a Paris-aligned pathway (cross-sectoral or specific).

As to paragraph 24(h) and AG 31(b), to the extent decarbonisation levers rely on the adoption of new technologies: (i) such reliance should be limited to technology reasonably be shown to be realistic, feasibly scalable and safe; and (ii) in the case of GHG removal technology such as CDR/SRM/carbon capture and storage, reliance should be limited to addressing residual emissions (in other words, substantively in line with SBTi's Corporate Net Zero Standard, an undertaking's <10% total GHG emissions that it is not technically feasible to abate by 2050, in scenarios that limit warming to 1.5C with low/no overshoot).

In relation to paragraphs 25 and 26, allowing net-zero targets or the 'neutralising' of residual emissions (or 'GHG neutrality'), instead of mandating clear, absolute, and gross GHG emission reduction targets in line with Paris goals, risks seriously undermining near-term, absolute, targets, the feasibility of reducing emissions, and transition plan comparability. To mitigate these risks:

(i) residual emissions should be limited to the <10% of Scopes 1, 2 and 3 emissions, which are expected to be technically non-feasible (i.e. impossible) to abate by 2050.

(ii) GHG removals or the purchase of carbon credits must be reported separately from residual GHG emissions, rather than described as a solution to 'neutralise' residual emissions. Undertakings may disclose a net-zero target by reference to their emissions reduction targets for 2050. However, any net zero target disclosed should:

- be science-based, and correspond with the definition of global net-zero in the IPCC reports;
- limit GHG removals or carbon credits to addressing residual emissions; and
- only be permitted in addition to disclosing the absolute and gross GHG emissions targets prescribed by paragraph 24, and not be applied in any way to an undertaking's near and medium term emissions reductions (i.e. reductions up to 2030).

(iii) GHG 'neutrality' claims should be prohibited, because they are inherently misleading (it is not

possible to truly 'neutralise' real world GHG emissions). Paragraph 26 should be amended to state: "In case, in addition to absolute and gross GHG emissions targets referred to in paragraph 24, the undertaking discloses the purchase of carbon credits or the use of GHG removals, it shall explain by reference to ESRS E1 Disclosure Requirements 12 and 13, separately, the credibility and integrity of the carbon credits or GHG removals used and how it ensures that such claims do not impede or lower the ambition of its GHG emission reduction targets, for example, by limiting the use of those carbon credits or GHG removals to addressing residual emissions (in other words, substantively in line with SBTi's Corporate Net Zero Standard, an undertaking's <10% total GHG emissions that it is not technically feasible to abate by 2050, in scenarios that limit warming to 1.5C with low/no overshoot)."

We would strongly recommend that paragraph 27 be deleted in its entirety, and Disclosure Requirement DR E1-2 should be expressed to be mandatory. The disclosure of targets under DR E1-2 is critical to assessing the credibility of an undertaking's transition plan. Alternatively, it should be amended to require undertakings to explain why it has not set climate-related targets, a plan to adopt those by no later than 2030, and for interim measures and monitoring.

## **DR E1-4 – Climate change mitigation and adaptation action plans and resources**

The undertaking shall disclose its climate change mitigation and adaptation action plans and the resources allocated for their implementation.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide transparency on the key actions taken and planned to achieve climate-related targets and to manage GHG emissions, transition and physical risks and opportunities, supporting the understanding of achieved performance improvements and the credibility of the undertaking's policies, strategy and business model with regards to climate change.

**Q26: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-4 – Climate change mitigation and adaptation act**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We strongly support disclosure against climate change mitigation action plans and the resources allocated for their implementation. We also agree that these disclosures shall follow ESRS 1 Disclosure Principle 3, but only subject to the deletion of paragraph 106 of ESRS 1 Disclosure Principle 3 (DP1-3), which reduces DP1-3 to a mere “comply or explain” basis.

As with GHG emissions reduction targets under Disclosure Requirement E1-2, disclosure of mitigation and action plans, and resources allocated, will be critical to determining the credibility of transition plans adopted and disclosed under Disclosure Requirement E1-1.

For the same reasons, we also strongly recommend the deletion of paragraphs 98 and 101 in ESRS 1 (which, respectively, reduce DP1-1 and DP1-2 to a mere “comply or explain” basis).

In support of a decision-useful assessment of an undertaking’s resource dependencies and risk exposure, AG 34 should include an additional sentence that in the event an undertaking is critically reliant on access to finance or other resources to implement its climate action plan, it should identify those resources, its plans to secure access, and the implications for its action plan if it cannot secure such access.

Finally, we would support an additional specific disclosure under this Disclosure Requirement on, briefly, how an undertaking’s lobbying activities and trade association membership(s) are consistent with (i) its transition plan and (ii) Paris alignment.

## **DR E1-5 – Energy consumption & mix**

The undertaking shall provide information on its energy consumption.

The principle to be followed is to provide an understanding of the undertaking’s absolute energy consumption, improvement in energy efficiency and share of renewable energy in its overall energy mix.

**Q27: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-5 – Energy consumption & mix**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We have no comments in response to this question.

## **DR E1-6 – Energy intensity per net turnover**

The undertaking shall provide information on the energy consumption associated with activities in high climate impact sectors per net turnover of these activities.

**Q28: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-6 – Energy intensity per net turnover**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We have no comments in response to this question.

## **DR E1-7 – Scope 1 GHG emissions**

The undertaking shall disclose its gross Scope 1 GHG emissions in metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent.

**Q29: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-7 – Scope 1 GHG emissions**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We have no comments in response to this question.

## **DR E1-8 – Scope 2 GHG emissions**

The undertaking shall disclose its gross indirect energy Scope 2 GHG emissions in metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the indirect impacts on climate change caused by the undertaking's consumed energy whether externally purchased or acquired.

**Q30: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-8 – Scope 2 GHG emissions**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We have no comments in response to this question.

### **DR E1-9 – Scope 3 GHG emissions**

The undertaking shall disclose its gross indirect Scope 3 GHG emissions in metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent. The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the GHG emissions that occur in the undertaking's value chain beyond its Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions. For many undertakings Scope 3 GHG emissions are the main component of the GHG inventory and an important driver of their transition risks.

**Q31: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-9 – Scope 3 GHG emissions**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We strongly support the disclosure of undertakings' gross Scope 3 GHG emissions. This will be critical for users of information disclosed under ESRS E1 to determine a complete picture of an undertaking's emissions and prospects for achieving Paris-alignment. Further, the disclosure of scope 3 emissions will better enable the EU's sustainable finance market to be equally robust on climate, by enabling the associated reductions in GHG emissions financing.

## **DR E1-10 – Total GHG emissions**

The undertaking shall disclose its total GHG emissions in metric tons of CO2 equivalent.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an overall understanding of the undertaking's GHG emissions and whether they occur from its own operations or the value chain. The disclosure is a prerequisite for measuring progress towards reducing GHG emissions in accordance with the undertaking's climate-related targets and EU policy goals as well as for the assessment of the undertaking's transition risks.

**Q32: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-10 – Total GHG emissions**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers

For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately

For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached

Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to

We have no comments in response to this question.

---

### **3B. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Environmental standards (2/5)**

---

#### **DR E1-11 – GHG intensity per net turnover**

The undertaking shall disclose its total GHG emissions per net turnover.

**Q33: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-11 – GHG intensity per net turnover**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We have no comments in response to this question.

## **DR E1-12 – GHG removals in own operations and the value chain**

The undertaking shall disclose GHG removals from own operations and the upstream and downstream value chain in metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide in a comparable manner transparency on actions to permanently remove or actively support the removal of GHG from the atmosphere.

**Q34: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-12 – GHG removals in own operations and the value chain**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We repeat our comments on paragraphs 25 and 26 of DR E1-3 (above), where we strongly caution against allowing undertakings to rely on GHG removals except to address residual emissions (in other words, substantively in line with SBTi's Corporate Net Zero Standard, an undertaking's <10% total GHG emissions that it is not technically feasible to abate by 2050, in scenarios that limit warming to 1.5C with low/no overshoot).

