

Le Président

Mr Hans Buysse
EFRAG
Administrative Board President

Paris, 27 July 2022

Référence : YOL.BNB.20220220

Objet : CNCC's response to EFRAG's Consultation on the proposed European Sustainability Reporting Standards

Dear President,

As Chairman and CEO of the CNCC, the French Institute of Statutory Auditors, I wish to express beforehand the overall support of the French profession to the objectives of the ambitious Green Deal of the European Union, which aims to transform the Union into a modern, resource-efficient, and competitive economy with no net emissions of greenhouse gases by 2050. Sustainability reporting is key to meeting these objectives.

The French profession of Statutory Auditors considers that the quality of the sustainability information to be produced by European undertakings under the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) will depend, among other things, on the quality of the:

- (a) European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS);
- (b) Companies' reporting systems, internal control systems and governance's oversight;
- (c) External assurance; and
- (d) Public supervision.

For that purpose, the French profession supports a set of reporting standards that leads to sustainability information of quality that is:

- (a) Meeting the requirements of the European directives and regulations;
- (b) Relevant, fit for purpose and addressing stakeholders' needs;
- (c) Comparable across companies, but also sufficiently sector-specific;
- (d) Both sufficiently balanced and focused, so that it can be produced by the undertakings at optimal cost/benefits and does not turn into a compliance exercise;
- (e) Convergent over time with international standards, through appropriate cooperation between the European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG) and the International Sustainability Standard-setting Board (ISSB), enabling the reduction of the regulatory fragmentation, as this is confusing for users and costly;

- (f) Auditable, to reduce the risk of greenwashing and because experience has proved that assurance is a key driver of the quality of sustainability information.

We really appreciate the opportunity offered by the public consultation process to provide our comments on the draft ESRS. We believe that we can bring relevant insight, anchored in many years of practical experience of providing limited assurance on the non-financial information required by the Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD). France is one of the few EU countries that selected this optional requirement under the NFRD, and applied it to a number of companies even wider than that envisaged by the NFRD (i.e. PIEs listed and non-listed above 500 employees). We have been able to contribute to, and observe, progress along the learning curve of French companies with respect to sustainability matters. We also have the experience at a large scale of assessing the magnitude of efforts required in order to provide limited or reasonable assurance on the information provided. This front runner position of the French preparers and auditors is clearly recognised by the IFAC worldwide study on Sustainability assurance¹. Our detailed responses to the EFRAG's Consultation Survey reflect this experience accumulated over many years of practice.

We commend the EFRAG Project task Force (PTF-ESRS) on reaching the important milestone of issuing for public consultation the first set of draft ESRS. We applaud the considerable work of EFRAG in such a short period.

Our overall view of the proposed ESRS is that we consider that the information required to be disclosed is generally relevant. However, having analysed all the draft ESRS, we find that the overall volume and complexity of the disclosure requirements need to be reviewed, and phased-in. We provide a series of comments with the objectives to help EFRAG both improve the quality of the proposed set of ESRS and facilitate their implementation.

In addition to having filled in the online questionnaires, we have attached in an appendix to this letter our main comments on the draft ESRS.

Should you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,



Yannick OLLIVIER

¹ Available at the following address: <https://www.ifac.org/knowledge-gateway/contributing-global-economy/discussion/state-play-sustainability-assurance>

Appendix: Main Comments from the CNCC on the draft ESRS

On the draft ESRS themselves, we have the following comments:

Our overall view of the proposed ESRS is that we consider that the information required to be disclosed is generally relevant. However, the following matters require EFRAG's attention.

Consistency with international standards and EU regulations

1. We acknowledge the need for the standards to satisfy the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the Sustainable Finance Disclosures Regulation (SFDR) requirements, as well as the international frameworks mentioned in the CSRD. We recognise the efforts made by EFRAG to fulfil such needs. However, we suggest that EFRAG makes further efforts on the following aspects:
 - i. *Contributing to global convergence and better integrating the content of global baseline standards to be developed by the International Standards Setting Board (ISSB), to the extent that the content of the ISSB baseline standards is consistent with the EU's legal framework and the objectives of the EU Green Deal².*

We support the existence of a global baseline for the sustainability reporting standards and interoperability with it, to allow for global comparisons, to facilitate reporting processes and to alleviate reporting burden. It may also be important for a number of ESRS preparers to be able to confirm compliance with the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards (SDS). It is important that such preparers should not be subject to dual reporting.