In relation to AG 60(c) and the first sentence of (e), we consider in particular that GHG removals in the value chain, just like carbon credits, should not be used to counterbalance or 'offset' emissions. They should be disclosed separately. This is to guard against the risk that undertakings rely on non-feasible CCS plans or impermanent biologic storage in place of near-term GHG emissions reductions. Biologic storage is not permanent. The 'removals' element of bioenergy with carbon capture and storage ("BECCS") relies on growing trees – and so also cannot be said to be permanent. Only Direct Air Carbon Capture and Storage ("DACCS") can be said to be permanent. Given these facts, we would recommend:

(i) an addition of a new sub-paragraph in AG 60 to reflect that undertakings shall explain that GHG removals based on enhancing biological sinks of CO<sub>2</sub> and BECCS are not permanent, and to mark them as qualitatively different from DACCS;

(ii) that the table set out in AG 62 should also include the markers that "forest restoration" is non-permanent;

that undertakings (a) carry out and report on an assessment of the permanence of GHG removals relied upon, and (b) report on permanent and non-permanent GHG removals separately.

Finally, paragraph 24 states, "The undertaking shall not include GHG removals, carbon credits or avoided emissions as means to achieve these targets".

AG 60 needs to make this clearer, by duplicating the wording used in AG 65 for carbon credits and applying the same standard to GHG removals.

## **DR E1-13 – GHG mitigation projects financed through carbon credits**

The undertaking shall disclose the amount of GHG emission reductions or removals from climate change mitigation projects outside its value chain it has financed through the purchase of carbon credits.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent and quality of carbon credits the undertaking has purchased from the voluntary market and cancelled in the reporting period.

**Q35: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-13 – GHG mitigation projects financed through carbon credits**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

While we appreciate that, as also indicated in AG 63, the purchasing of carbon credits can be a useful contribution to mitigate climate change, they must not be mistaken as a substitute for actual emissions reductions. We strongly agree with the exclusion of reliance on GHG removals, carbon credits or avoided emissions as a means to achieve GHG emissions reduction targets.

In response to proposed Disclosure Requirements E1-12 to 14 and AG 58 to 69, taken together, we consider that undertakings should not be encouraged to rely on carbon credits, GHG removals, or avoided emissions to meet the targets, emissions trajectories or plans set by the undertaking.

If carbon credits, GHG removals and/or avoided emissions are to be used, we agree that these should be disclosed separately to the undertaking's Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions and reduction targets. Further, the purchase of carbon credits:

- (i) should be redefined and disclosed separately as other 'contributions';
- (ii) should not obscure the undertaking's absolute emissions reductions, nor should they be applied in any way to an undertaking's near and medium term emissions reductions (i.e. reductions up to 2030); and
- (iii) may only be applied to emissions as a contribution to address residual emissions (in other words, substantively in line with SBTi's Corporate Net Zero Standard, an undertaking's <10% total GHG emissions that it is not technically feasible to abate by 2050, in scenarios that limit warming to 1.5C with low/no overshoot).

If GHG removals, carbon credits or avoided emissions are relevant to the undertaking, it should also provide sufficient disclosure for an informed assessment of their credibility to be made. The commonly used Corporate Net Zero Standard designed by the SBTi similarly restricts the use of carbon credits in achieving emissions reduction targets.

It is essential that GHG removals, carbon credits and avoided emissions are not used inappropriately as 'offsets' in a way that undermines the absolute emissions reductions necessary to achieve global climate goals; and that they are not presented misleadingly to investors or consumers as reducing an undertaking's emissions or neutralising its climate impact. Achieving climate goals requires the significant reduction of emissions year on year, and we have no 'room' in the global carbon budget for incurring avoidable emissions on the basis that they are balanced by offsets. As put by Carbon Watch in its Carbon markets 101, "in order to be able to offset one's emissions, someone else needs to have 'extra' emission reductions available to sell. Yet, the Paris Agreement requires all countries to reduce emissions as much as they can. This means that there is no room to offset, because there are no 'extra emission reductions' available when countries are already doing their maximum". The Voluntary Carbon Markets Integrity Initiative further concludes in its 2021 consultation report that "The imperative for overall and absolute emissions reductions globally, to keep 1.5°C within reach, necessarily means the end to 'traditional' offsetting" at page 31. This principle must be firmly baked into the ESRS E1 transition plan framework from the outset so that GHG removals, carbon credits and avoided emissions are not mis-used to meet emissions reduction targets.

For the reasons set out above, and by reference also to our comments in response to Disclosure Requirement E1-3, we also strongly support AG 65.

**(Optional) DR E1-14 – Avoided GHG emissions from products and services**

The undertaking may disclose its estimated total avoided GHG emissions from its products and services in metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent.

The principle to be followed under this optional Disclosure Requirement is to provide transparency on the methodologies used and assumptions made by the undertaking when estimating and communicating about the impacts of their products and services on climate change in comparison to other products and services, or in comparison to a situation where their products and services would not exist, considering that there is currently no generally accepted framework for accounting and reporting on such avoided emissions.

**Q36: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-14 – Avoided GHG emissions from products and services**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We repeat our comments above in response to Disclosure Requirements E1-12 and E1-13.

## **DR E1-15 – Potential financial effects from material physical risks**

The undertaking shall disclose the estimated potential financial effects from its material physical risks.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how material climate-related physical risks may affect the undertaking's performance and position over the short, medium and long term, considering that those potential future financial effects may not meet at the reporting date the recognition and measurement criteria set for assets and liabilities.

**Q37: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-15 – Potential financial effects from material physical risks**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

In general, we support Disclosure Requirement E1-15 that an undertaking should be required to disclose the estimated financial effects from its material physical risks.

Consistent and decision-useful disclosures across both narrative reporting and financial statements are paramount for users of climate disclosures to be able to conduct a straightforward and efficient assessment of the credibility of undertakings' transition plans. To that end, undertakings' disclosures should:

- (i) affirm that accounting assumptions are consistent with the undertaking's climate disclosures;
- (ii) cross-reference to where in the notes to the accounts the approach to climate is explained; and
- (iii) confirm whether Paris-aligned assumptions are used in the accounts and if not, where a sensitivity to such assumptions is provided.

We support the proposed methods of calculating potential financial effects from material physical risks as set out under Calculation Rules, AG 70-74, save that under AG 73 we consider undertakings "should, where possible," (rather than "may") assess the share of net turnover from business activities at physical risk as a list of business activities, with their percentage of total net turnover, the risk factors (hazards and exposure) and, if possible, the magnitude of the potential financial effects in terms of margin erosion over the short-, medium- and long-term.

We would also support a new AG to the effect that where risk factors are considered to be "significant" or "material", undertakings provide a brief explanation as to how they intend to address those risks. On this term, however, we do note that under ESRS 1, paragraph 51, the separate methods for determining "materiality" (whether from an impact or a financial perspective) vs "significance" is inconsistent with paragraph 48 ESRS 1, which states "the terms significant and material have the same meaning when referring to impacts, risks and opportunities in ESRS" [emphasis added]. We do agree with the framing of what makes a sustainability matter financially material under paragraph 53, ESRS 1: "For the purposes of preparing sustainability reporting, a sustainability matter is material from a financial perspective if it triggers or may trigger significant financial effects on undertakings, i.e., it generates or may generate significant risks or opportunities that influence or are likely to influence the future cash flows and therefore the enterprise value of the undertaking in the short-, medium- or long-term, but it is not captured or not yet fully captured by financial reporting at the reporting date".

## **DR E1-16 – Potential financial effects from material transition risks**

The undertaking shall disclose the estimated potential financial effects from material transition risks.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how material climate-related transition risks may affect the undertaking's performance and position over the short, medium and long-term, considering that those potential future financial effects may not meet at the reporting date the recognition and measurement criteria set for assets and liabilities.

**Q38: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-16 – Potential financial effects from material transition risks**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We repeat our comments in response to Disclosure Requirements E1-15 above. In general, we support Disclosure Requirement E1-16 that an undertaking should be required to disclose the estimated financial effects from its material transition risks.

Consistent and decision-useful disclosures across both narrative reporting and financial statements is paramount for users of climate disclosures to be able to conduct a straightforward and efficient assessment of the credibility of undertakings' transition plans. To that end, undertakings' disclosures should:

- (i) affirm that accounting assumptions are consistent with their climate disclosures;
- (ii) cross-reference to where in the notes to the accounts the approach to climate is explained; and
- (iii) confirm whether Paris-aligned assumptions are used in the accounts and if not, where a sensitivity to such assumptions is provided.

## **(Optional) DR E1-17 – Potential financial effects from climate-related opportunities**

The undertaking may disclose its potential financial effects from climate-related opportunities.

The principle to be followed under this optional Disclosure Requirement is to allow users to understand how the undertaking may financially benefit from material climate-related opportunities. The disclosure is complementary to information requested under the Taxonomy Regulation.



**Q39: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E1-17 – Potential financial effects from climate-related opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We repeat our comments in response to Disclosure Requirements E1-15 and E1-16 above. Consistent and decision-useful disclosures across both narrative reporting and financial statements is paramount for users of climate disclosures to be able to conduct a straightforward and efficient assessment of the credibility of undertakings' transition plans, including climate-related opportunities.

To that end, undertakings' disclosures should:

- (i) affirm that accounting assumptions are consistent with their climate disclosures;
- (ii) cross-reference to where in the notes to the accounts the approach to climate is explained; and
- (iii) confirm whether Paris-aligned assumptions are used in the accounts and if not, where a sensitivity to such assumptions is provided.

## **E2-1 – Policies implemented to prevent and control pollution**

The undertaking shall disclose its policies related to pollution prevention and control.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking monitors and manages its pollution-related impacts, risks and opportunities.

**Q40: Please, rate to what extent do you think E2-1 – Policies implemented to prevent and control pollution**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E2-2 – Measurable targets for pollution**

The undertaking shall describe the pollution-related targets it has adopted.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the targets the undertaking has adopted to support its pollution-related policies and address its material related impacts, risks and opportunities.

**Q41: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E2-2 – Measurable targets for pollution**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E2-3 – Pollution action plans and resources**

The undertaking shall disclose its pollution-related action plans and the resources allocated to their implementation.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide transparency on the key actions taken and planned in order to achieve its pollution-related policy objectives and targets.

**Q42: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E2-3 – Pollution action plans and resources**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers

For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately

For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached

Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to

---

### **3B. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Environmental standards (3/5)**

---

#### **DR E2-4 – Pollution of air, water and soil**

The undertaking shall disclose information on a list of pollutants that are generated or used during production processes or that are procured, and that leave its facilities as emissions, as products, or as part of products or services.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide transparency on the emissions that the undertaking generates.



**Q43: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E2-4 – Pollution of air, water and soil**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E2-5 – Substances of concern and most harmful substances**

The undertaking shall disclose specific information on the substances of concern and most harmful substances that are generated or used during production processes or that are procured, and that leave its facilities as emissions, as products, or as part of products or services.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the impact of the undertaking on health and the environment related to the undertaking's production, use, distribution and commercialisation of substances of concern and most harmful substances, as well as an understanding of the undertaking's exposure towards those substances of concern including risks arising from changes in regulations.

**Q44: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E2-5 – Substances of concern and most harmful substances**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E2-6 – Pollution-related incidents and deposit impacts and risks, and financial exposure to the undertaking**

The undertaking shall disclose the impact of and its financial exposure to pollution-related incidents and deposits.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how principal pollution-related incidents and deposits may affect the environment and society and/or the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short-, medium- and long-term.

**Q45: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E2-6 – Pollution-related incidents and deposit impacts and risks, and financial exposure to the undertaking**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E2-7 – Financial effects from pollution-related impacts, risks and opportunities**

The undertaking shall disclose the financial effects of the risks and opportunities arising from pollution-related impacts and dependencies.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to an understanding of the effects of risks and opportunities, arising from the undertaking's pollution-related impacts and dependencies, on the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short, medium and long term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value.

**Q46: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E2-7 – Financial effects from pollution-related impacts, risks and opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E3-1 – Policies implemented to manage water and marine resources**

The undertaking shall disclose its policies related to water and marine resources<sup>2</sup>.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking monitors and manages its material water and marine resources impacts, risks and opportunities.



**Q47: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E3-1 – Policies implemented to manage water and marine resources**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E3-2 – Measurable targets for water and marine resources**

The undertaking shall disclose the water and marine resources-related targets it has adopted.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of the targets the undertaking has adopted to support its water and marine resources policies and address its material related impacts, risks and opportunities.

**Q48: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E3-2 – Measurable targets for water and marine resources**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E3-3 – Water and marine resources action plans and resources**

The undertaking shall disclose its water and marine resources action plans and the resources allocated for their implementation.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide transparency on the key actions take and planned to achieve water and marine resources-related targets and to manage related risks, impacts and opportunities.

**Q49: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E3-3 – Water and marine resources action plans and resources**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E3-4 – Water management performance**

The undertaking shall provide information on its water management performance.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of the undertaking's water cycle at entity level and how the undertaking is managing to meet the targets it has set.

**Q50: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E3-4 – Water management performance**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E3-5 – Water intensity performance**

The undertaking may provide information on its water intensity performance.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking is managing to decouple net turnover from the withdrawal, consumption and discharge of water.



**Q51: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E3-5 – Water intensity performance**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E3-6 – Marine resources-related performance**

The undertaking shall provide information on marine resources-related performance indicators.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking is impacting marine resources and marine waters and how it is managing to meet whichever marine resources-related targets it has set.

**Q52: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E3-6 – Marine resources-related performance**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers

For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately

For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached

Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to

---

### **3B. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Environmental standards (4/5)**

---

#### **DR E3-7 – Financial effects from water and marine resources related impacts, risks and opportunities**

The undertaking shall disclose its financial effects of material risks and opportunities arising from water and marine resources-related impacts and dependencies.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the effects of material risks and opportunities, related to the undertaking's water and marine resources-related impacts and dependencies, on the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short, medium and long term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value, considering that those potential future financial effects may not meet at the reporting date the recognition criteria set for financial statements.

**Q53: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E3-7 – Financial effects from water and marine resources related impacts, risks and opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E4-1 – Transition plan in line with the targets of no net loss by 2030, net gain from 2030 and full recovery by 2050**

The undertaking shall disclose its plans to ensure that its business model and strategy are compatible with the transition to achieve no net loss by 2030, net gain from 2030 and full recovery by 2050.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the transition plan of the undertaking and its compatibility with the preservation and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems in line with the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030.

**Q54: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-1 – Transition plan in line with the targets of no net loss by 2030, net gain from 2030 and full recovery by 2050**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E4-2 – Policies implemented to manage biodiversity and ecosystems**

The undertaking shall disclose its policies related to biodiversity and ecosystems.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking has policies that address prevention, mitigation or remediation of actual or potential adverse impacts and protection and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems and of how the undertaking monitors and manages its material biodiversity and ecosystems-related impacts and risks and opportunities arising from impacts and dependencies and addresses the strategies of no net loss by 2030, net gain from 2030, and full recovery of biodiversity and ecosystems by 2050.



**Q55: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-2 – Policies implemented to manage biodiversity and ecosystems**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E4-3 – Measurable targets for biodiversity and ecosystems**

The undertaking shall disclose the biodiversity and ecosystem-related targets it has adopted.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the targets the undertaking has adopted to support its biodiversity and ecosystems policies and address its material related impacts, dependencies, risks and opportunities.

**Q56: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-3 – Measurable targets for biodiversity and ecosystems**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E4-4 – Biodiversity and ecosystems action plans**

The undertaking shall disclose its biodiversity and ecosystems-related actions and action plans and allocation of resources to meet its policy objectives and targets.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide transparency on the key actions taken and planned to achieve biodiversity and ecosystems-related targets and to manage related risks, impacts and opportunities.