We therefore ask EFRAG and the ISSB to work together to identify the differences between their standards and resolve them to the extent possible. This is particularly true with respect to the architecture of the standards, the materiality definitions, terminology and concepts, and the range of intended stakeholders.

It is also important that EFRAG and ISSB work on the scalability of their respective standards from the initial conception phase, because even though sustainability information is mostly a matter for large companies at the moment, there will certainly be a trickle-down effect on SMEs sooner rather than later via the value chains requirements.

- ii. *Streamlining and ensuring the consistency with other EU regulations.*

We note that the definitions of "value chain" and "due diligence" are not fully aligned between the Corporate sustainability reporting Directive (CSRD) and the proposed Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD). As such definitions are so important for selecting the information to be reported, it will be important to align the definitions as the CSDDD becomes final.

Double materiality and materiality exercise

2. *We consider that the concept of "Double materiality", i.e. impact materiality and financial materiality, and how to perform a materiality exercise (i.e. to decide what material sustainability information to report) are not sufficiently explained to enable practical implementation and enforcement.*

We therefore consider that the following actions should be taken by EFRAG:

- i. Develop further guidance and illustrations on double materiality, impact materiality and financial material, and how to perform a materiality exercise, recognising however that determining materiality is always a dynamic exercise over time;
 - ii. Carry out a joint and concerted work effort with ISSB and GRI to clarify the similarities and differences between the materiality concepts used in each of the framework. The same

² Refer to provisional final text of CSRD, Recital (37)

terminology should be used when the same concepts are used. Otherwise, different terminology should be used.

- iii. Illustrate how entities could disclose their materiality matrix and their intended stakeholders per the ESRS 2 disclosure requirements.

3. *We do not support the materiality rebuttable presumption.*

Currently, because of the lack of sufficient guidance, we are in doubt as to whether this concept can be implemented and enforced consistently. We also question whether it is really needed, if the materiality principles are sufficiently clear for their consistent implementation. The standards should properly define what is material and give enough guidance to the entities to guide them in deciding what is material to their activity and business model. Presuming materiality of all topics and requiring the entities to rebut such presumption seems to be unduly onerous and inefficient.

In any case, we are opposed to requiring disclosures of why each disclosure requirement was rebutted at a granular level. We support limiting such explanations to cases where they are material to the understanding of users of the sustainability reporting.

Volume and granularity of information

4. *We find that the information requested by ESRS, when aggregated together, can result in too voluminous and granular information, in particular, for the first-time implementation (including for NFRD undertakings).*

EFRAG might want to improve the scalability of its standards by defining which disclosures are required irrespective of the size and activity of the entity. Also, we are conscious that the maturity of the undertakings in terms of degree of preparedness for providing the information requested will be very different from one entity to another.

Based on those observations, we consider that EFRAG should:

- i. Revise the need for certain requirements and their level of granularity, to avoid leading to a box-ticking exercise - see our detailed suggestions in our responses to the Consultation Survey questionnaires;
 - ii. Phase-in certain disclosure requirements, particularly in relation to value chain and due diligence (which would benefit from the finalisation of the CSDDD), certain performance metrics and financial effects. For example, we recommend that the performance measurement metrics in ESRS E4 *Biodiversity and ecosystems* (DR E4-5 to DR E4-10) be phased in. Currently, there is no global consensus on biodiversity metrics. However, methodologies need to be sufficiently detailed and operationalised to allow for meaningful comparison of impacts and mitigation activities over time;
 - iii. Focus first on the description and assessment of impacts, risks and opportunities, and the provision of information satisfying the needs of SFDR indicators.
5. *We would like to point out that the sustainability reporting should not be the place to state compliance with particular EU regulations.*

We found a couple of disclosure requirements where we had this impression (e.g., on privacy at work). We suggest EFRAG review its proposed disclosure requirement to that effect, as we do not consider that, with the sustainability reporting, the role of the auditor is to verify the correct application of other laws or regulations than ESRS / CSRD.