**Q57: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-4 – Biodiversity and ecosystems action plans**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E4-5 – Pressure metrics**

The undertaking shall report pressure metrics.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide information on material impact drivers that unequivocally influence biodiversity, ecosystem services and underlying ecosystems.

**Q58: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-5 – Pressure metrics**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E4-6 – Impact metrics**

The undertaking shall report metrics for material biodiversity and ecosystem-related impacts, either by material geographical locations, and/or by material raw materials.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the progress of the undertaking's towards no net loss and net gain, including how biodiversity offsets may be integrated in this measurement approach.



**Q59: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-6 – Impact metrics**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR E4-7 – Response metrics**

The undertaking shall disclose response metrics.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking minimises, rehabilitates or restores material impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems in material geographical locations of sites and/or raw materials identified.

**Q60: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-7 – Response metrics**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E4-8 – Biodiversity-friendly consumption and production metrics**

The undertaking may disclose metrics on its biodiversity-friendly consumption and production.

The principle to be followed under this optional Disclosure Requirement is, if the undertaking so decides, to provide an understanding of its consumption and production that qualifies as being biodiversity-friendly.

**Q61: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-8 – Biodiversity-friendly consumption and production metrics**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **E4-9 – Biodiversity offsets**

The undertaking may disclose the actions, development and financing of biodiversity and ecosystems mitigation projects (offsets) inside and outside its value chain.

The principle to be followed under this optional Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent and quality of the development; investment and implementation of projects or programmes inside or outside the undertaking's value chain that compensate for any residual, significant adverse impacts on biodiversity that cannot be avoided, reduced or removed, minimised, or restore biodiversity loss inside or outside the undertaking's value chain (also commonly referred to as biodiversity offsets).

**Q62: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-9 – Biodiversity offsets**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E4-10 – Financial effects from biodiversity-related impacts, risks and opportunities**

The undertaking shall disclose its financial effects of risks and opportunities arising from biodiversity-related impacts and dependencies.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the effects of risks and opportunities, arising from the undertaking's biodiversity-related impacts and dependencies, on the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short, medium and long term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value, considering that those potential future financial effects may not meet at the reporting date the recognition criteria set for financial statements.



**Q63: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E4-10 – Financial effects from biodiversity-related impacts, risks and opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers

For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately

For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached

Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to

---

### **3B. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Environmental standards (5/5)**

---

#### **DR E5-1 – Policies implemented to manage resource use and circular economy**

The undertaking shall disclose separately its policies (i) to decouple economic activity from extraction of non-renewable resources and (ii) for regeneration of renewable resources and ecosystems.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the undertaking's ability to transition away from extraction of virgin non-renewable resources and to implement practices that secure and contribute to the regeneration of the stock of renewable resources and the ecosystems they are part of.

**Q64: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E5-1 – Policies implemented to manage resource use and circular economy**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

Minimising resource extraction is a central tenet of the circular economy, and applies to all resources – renewable or otherwise. The framing of DR E5-1 around “decoupl[ing] economic activity from extraction of non-renewable resources” is inaccurate and misleading, as it implies that switching from non-renewable to renewable resources is circular. DR E5-1 should instead require information on policies to accurately reflect circular economy principles and the circular strategies hierarchy, prioritising upstream strategies (e.g. reuse, repair, refurbishment) over downstream strategies (e.g. recycling) and certainly over simple substitution of one material over another.

Please note, we have answered not applicable for Q64 D, E, H and I above as we consider that it is not possible to make this assessment on the basis of the current draft. We adopt the same approach for the remainder of the questions on ESRS 5.

Please note further that the Ellen MacArthur Foundation has appended a position paper setting out the joint position of our organisations and others to its consultation response to ESRS 5, as well as a mark up of ESRS 5 reflecting our proposed changes. This reflects our common positions.

## **DR E5-2 – Measurable targets for resource use and circular economy**

The undertaking shall disclose the resource use and circular economy-related targets it has adopted.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the capacity of the undertaking to meet the policy’s objectives of resource use and circular economy.

**Q65: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E5-2 – Measurable targets for resource use and circular economy**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

The categories of targets set out in paragraph 25 do not accurately reflect circular economy principles. As further explained below with reference to DR E5-6 focussing on waste elimination is not the correct approach, but rather, upstream strategies, in particular, implementation of circular strategies should be encouraged. As such, an additional category of targets should be included – that of “targets to increase systemic circular design”.

The category of target specified in 25(b) (“targets for material use rate”) is useful and relevant, but the lack of definition for “material use rate” in Appendix A to ESRS 5 is likely to lead to confusion amongst issuers. As such, we recommend a definition of “material use rate” be included in Appendix A.

Finally, for the reasons set out above under our feedback on DR-E5, 25(c) should be reframed as targets to minimise use of all resources, not just virgin non-renewable resources.

### **DR E5-3 – Resource use and circular economy action plans**

The undertaking shall describe its resource use and circular economy-related action plans and the resources allocated to their implementation.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the measures taken to increase the share of circularity in the flows and to optimise the use of resources supporting the credibility of the undertaking’s strategy to develop circular business models fostering the transition to a more circular economy.

**Q66: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E5-3 – Resource use and circular economy action plans**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

As a general comment, ESRS E5 lacks recognition of the hierarchy of circular strategies (also known as the 'resource use' hierarchy). Not all 'circular' strategies are of equal value and 'circularity': some have much more circular potential than others. This can be seen with reference to frameworks such as that included in the European Commission's 2020 document entitled "Categorisation system for the circular economy" (p. 7). The whole standard would be strengthened and clarified by reference to such a framework. With particular reference to DR E5-3, we consider that undertakings should be required to disclose how they have prioritized actions in line with the circular strategies hierarchy. This would allow much greater comparability between the action plans of different undertakings.

## **DR E5-4 – Resources inflows**

The undertaking shall provide information on its resources' inflows.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the resource use in the course of the undertaking's own operations, considering separately renewable and non-renewable resources and including transparency on virgin versus non virgin materials and on sustainable versus regenerative source.



**Q67: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E5-4 – Resources inflows**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We consider that inflows should account for all material use in order for users of sustainability information to understand the full scope of undertakings' resource use. DR E5-4 must therefore specify that undertakings provide information on inflows in disaggregated form, under the following categories: (I) non-virgin (i.e reused and recycled products and materials), (ii) sourced from by-products/wastestreams, (iii) virgin but renewable and regeneratively produced (iv) virgin but renewable and not regeneratively produced and (v) none of the above.

The difference between regeneratively produced renewables and non-regeneratively produced renewables is crucial, and should be better reflected in ESRS 5 generally, including DR E5-4. Production of renewable resources can have several, serious negative environmental outcomes, including the degradation of ecosystems. Renewable materials that are not produced regeneratively undermine a key tenet of the circular economy (the regeneration of ecosystems) and should therefore not be considered circular.

## **DR E5-5 – Resources outflows**

The undertaking shall provide information on its resources' outflows.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking is contributing to circular economy by increasing the durability, reparability, upgradability, reusability or recyclability of the products and materials.

**Q68: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E5-5 – Resources outflows**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

DR E5-5 is currently missing the most important data points required to understand the progress of an undertaking towards greater circularity: design for recovery and circulation in practice. Undertakings should be required to disclose information on outflows designed according to the hierarchy of circular strategies (see our response to Q66), disaggregated according to the circular strategy for which it has been designed, and data on recirculation in practice, disaggregated on the same basis.

Furthermore, we strongly recommend that AG 25(b) - which requires undertakings to disclose information on the total weight/percentage of products containing substances of concern – be moved to DR E5-5. This reference to substances of concern is very relevant to DR E5-5, since the presence of substances of concern in materials and products is directly relevant to their potential for (safe) recirculation in practice. It is not appropriate that this requirement only appear in the Application Guidance, and not in the Disclosure Requirement itself.

## **DR E5-6 – Waste**

The undertaking shall provide information on its wastes.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the undertaking waste management strategy and of the extent to which the undertaking knows how its waste is managed in its own activities.