6. *In order to reduce the burden while at the same time improving the relevance of the information provided, some disclosures requirements could be reclassified as sector specific rather than sector agnostic, either permanently or temporarily during the phasing in of the implementation of the standards.*

This could be the case for example for certain disclosure requirements related to pollution, water consumption or biodiversity, for which certain service activities clearly have no impact (see other proposals in our responses to the Consultation Survey questionnaires).

Information related to the value chain

7. *With regard to the “Value Chain”, we consider that ESRS should include further explanations and application guidance to better understand the boundaries of the value chain.*

Also, as collecting, estimating and verifying information in relation to the value chain presents very significant challenges both for the preparer and the auditor, *due to the lack of data and recognised methodologies to provide approximations and internal control, we suggest, similarly to the recently discussed CSRD, a transition period for undertakings* which would consist of:

- i. First and second years of application: the performance metrics would not cover the value chain and only the undertaking's own operations (except for scope 3 GHG emissions under ESRS E1 *Climate change* and SFRD indicators);
- ii. The third year of application: the performance metrics would start covering the value chain. Where the current year information related to the value chain would not yet be available and the undertaking has to estimate performance metrics for the value chain, the undertaking should prepare the performance metrics by using information published by the value chain the previous year.

Information related to financial effects

8. *We believe that the requirements for the disclosure of the financial effects are insufficiently precise to provide for comparability and assurance. We therefore consider that EFRAG should provide further details and guidance.*

EFRAG should also phase-in the related disclosure requirements as companies first need to get up to speed in the assessment of their impacts, risks and opportunities in relation to the topics and subtopics covered by EFRAG, before being able to make any determination of financial effects. However, we recognise the importance of the interconnection between financial and sustainability information, and we propose, in the context of the phasing-in, that companies first give a narrative description of the intended financial effects, then provide ranges of expected financial effects and later on more precise estimates.

Auditability

9. *Regarding the auditability of the information required, we generally believe that it is possible to provide assurance on the information required.*

Sometimes, there will be significant challenges associated with it, particularly as it relates to forward-looking information, the value chain, the due diligence process, financial effects and complex performance metrics where there are no recognised measurement methodologies developed yet. For instance, while we believe that it will be feasible to identify third party relationships that have a direct impact on the undertaking, we believe that identifying third parties of third parties who have an indirect impact on the undertaking activity will be a more difficult exercise.

10. *Overall, we believe that companies will experience a curve of continuous progress over the years, with the trigger of the assurance requirements.*

This has proved in France to be very effective, leading to an improvement of the quality of sustainability information, since it was first introduced in 2010. Mandatory assurance is definitely a driver of quality, alongside the other pillars of good corporate reporting: i.e. proper information system, internal control, good corporate governance and public oversight, in order to raise sustainability reporting as a key element of corporate reporting

11. *Obviously, the increased amount of information required by the CSRD and ESRS, compared to that formerly required by the NFRD, will lead to a significant increase in the work effort required from preparers to produce this information and for auditors to verify it.*

Such increased work effort will undoubtedly result into an increase in the cost of the assurance provided on the sustainability information. However, considering the societal, political and investor's demand for reliable and relevant sustainability information, exempt of greenwashing, and which should soon become as important as financial information, we believe that the expected benefits outweigh the increased cost.

Due process

12. *Finally, we would like to advise EFRAG on a point which may be key to the success of the body of standards it is setting, i.e. adhering to the due process.*

The due process has been extremely tense and the comment period very short on this set of exposure drafts, to the extent that it could have endangered the quality of the comments provided to EFRAG and the buy-in of the stakeholders. Respondents are making their best efforts to provide comments of quality despite the extremely short deadlines imposed by the European agenda.

We believe that EFRAG should allow itself sufficient time to properly analyse the comments received and amend the draft ESRS accordingly. We therefore firstly advise EFRAG not to rush the adoption of standards without having duly considered the comments received on exposure and secondly, we believe that the standards should be subject to a post implementation review very quickly after their first year of implementation, for EFRAG to be able to understand and correct shortcomings, if any.

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

CNCC

* First name

50 character(s) maximum

Cédric

* Surname

50 character(s) maximum

Gélard

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

50 character(s) maximum

cedric.gelard@cncf.fr

* Country of origin

50 character(s) maximum

France

* 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 broadly manage with the structure and articulation of the cross-cutting and topical standards. Sector standards are pending so we cannot fully conclude at this stage.

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

Structure of the standards is different. We note that the TCFD framework is dedicated to investors whereas ESRS covers all stakeholders including investors.

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

Structure of the standards is different, i.e. ISSB standards are dedicated to investors whereas ESRS covers all stakeholders including investors. We do not find this to be a highly critical impediment for interoperability, albeit the differences in structures will definitely not facilitate it.

As stated in the cover letter (Appendix, point 1 relating to the consistency with international standards and EU regulations), we acknowledge the need for the standards to satisfy the CSRD and the Sustainable Finance Disclosures Regulation (SFDR) requirements, as well as the international frameworks mentioned in the CSRD. We recognise the efforts made by EFRAG to fulfil such needs. However, we suggest that EFRAG makes further efforts on the following aspects:

- i. Contributing to global convergence and better integrating the content of global baseline standards to be developed by the International Standards Setting Board (ISSB), to the extent that the content of the ISSB baseline standards is consistent with the EU's legal framework and the objectives of the EU Green Deal (Refer to provisional final text of CSRD, Recital (37)).

We support the existence of a global baseline for the sustainability reporting standards and interoperability with it, to allow for global comparisons, to facilitate reporting processes and to alleviate reporting burden. It may also be important for a number of ESRS preparers to be able to confirm compliance with the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards (SDS). It is important that such preparers should not be subject to dual reporting.

We therefore ask EFRAG and the ISSB to work together to identify the differences between their standards and resolve them to the extent possible. This is particularly true with respect to the architecture of the standards, the materiality definitions, terminology and concepts, and the range of intended stakeholders.

It is also important that EFRAG and ISSB work on the scalability of their respective standards from the initial conception phase, because even though sustainability information is mostly a matter for large companies at the moment, there will certainly be a trickle-down effect on SMEs sooner rather than later via the value chains requirements.

Please also refer to Q1.

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

A priori fully but we do not have expertise on all European legislation.
As stated in the cover letter, we support a set of reporting standards that leads to sustainability information of quality that is meeting the requirements of the European directives and regulations.

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

We also believe that The European Pillar of Social Rights and the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD) should be considered more fully particularly with regard to the expected targets (ESRS S1-4).

We note that the definitions of “value chain” and “due diligence” are not fully aligned between the CSRD and the proposed CSDDD. As such definitions are so important for selecting the information to be reported, it will be important to align the definitions as the CSDDD becomes final.

The finalisation and implementation of the CSDDD would be of great support to the auditing profession with respect to verifications related to value chain and due diligence information.

We have however a concern.

As stated in our cover letter (point 5), we would like to point out that the sustainability reporting should not be the place to state compliance with particular EU regulations.

We found a couple of disclosure requirements where we had this impression (e.g., on privacy at work). We suggest EFRAG review its proposed disclosure requirement to that effect, as we do not consider that, with the sustainability reporting, the role of the auditor is to verify the correct application of other laws or regulations than ESRS / CSRD.

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.

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

Please note that we have not performed a fully detailed comparison of the ESR requirements with the SFDR reporting obligations.