**Q69: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E5-6 – Waste**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We are concerned by the inclusion of a disclosure requirement on waste in ESRS 5, as it incorrectly gives the impression that the circular economy is about waste management. What happens to waste generated by economic activities is irrelevant to the circular economy: the fact that waste is generated at all is what counts, as this means that resources have been taken out of circulation and are lost to the economy. Whilst we appreciate that different forms of waste management have differing impacts on the environment, we consider that this information would be more appropriately included in ESRS 2 on Pollution. DR E5-6 should be deleted. Instead, 'waste' can be accounted for under E5-5 on outflows, by requiring undertakings to disclose data on materials not designed for any form of recirculation and data on outputs that have not been recirculated in practice.

## **DR E5-7 – Resource use optimisation**

The undertaking shall provide information on its strategy to optimise resource use in creating circular business models.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the intensity of materials and products used by the undertaking and its capability to keep a resource at its highest value.

**Q70: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E5-7 – Resource use optimisation**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

We consider that DR E5-7 is too broad and does not contain sufficient safeguards on what constitutes a 'circular business model' in order for the disclosure of turnover to be indicative of circularity. We are concerned that undertakings will report turnover linked to seemingly circular business models that actually rely on underlying linear models. We propose that a definition of 'circular business models' be included in Appendix A to ESRS 5, and that the Application Guidance set out details of minimum safeguards to be met in order for a business model to be considered circular.

## **DR E5-8 – Circularity support**

The undertaking shall provide information on its ability to create partnerships to accelerate the transition from linear to circular economy.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the services and products that contribute to create circular systems initiatives outside its own activities in the value chain.



**Q71: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E5-8 – Circularity support**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR E5-9 Financial effects from resource use and circular economy-related impacts, risks and opportunities**

The undertaking shall disclose its financial effects of material risks and opportunities arising from resource use and circular economy-related impacts and dependencies.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the effects of material risks and opportunities, related to the undertaking's resource use and circular economy-related impacts and dependencies, on the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short-, medium- and long-term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value, considering that those potential future financial effects may not meet at the reporting date the recognition criteria set for financial statements.

**Q72: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E5-9 – Financial effects from resource use and circular economy-related impacts, risks and opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

---

### **3C. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Social standards (1/4)**

---

For the purpose of the questions included in this section, respondents are encouraged to consider the following:

- when sharing comments on a given Disclosure Requirement, and as much as possible, reference to the specific paragraphs being commented on should be included in the written comments,
- in the question asked, for each ESRS, about the alignment with international sustainability standards, these include but are not limited to the IFRS Sustainability Standards and the Global Reporting Initiative Standards. Other relevant international initiatives may be considered by the respondents. When commenting on this particular question, respondents are encouraged to specify which international standards are being referred to.

A complete index of Disclosure Requirements and their corresponding Application Guidance can be found in Appendix I – Navigating the ESRS.

#### **DR S1-1 – Policies relate to own workforce**

The undertaking shall state its policies that address the management of its material impacts on own workforce, as well as associated material risks and opportunities; and provide a summary of the content of the policies and how they are communicated.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking has policies that address the identification, assessment, management and/or remediation of material impacts on the undertaking's own workforce specifically, as well as policies that cover impacts, risks and opportunities in one policy. It also aims to provide an understanding of how both the internal organisation, and the workers whose interests they address, are made aware of their existence and content.

**Q73: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-1 – Policies relate to own workforce**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-2 – Processes for engaging with own workers and workers' representatives about impacts**

The undertaking shall explain its general processes for engaging with its own workers and workers' representatives about actual and potential material impacts on its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking engages, as part of its ongoing due diligence process, with its own workers and workers' representatives about material, actual and potential, positive and/or negative impacts that do, or may, affect its own workforce.

**Q74: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-2 – Processes for engaging with own workers and workers’ representatives about impacts**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-3 – Channels for own workers and workers’ representatives to raise concerns**

The undertaking shall describe:

- the channels it has in place for own workers and workers’ representatives to raise their concerns or needs directly with the undertaking, and / or
- the processes through which the undertaking supports the availability of such channels through the workplace of own workers, and
- how it monitors issues raised and addressed.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the formal means by which the undertaking’s own workers and workers’ representatives can make their concerns and needs known directly to the undertaking and/or through which the undertaking supports the availability of grievance mechanisms in the workplace of their own workers and workers’ representatives, how follow up is done with these own workers and workers’ representatives regarding the issues raised, and the effectiveness of these channels.



**Q75: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-3 – Channels for own workers and workers' representatives to raise concerns**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-4 - Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities**

The undertaking shall explain any outcome-oriented targets it may have related to:

1. Reducing negative impacts on its own workforce; and/or
2. Advancing positive impacts on its own workforce; and/or
3. Managing material risks and opportunities related to its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking is using outcome-oriented targets to drive and measure its progress in addressing its negative impacts and/or advancing positive impacts on its own workforce, and/or in managing material risks and opportunities related to its own workforce.

**Q76: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-4 - Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-5 – Taking action on material impacts on own workforce and effectiveness of those actions**

The undertaking shall explain:

1. What action is planned or underway to prevent, mitigate or remedy material negative impacts on its own workforce that are connected to its operations, products or services;
2. Any additional initiatives or processes it has in place with the primary purpose of delivering positive impacts for its own workforce; and
3. How it assesses the effectiveness of these actions, programmes and processes in delivering outcomes or its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the types of processes, initiatives or engagements through which the undertaking:

1. Works to prevent, mitigate and remedy material impacts on its own workforce; or
2. Seeks to achieve positive impacts for its own workforce, recognizing that in both instances, the ultimate aim is to deliver improved outcomes in workers' lives.

**Q77: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-5 – Taking action on material impacts on own workforce and effectiveness of those actions**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-6 - Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to own workforce**

The undertaking shall explain:

- What action is planned or underway to mitigate material risks for the undertaking arising from its impacts and dependencies on its own workers; and
- What action is planned or underway to pursue material opportunities for the undertaking in relation to own workers.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the ways in which the undertaking is addressing material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to its own workforce.

**Q78: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-6 - Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to own workforce**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-7 – Characteristics of the undertaking’s employees**

The undertaking shall describe key characteristics of employees in its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is, in conjunction with Disclosure Requirement ESRS S1-8, to provide insight into the undertaking’s approach to employment, including the scope and nature of impacts arising from its employment practices, to provide contextual information that aids an understanding of the information reported in other disclosures, and to serve as the basis for calculation for quantitative metrics to be disclosed under other Disclosure Requirements in this Standard, in particular on Working Conditions, Equal Opportunities and Other Work-Related Rights.



**Q79: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-7 – Characteristics of the undertaking’s employees**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-8 – Characteristics of non-employee workers in the undertaking’s own workforce**

The undertaking shall describe key characteristics of non-employee workers in its own workforce. The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is, in conjunction with Disclosure Requirement S1-7, to provide insight into the undertaking’s approach to employment, including the scope and nature of impacts arising from its employment practices, to provide contextual information that aids an understanding of the information reported in other disclosures, and to serve as the basis for calculation for quantitative metrics to be disclosed under other Disclosure Requirements in this Standard, in particular on Working Conditions, Equal Opportunities and Other Work-Related Rights.

**Q80: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-8 – Characteristics of non-employee workers in the undertaking’s own workforce**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-9 – Training and skills development indicators**

The undertaking shall disclose the extent to which training and development is provided to its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the training and skills development-related activities that have been offered to own workers, within the context of continuous professional growth, to upgrade own workers' skills and facilitate continued employability.

**Q81: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-9 – Training and skills development indicators**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-10 – Coverage of the health and safety management system**

The undertaking shall disclose information on the extent to which its own employees are covered by its health and safety management system.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the coverage of the undertaking's management system to prevent harm and promote health amongst the undertaking's employees.

**Q82: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-10 – Coverage of the health and safety management system**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

---

### **3C. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Social standards (2/4)**

---

#### **DR S1-11 – Performance of the health and safety management system**

The undertaking shall disclose the number of incidents associated with work-related injuries, ill health and fatalities of its own workers.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the quality and performance of the established health and safety management system to prevent work-related incidents. The undertaking shall provide the following information to comply with paragraph this Disclosure Requirement:

- the number of fatalities as a result of work-related injuries and work-related ill health;
- the number and rate<sup>[1]</sup> of recordable work-related injuries;
- the number of cases of recordable work-related ill health; and
- the number of days lost to work-related injuries and fatalities from work-related accidents, work-related ill health and fatalities from ill health.

[1] This information supports the information needs of financial market participants subject to Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 as reflecting an additional indicator related to principal adverse impacts as set out by indicator #2 in Table 3 of Annex 1 of the related Delegated Regulation with regard to disclosure rules on sustainable investments (“Rate of accidents”).



**Q83: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-11 – Performance of the health and safety management system**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **(Optional) DR S1-12 – Working hours**

The undertaking shall disclose the percentage of its own workers that exceed 48 hours of work per week over the applicable reference period.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of whether the undertaking respects the thresholds established by the EU and ILO standards on weekly working hours (48 hours per week over a reference period) to protect own workers' physical and mental health and their safety and work-life balance.

**Q84: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-12 – Working hours**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-13 – Work-life balance indicators**

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the actual practices amongst the employees to take family-related leave in a gender equitable manner.

**Q85: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-13 – Work-life balance indicators**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-14 – Fair remuneration**

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of whether all of an undertaking's own workers are earning a fair wage, and, if this is not the case, an understanding of what percentage of own workers are earning less than a fair wage.

**Q86: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-14 – Fair remuneration**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-15 – Social security eligibility coverage**

The undertaking shall disclose the percentage of its own workers eligible for social security.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to understand whether there are own workers of the undertaking that are not eligible for social security and, as a result, are especially vulnerable to major social risks.



**Q87: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-15 – Social security eligibility coverage**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-16 – Pay gap between women and men**

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent of any gap in the pay between women and men amongst the undertaking's employees.

**Q88: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-16 – Pay gap between women and men**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-17 – Annual total compensation ratio**

The undertaking shall disclose the ratio between the compensation of its highest paid individual and the median compensation for its employees.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the level of compensation inequality inside the undertaking, whether wide pay disparities exist and how such disparities have evolved over time.

**Q89: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-17 – Annual total compensation ratio**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-18 – Discrimination incidents related to equal opportunities**

The undertaking shall disclose the number of work-related discrimination incidents, any corrective actions taken during the reporting period and any related material fines or sanctions.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the incidence of work-related discrimination, including sexual and non-sexual harassment, the corrective actions that the undertaking has taken for its own workforce, and any related material fines and sanctions.

**Q90: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-18 – Discrimination incidents related to equal opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-19 – Employment of persons with disabilities**

The undertaking shall disclose the percentage of persons with disabilities amongst its own workforce. The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which persons with disabilities are included in an undertaking's workforce, and its composition by gender.



**Q91: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-19 – Employment of persons with disabilities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-20 – Differences in the provision of benefit to employees with different employment contract types**

The undertaking shall disclose information on benefits which are standard for full-time permanent employees but are not provided to employees with temporary, part-time and non-guaranteed hour contracts. The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which certain employees (those with temporary, part-time and/or non-guaranteed hour contracts) do not receive the same benefits as full-time, permanent employees.

**Q92: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-20 – Differences in the provision of benefits to employees with different employment contract types**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

---

### **3C. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Social standards (3/4)**

---

#### **DR S1-21 – Grievances and complaints related to other work-related rights**

The undertaking shall state the number of grievances and complaints received and resolved relating to workers' other work-related rights.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the undertaking's grievance mechanism or channel. This is the mechanism or channel through which those workers whose other work-related rights are impacted by the undertaking are able to lodge a concern or complaint, and that can provide access to remedy by resolving those complaints. Furthermore, it is to provide an understanding of the number of complaints raised and resolved at National Contact Points for OECD Multinationals.

**Q93: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-21 – Grievances and complaints related to other work-related rights**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-22 – Collective bargaining coverage**

The undertaking shall disclose information on the extent to which the working conditions and terms of employment of its own workforce are determined or influenced by collective bargaining agreements. The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the importance of collective bargaining agreements for its own workforce.

**Q94: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-22 – Collective bargaining coverage**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-23 – Work stoppages**

The undertaking shall disclose the extent of major work stoppages (including both strikes and lockouts) because of disputes between the undertaking and its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent of worker disputes and their impact on the undertaking's operations.



**Q95: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-23 – Work stoppages**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-24 – Social dialogue**

The undertaking shall disclose the extent and functioning of social dialogue with workers' representatives of its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the institutional prerequisites for social dialogue in the undertaking exist and the extent to which rights to social dialogue are respected in the undertaking's operations, particularly for those which are located in the European Economic Area (EEA).

**Q96: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-24 – Social dialogue**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S1-25 – Identified cases of severe human rights issues and incidents**

The undertaking shall disclose the number of severe human rights issues and incidents connected to own workforce which occurred in the reporting year.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which severe human rights issues (e.g. forced labour, human trafficking or child labour) and incidents affecting the undertaking's own workforce through its activities or business relationships occurred in the reporting year.

**Q97: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-25 – Identified cases of severe human rights issues and incidents**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S1-26 – Privacy at work**

The undertaking shall disclose the right to privacy at work for its own workforce.

The principle underlying this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of an undertaking's measures on personal data protection concerning its workforce and the nature and extent of worker surveillance that is conducted.

**Q98: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-26 – Privacy at work**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S2-1 - Policies related to value chain workers**

The undertaking shall state its policies that address the management of its material impacts on value chain workers, as well as associated material risks and opportunities; and provide a summary of the content of the policies and how they are communicated.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking has policies that address the identification, assessment, management and/or remediation of material impacts on value chain workers specifically, as well as policies that cover material risks or opportunities related to value chain workers, or policies that cover impacts, risks and opportunities in one policy. It also aims to provide an understanding of how both the internal organisation, and the value chain workers whose interests they address, are made aware of their existence and content.



**Q99: Please, rate to what extent do you think S2-1 – Policies related to value chain workers**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S2-2 - Processes for engaging with value chain workers about impacts**

The undertaking shall explain its general processes for engaging with value chain workers and their representatives about actual and potential material impacts on them.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking engages, as part of its ongoing due diligence process, with value chain workers and related trade union and worker representatives about material actual and potential positive and/or negative impacts that do or may affect them, and whether and how perspectives of value chain workers are taken into account in the decision-making processes of the undertaking.

**Q100: Please, rate to what extent do you think S2-2 – Processes for engaging with value chain workers about impacts**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S2-3 – Channels for value chain workers to raise concerns**

The undertaking shall describe:

1. the channels it has in place for value chain workers to raise their concerns or needs directly with the undertaking; and/or
2. the processes through which the undertaking supports the availability of such channels through the workplace of value chain workers; and
3. how it monitors issues raised and addressed.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the formal means by which value chain workers can make their concerns and needs known directly to the undertaking and/or through which the undertaking supports the availability of grievance mechanisms in the workplace of value chain workers, how there is follow up with these workers regarding the issues raised and the effectiveness of these channels.

**Q101: Please, rate to what extent do you think S2-3 – Channels for value chain workers to raise concerns**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S2-4 - Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities**

The undertaking shall explain the outcome-oriented targets it may have related to:

1. reducing negative impacts on value chain workers; and/or
2. advancing positive impacts on value chain workers; and/or
3. managing material risks and opportunities related to value chain workers.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking is using outcome-oriented targets to drive and measure its progress in addressing negative impacts, and/or advancing positive impacts, on value chain workers, and/or in managing material risks and opportunities related to value chain workers.

**Q102: Please, rate to what extent do you think S2-4 – Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

---

### **3C. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Social standards (4/4)**

---

#### **DR S2-5 - Taking action on material impacts on value chain workers and effectiveness of those actions**

The undertaking shall explain:

1. what action is planned or underway to prevent, mitigate or remedy material negative impacts on value chain workers that are connected to its operations, products or services;
2. any additional initiatives or processes it has in place with the primary purpose of delivering positive impacts for value chain workers; and
3. how it assesses the effectiveness of these actions, programmes and processes in delivering intended outcomes for value chain workers.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the types of process, initiative or engagement through which the undertaking (a) works to prevent, mitigate and remedy material impacts on value chain workers, or (b) seeks to achieve positive impacts for value chain workers, recognising that in both instances, the ultimate aim is to deliver improved outcomes in workers' lives.