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)

- In a long term vision, we consider that Option 1 should be retained so that sustainability reporting should be placed at the same level as financial reporting.
However, we draw your attention to the fact that, regarding the banking industry, part of the information requested by ESRS is also requested by the Implementing Technical Standards (ITS) on prudential disclosures on ESG risks in accordance with article 449a CRR (pillar 3 disclosures), which is already a separately identifiable part of the management report. For the banking industry, option 1 might therefore be difficult to apply if the objective is to avoid redundancy. Moreover, we believe that further guidance from EBA and EFRAG is needed to see how Option b) or c) would apply in this specific case.
- Options b) & c) are more compatible with the concept of a non financial reporting integrated into the annual report.
- In addition, the option to be retained could also depend on the size of the entity or activity sector of the entity.

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

As stated in our cover letter (Appendix, point 8 relating to information related to financial effects), we believe that the requirements for the disclosure of the financial effects are insufficiently precise to provide for comparability and assurance. We therefore consider that EFRAG should provide further details and guidance.

EFRAG should also phase-in the related disclosure requirements as companies first need to get up to speed in the assessment of their impacts, risks and opportunities in relation to the topics and subtopics covered by EFRAG, before being able to make any determination of financial effects. However, we recognise the importance of the interconnection between financial and sustainability information, and we propose, in the context of the phasing-in, that companies first give a narrative description of the intended financial effects, then provide ranges of expected financial effects and later on more precise estimates.

We note that the specific references in some ESRS to line items in financial statements refer to line items that are in many cases not in direct reading in financial statements. This may be of limited help for the users of sustainability statements. We suggest that EFRAG further considers the specific reconciliations with the financial statements required.

Moreover, making the connectivity is complex because explaining financial effects that have not yet been recognised in financial statements may create confusion as to how this information is incorporated in the preparation of financial statements, if there are no similar references or linkage between the two. Thus, we recommend that the reciprocal connectivity between financial and sustainability statements should be the subject of further research and work.

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

1/ Concepts should be aligned between ESRS and ISSB. We see no reason why they should not. Please refer to Q3 part 1A concerning the consistency with international standards and EU regulations.
2/ The definition of users should be given in the glossary to deal with consistency problems in § 26-28, with the use of either the term “users” or “stakeholders”: § 26 refers to “users” whereas §27 refers to “stakeholders”. The latter should be replaced by “users”.
3/ In the definition of “Relevance”, the term “substantive” does not seem appropriate with respect to the enounced definition of materiality.

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

1/ Concepts should be aligned between ESRS and IFRS. Please also refer to Q3 part 1A concerning the consistency with international standards and EU regulations.
2/ In ESRS 1.32, it is stated that "...the undertaking has implemented adequate processes and internal controls to reduce errors...". However, undertakings should not aim to merely reduce errors but should rather aim to be free of them. We rather suggest using wording such as “information free from material errors and misstatements”.

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

Concepts should be aligned between ESRS and IFRS.
Please also refer to Q3 part 1A concerning the consistency with international standards and EU regulations.

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

Concepts should be aligned between ESRS and IFRS.
Please also refer to Q3 part 1A concerning the consistency with international standards and EU regulations.
Regarding more specifically the auditability of the information required, as stated in our cover letter letter (points 9 – 11 relating to auditability), we generally believe that it is possible to provide assurance on the information required.
Sometimes, there will be significant challenges associated with it, particularly as it relates to forward-looking information, the value chain, the due diligence process, financial effects and complex performance metrics where there are no recognised measurement methodologies developed yet. For instance, while we believe that it will be feasible to identify third party relationships that have a direct impact on the undertaking, we believe that identifying third parties of third parties who have an indirect impact on the undertaking activity will be a more difficult exercise.
Overall, we believe that companies will experience a curve of continuous progress over the years, with the trigger of the assurance requirements.
This has proved in France to be very effective, leading to an improvement of the quality of sustainability information, since it was first introduced in 2010. Mandatory assurance is definitely a driver of quality, alongside the other pillars of good corporate reporting: i.e. proper information system, internal control, good corporate governance and public oversight, in order to raise sustainability reporting as a key element of corporate reporting.
Obviously, the increased amount of information required by the CSRD and ESRS, compared to that formerly required by the NFRD, will lead to a significant increase in the work effort required from preparers to produce this information and for auditors to verify it.
Such increased work effort will undoubtedly result into an increase in the cost of the assurance provided on the sustainability information. However, considering the societal, political and investor's demand for reliable and relevant sustainability information, exempt of greenwashing, and which should soon become as important as financial information, we believe that the expected benefits outweigh the increased cost.