**Q103: Please, rate to what extent do you think S2-5 – Taking action on material impacts on value chain workers and effectiveness of those actions**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S2-6 - Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to value chain workers**

The undertaking shall explain:

1. what action is planned or underway to mitigate material risks for the undertaking arising from its impacts and dependencies on value chain workers; and
2. what action is planned or underway to pursue material opportunities for the undertaking in relation to value chain workers.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the ways in which the undertaking is addressing the material risks and pursuing the material opportunities related to workers in its value chain.

**Q104: Please, rate to what extent do you think S2-6 – Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to value chain workers**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S3-1 – Policies related to affected communities**

The undertaking shall state its policies that address the management of its material impacts on communities, as well as associated material risks and opportunities; and provide a summary of the content of the policies and how they are communicated.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking has policies that address the identification, assessment, management and/or remediation of material impacts on local communities specifically, as well as policies that cover material risks or opportunities related to affected communities, or policies that cover impacts, risks and opportunities in one policy. It also aims to provide an understanding of how both the internal organisation, and the local communities whose interests they address, are made aware of their existence and content.

**Q105: Please, rate to what extent do you think S3-1 – Policies related to affected communities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S3-2 – Processes for engaging with affected communities about impacts**

The undertaking shall explain its general processes for engaging with affected communities and their representatives about actual and potential material impacts on them.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking engages as part of its ongoing due diligence process with affected communities about material actual and potential positive and/or negative impacts that do or may affect them, and whether and how perspectives of affected communities are taken into account in the decision-making processes of the undertaking.

**Q106: Please, rate to what extent do you think S3-2 – Processes for engaging with affected communities about impacts**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S3-3 – Channels for affected communities to raise concerns**

The undertaking shall describe:

1. the channels it has in place for affected communities to raise their concerns or needs directly with the undertaking; and/or
2. the processes through which the undertaking supports the availability of such channels by its business relationships; and
3. how it monitors issues raised and addressed.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the formal means by which affected communities can make their concerns and needs known directly to the undertaking, and/or through which the undertaking supports the availability of mechanisms by its business relationships, how there is follow up with these communities regarding the issues raised, and the effectiveness of these channels.



**Q107: Please, rate to what extent do you think S3-3 – Channels for affected communities to raise concerns**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S3-4 – Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities**

The undertaking shall explain the outcome-oriented targets it may have related to:

1. reducing negative impacts on affected communities; and/or
2. advancing positive impacts on affected communities; and/or
3. managing material risks and opportunities related to affected communities.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking is using outcome-oriented targets to drive and measure progress in addressing negative impacts, and/or advancing positive impacts, on affected communities.

**Q108: Please, rate to what extent do you think S3-4 – Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

**DR S3-5 – Taking action on material impacts on affected communities and effectiveness of those actions**

**Q109: Please, rate to what extent do you think S3-5 – Taking action on material impacts on affected communities and effectiveness of those actions**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S3-6 - Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to affected communities**

The undertaking shall explain:

1. what action is planned or underway to mitigate material risks for the undertaking arising from its impacts and dependencies on local communities; and
2. what action is planned or underway to pursue material opportunities for the undertaking in relation to local communities.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the ways in which the undertaking is addressing the material risks and pursuing the material opportunities related to affected communities.

**Q110: Please, rate to what extent do you think S3-6 – Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to affected communities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S4-1 – Policies related to consumers and end-users**

The undertaking shall state its policies that address the management of its material impacts of its products and/or services on consumers and end-users, as well as associated material risks and opportunities; and provide a summary of the content of the policies and how they are communicated.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking has policies that address the identification, assessment, management and/or remediation of impacts on consumers and end-users specifically, as well as policies that cover material risks or opportunities related to consumers and end-users, or policies that cover impacts, risks and opportunities in one policy. It also aims to provide an understanding of how both the internal organisation, and the consumers and end-users whose interests they address, are made aware of their existence and content.



**Q111: Please, rate to what extent do you think S4-1 – Policies related to consumers and end-users**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S4-2 – Processes for engaging with consumers and end-users about impacts**

The undertaking shall explain its general processes for engaging with consumers and end-users and their representatives about actual and potential material impacts on them.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how the undertaking engages as part of its ongoing due diligence process with consumers and end-users about material actual and potential positive and/or negative impacts that do or may affect them, and whether and how perspectives of consumers and end-users are taken into account in the decision-making processes of the undertaking.

**Q112: Please, rate to what extent do you think S4-2 – Processes for engaging with consumers and end-users about impacts**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S4-3 – Channels for consumers and end-users to raise concerns**

The undertaking shall describe:

1. the channels it has in place for consumers and end-users to raise their concerns/complaints or needs directly with the undertaking; and/or
2. the processes through which the undertaking supports the availability of mechanisms by its business relationships; and
3. how it monitors issues raised and addressed.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the formal means by which consumers and end-users can make their concerns and needs known directly to the undertaking and/or through which the undertaking supports the availability of mechanisms by its business relationships, how there is follow up with these consumers and end-users regarding the issues raised, and the effectiveness of these channels.

**Q113: Please, rate to what extent do you think S4-3 – Channels for consumers and end-users to raise concerns**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR S4-4 – Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities**

The undertaking shall explain the outcome-oriented targets it may have related to:

1. reducing negative impacts on consumers and end-users; and/or
2. advancing positive impacts on consumers and end-users; and/or
3. managing material risks and opportunities.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking is using outcome-oriented targets to drive and measure progress in addressing negative impacts, and/or advancing positive impacts, on consumers and end-users.

**Q114: Please, rate to what extent do you think S4-4 – Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S4-5 – Taking action on material impacts on consumers and end-users and effectiveness of those actions**

The undertaking shall explain:

1. what action is planned or underway to prevent, mitigate or remedy material negative impacts on consumers and end-users who are connected to its operations, products or services;
2. any additional initiatives or processes it has in place with the primary purpose of positively contributing to improved social outcomes for consumers and end-users; and
3. how it assesses the effectiveness of these actions, programmes and processes in contributing to intended outcomes for consumers and end-users.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the types of process, initiative or engagement through which the undertaking:

1. works to prevent, mitigate and remedy material impacts on consumers and end-users, and
2. seeks to achieve positive impacts for consumers and end-users, recognising that in both instances, the ultimate aim is to deliver improved outcomes for consumers' and end-users' lives.



**Q115: Please, rate to what extent do you think S4-5 – Taking action on material impacts on consumers and end-users and effectiveness of those actions**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR S4-6 – Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to consumers and end-users**

The undertaking shall explain:

1. what action is planned or underway to mitigate material risks for the undertaking arising from its impacts and dependencies on consumers and end-users; and
2. what action is planned or underway to pursue material opportunities for the undertaking in relation to consumers and end-users.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the ways in which the undertaking is addressing the material risks and pursuing the material opportunities related to consumers and end-users.

**Q116: Please, rate to what extent do you think S4-6 – Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to consumers and end-users**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

---

## **3D. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Governance standards (1/2)**

---

For the purpose of the questions included in this section, respondents are encouraged to consider the following:

- when sharing comments on a given Disclosure Requirement, and as much as possible, reference to the specific paragraphs being commented on should be included in the written comments,
- in the question asked, for each ESRS, about the alignment with international sustainability standards, these include but are not limited to the IFRS Sustainability Standards and the Global Reporting Initiative Standards. Other relevant international initiatives may be considered by the respondents. When commenting on this particular question, respondents are encouraged to specify which international standards are being referred to.

A complete index of Disclosure Requirements and their corresponding Application Guidance can be found in Appendix I – Navigating the ESRS.

### **DR G1-1 – Governance structure and composition**

The undertaking shall provide information on its governance structure and composition.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the structure and composition of the governance and the distribution of roles and responsibilities throughout the undertaking's organisation, from its administrative, management and supervisory bodies to its executive and operational levels.