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

Concepts should be aligned between ESRS and IFRS.
Please also refer to Q3 part 1A concerning the consistency with international standards and EU regulations.

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

1/ We fully support the concept of double materiality, as it is explained in paragraph 46.
2/ However, the concepts of “information materiality” and “material sustainability matters” should be more explicit and better formulated in ESRS 1. The paragraphs on possible omissions of information because of materiality, as mentioned at § 43 and 62, are not sufficiently clear. Their implementation is not straightforward.
3/ Also, the concept of “material sustainability matters” is missing in the first sentence of paragraph 3 (“The undertaking shall disclose all material information on its material sustainability-related impacts”).”

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

1/ As stated in our cover letter (Appendix, point 2 relating to double materiality and the materiality exercise), we consider that the concept of “Double materiality”, i.e. impact materiality and financial materiality, and how to perform a materiality exercise (i.e. to decide what material sustainability information to report) are not sufficiently explained to enable practical implementation and enforcement.

2/ We highly recommend developing an application guidance in order to illustrate the process to be implemented and get at the materiality matrix. At this stage, there is only few information in order to show the feasibility of the exercise (AG 56 – AG 72).

We therefore consider that the following actions should be taken by EFRAG:

- a) Develop further guidance and illustrations on double materiality, impact materiality and financial material, and how to perform a materiality exercise, recognising however that determining materiality is always a dynamic exercise over time;
- b) Carry out a joint and concerted work effort with ISSB and GRI to clarify the similarities and differences between the materiality concepts used in each of the framework. The same terminology should be used when the same concepts are used. Otherwise, different terminology should be used;
- c) Illustrate how entities could disclose their materiality matrix and their intended stakeholders per the ESRS 2 disclosure requirements.

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

Please refer to our comments in the cover letter, and in Q3 of Consultation Survey 1A.

We support the existence of a global baseline for the sustainability reporting standards and interoperability with it, to allow for global comparisons, to facilitate reporting processes and to alleviate reporting burden. It may also be important for a number of ESRS preparers to be able to confirm compliance with the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards (SDS). It is important that such preparers should not be subject to dual reporting.

Currently, we see significant differences between ESRS and ISSB standards with respect to the architecture of the standards, the materiality definitions, terminology and concepts, and the range of intended stakeholders. We therefore ask EFRAG and the ISSB to work together to identify the differences between their standards and resolve them to the extent possible.

As indicated at Q19, further guidance is needed on how to identify what is material for the purposes of ESRS reporting under the CSRD. The current definition of double materiality does not give a sufficient methodology to identify what double materiality means. For first time preparers (i.e. entities unfamiliar with NFRD), it is hard to understand what material impacts, risks, and opportunities are.

More specifically:

- Impact materiality appears aligned with GRI pillar 1 (double materiality) but not with ISSB IFRS S1. We recommend EFRAG to work with the ISSB, so that the ISSB considers the impact materiality, in addition to the financial materiality.
- We struggle to find the ESRS concepts in GRI and ISSB. As said above, we invite EFRAG/ISSB/GRI to work together in order to align their terminology and wording, when concepts are similar, and to explain residual differences when relevant.
- Some practical examples illustrating the resulting differences in the application of the differing materiality concepts between ESRS and ISSB would be useful to understand such differences.
- Harmonization of the concepts is critical in order to allow a comparability of information, especially for undertakings which should comply to different set of standards.

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

We highly recommend developing an application illustrative guidance in order to illustrate the process to be implemented to determine the materiality of sustainability topics. At this stage, there is only few guidance in order to show the feasibility of the exercise (AG 56 – AG 72).