**Q117: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-1 – Governance structure and composition**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G1-2 – Corporate governance code or policy**

The undertaking shall disclose the corporate governance code, policy or practices that determine the function of its administrative, management or supervisory bodies.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide information about any legal or regulatory requirements that mandate and influence the design of the governance structure of the undertaking, together with information on aspects implemented that are over and above any relevant legal or regulatory requirements.

**Q118: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-2 – Corporate governance code or policy**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

### **DR G1-3 – Nomination process**

The undertaking shall provide information about the nomination and selection processes for its administrative, management and supervisory bodies.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide information about the criteria used for selecting and nominating the members of the undertaking's administrative, management and supervisory bodies.



**Q119: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-3 – Nomination process**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G1-4 – Diversity policy**

The undertaking shall provide information on the diversity policy applied in relation to its administrative, management and supervisory bodies.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide information about the undertaking's diversity policy to promote a diversified composition of its administrative, management and supervisory bodies. This shall also include the diversity criteria adopted with the associated rationale on their prioritisation, and the mechanism adopted to foster diversity representation.

**Q120: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-4 – Diversity policy**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G1-5 – Evaluation process**

The undertaking shall describe the process, if any, followed for evaluating the performance of its administrative, management and supervisory bodies in overseeing the management of the undertaking.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide transparency on the process implemented by the undertaking for the evaluation of the performance of its administrative, management and supervisory bodies in supervising the management of the undertaking.

**Q121: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-5 – Evaluation process**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G1-6 – Remuneration policy**

The undertaking shall describe the policy used for the remuneration of its administrative, management and supervisory bodies.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide information about the undertaking's policy for the remuneration of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies.

**Q122: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-6 – Remuneration policy**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G1-7 – Risk management processes**

The undertaking shall provide information on its risk management processes, with regards to risk arising for the undertaking and for the stakeholders.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to inform about the undertaking's risk management processes. This includes an understanding of the supervision and monitoring of risk management by the undertaking's administrative, management and supervisory bodies.



**Q123: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-7 – Risk management processes**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G1-8 – Internal control processes**

The undertaking shall provide information on its internal control processes, including in relation to the sustainability reporting process.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to inform about the aspects related to the governance factors that affect the undertaking's internal control processes, including in relation to sustainability reporting. This also includes an understanding of the supervision and monitoring of those processes by the undertaking's administrative, management and supervisory bodies.

**Q124: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-8 – Internal control processes**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G1-9 – Composition of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies**

The undertaking shall provide information about the composition of its administrative, supervisory and management bodies.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide information about the diversity of the members of its administrative, management and supervisory bodies and committees.

**Q125: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-9 – Composition of the administrative, management and supervisory**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G1-10 – Meetings and attendance rate**

The undertaking shall provide information about the number of meetings and the attendance rate for its administrative, management and supervisory bodies and committees.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide information about the rate of participation in meetings of the members of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies and committees.

**Q126: Please, rate to what extent do you think G1-10 – Composition of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies and committees**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G2-1– Business conduct culture**

The undertaking shall disclose its initiatives to establish, develop and promote a business conduct culture.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of how the administrative, management and supervisory bodies are involved in forming, monitoring, promoting and assessing the business conduct culture.



**Q127: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-1 – Business conduct culture**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G2-2 – Policies and targets on business conduct**

The undertaking shall provide information about its policies with respect to business conduct matters.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of the undertaking's ability (i) to mitigate any negative impacts and maximise positive impacts related to business conduct throughout its value chain, and (ii) to monitor and manage the related risks.

**Q128: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-2 – Policies and targets on business conduct**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers

For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately

For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached

Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to

---

### **3D. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Governance standards (2/2)**

---

#### **DR G2-3 – Prevention and detection of corruption and bribery**

The undertaking shall provide information about its system to prevent and detect, investigate, and respond to allegations or incidents relating to corruption and bribery.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide transparency on the key procedures of the undertaking to prevent and detect, investigate and respond to corruption or bribery-related incidents or allegations.

**Q129: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-3 – Prevention and detection of corruption and bribery**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G2-4 – Anti-competitive behaviour prevention and detection**

The undertaking shall provide information about its system to prevent and detect, investigate, and respond to allegations or incidents relating to anti-competitive behaviour.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide transparency on the key procedures of the undertaking to prevent and detect, investigate and respond to allegations or incidents of anti-competitive behaviour.

**Q130: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-4 – Anti-competitive behaviour prevention and detection**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G2-5 – Anti-corruption and anti-bribery training**

The undertaking shall provide information about any anti-corruption and anti-bribery training programmes offered.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of the undertaking's training and educational initiatives to develop and maintain awareness related to anti-corruption or anti-bribery and business conduct within the undertaking as well as in the value chain.



**Q131: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-5 – Anti-corruption and anti-bribery training**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G2-6 – Corruption or bribery events**

The undertaking shall provide information on legal proceedings related to corruption or bribery during the reporting period.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide transparency on legal proceedings relating to corruption or bribery incidents during the reporting period and the related outcomes.

**Q132: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-6 – Corruption or bribery events**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G2-7 – Anti-competitive behaviour events**

The undertaking shall provide information on any publicly announced investigation into or litigation concerning possible anti-competitive behaviour it is facing during the reporting period.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide transparency on publicly announced investigations into or litigation concerning possible anti-competitive behaviour of the undertaking that are ongoing during the reporting period.

**Q133: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-7 – Anti-competitive behaviour events**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G2-8 – Beneficial ownership**

The undertaking shall provide information about its beneficial owners (as defined in article 3(6) of Directive (EU) 2015/849) and control structure.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide transparency on the individuals who ultimately own or control the undertaking's organisational and control structure, including beneficial owners.

**Q134: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-8 – Beneficial ownership**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G2-9 – Political engagement and lobbying activities**

The undertaking shall provide information on its political contributions and lobbying or advocacy activities.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide transparency on the types, purpose and cost of political contributions and lobbying activities of the undertaking during the reporting period.



**Q135: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-9 – Political engagement and lobbying activities**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

## **DR G2-10 – Payment practices**

The undertaking shall provide information on the payment practices to support transparency about these practices given the importance of timely cash flows to business partners.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide insights on the contractual payment terms and the average actual payments.

**Q136: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-10 – Payment practices**

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**For part E, please explain why costs would be unreasonable and / or what particular benefit this disclosure requirement offers**

**For part F, please specify what existing European sustainability reporting obligation you think the disclosure requirements misses to address adequately**

**For part G, please explain how you think further alignment could be reached**

**Please share any comment and suggestion for improvement you might have relating to the above questions, referring explicitly to the part of the question you are providing comment to**

Payment delays complicate the financial management of undertakings, especially SMEs[1], who rely on predictable flows of cash to operate. According to the relevant EU legislation (Directive 2011/7/EU) a payment is late when the creditor has not received the funds at the expiry of the period negotiated in the contract. And yet, even payments performed within the contractually negotiated period can hide unfair payment practices. Very often businesses accept payment terms longer than they are comfortable with[2], as such terms may reflect the one party’s power compared to the other, such as by virtue of its size or brand.

[1] SMEs (Small and Medium-sized enterprises) are defined according to the Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/sme-definition\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/sme-definition_en)

[2] According to the Intrum European payment Report 2021, on average 49% of businesses in the EU accepted payment terms longer than they are comfortable with out of fear of losing their customers or damaging business relations.

**Q137: do you consider that the indicators in G2-10 (in isolation or jointly) capture the following sufficiently:**

	Yes	No	No opinion
the extent to which accounts payable or creditors at period end have been outstanding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
the fairness of the undertaking’s payment practices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If not, please provide your rationale and indicate the sector(s) for which you deem add-ons necessary.

**Q 138: what alternative indicators would you propose? Please specify whether your proposal(s) are of sector-agnostic or sector-specific nature.**

---

**If you have any other comments in the form of a document please upload it here**

---

## **Contact**

[Contact Form](#)