Please also refer to Q19 part 1B.

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

Please refer to our earlier comments at Q19/Q20 part 1B.

1. The GRI financial materiality is not aligned with the financial materiality of ESRS 1.
2. The ISSB definition of financial materiality is broad and we do not know where the interference with impact materiality stops. It could be relevant that either ISSB takes in account impact materiality and integrate this notion in its definition of materiality, or explain why it is not the case in presenting the gap analysis between ISSB IFRS SDS and ESRS.
3. We struggle to find ESRS concepts in GRI and ISSB. We invite GRI/EFRAG/ISSB to work together in order to align all the terminology and wording when concepts are similar, and to explain residual differences when relevant.
4. As stated above,
 - a. some practical examples illustrating the resulting differences in the application of the differing materiality concepts between ESRS and ISSB would be useful to understand such differences.
 - b. harmonization of concepts is critical in order to allow a comparability of information especially for undertakings which want to comply with different set of standards.

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

We highly recommend developing an application illustrative guidance in order to illustrate the process to be implemented to determine the materiality of sustainability topics. At this stage, there is only few guidance in

order to show the feasibility of the exercise (AG 56 – AG 72).
Please also refer to Q19/Q20/Q22 part 1B.

(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

As stated in our cover letter (Appendix, point 3), we do not support the materiality rebuttable presumption. Currently, because of the lack of sufficient guidance, we are in doubt as to whether this concept can be implemented and enforced consistently.

We also question whether it is really needed, if the materiality principles are sufficiently clear for their consistent implementation. The standards should properly define what is material and give enough guidance to the entities to guide them in deciding what is material to their activity and business model. Presuming materiality of all topics and requiring the entities to rebut such presumption seems to be unduly onerous and inefficient.

In any case, we are opposed to requiring disclosures of why each disclosure requirement was rebutted at a granular level. How companies justify and document in their process what they are rebutting will be key. However, this justification and documentation do not necessarily have to be accompanied by additional narrative in the report. We support limiting such explanations to cases where they are material to the understanding of users of the sustainability reporting.

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

It is key to avoid producing non necessary information.

Care should be given not to make its application too time consuming, with the obligation to produce a narrative to justify its application

Please refer to Q24 part B.

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

This leads to a decrease of the comparability of the information provided by the undertaking.

Please refer to Q24 part 1B.

Q27: how would you suggest it can be improved?

Please refer to Q24 part 1B.

Moreover, we have the following comments:

1. Consistency between ESRS 2 § 77c) and ESRS 1 § 57 should be reinforced

a. ESRS 2 § 77c)

“The disclosure required by paragraph 75 shall include the following information:

(c) a list of ESRS or group of disclosure requirements related to a specific aspect covered by an ESRS that are complied with a “not material for the undertaking” disclosure, with a clear indication as to the application of the rebuttable presumption and the reason why it is rebutted (see also chapter 2.2. of ESRS 1)”

b. ESRS 1 § 57

Sector-agnostic and sector-specific ESRS mandate disclosure requirements for all undertakings or all undertakings in a particular sector reflecting double materiality. Therefore, all mandatory disclosure requirements established by ESRS shall be presumed to be material and, therefore, to justify a full disclosure in accordance with the relevant ESRS. However, to consider the undertaking’s facts and circumstances and the outcome of its assessment process, such a presumption is rebuttable based on reasonable and supportable evidence.

2. Undertakings should :
- c. Document and archive their analysis but not disclose it, except if it is useful for the stakeholders
- d. Clarify in their reporting the date at which they have performed the materiality analysis and the dates of updates

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

As stated in our cover letter (Appendix, point 7 – Information related to the value chain), with regard to the "Value Chain", we consider that ESRS should include further explanations and application guidance to better understand the boundaries of the value chain.

Also, as collecting, estimating and verifying information in relation to the value chain presents very significant challenges both for the preparer and the auditor, due to the lack of data and recognised methodologies to provide approximations and internal control, we suggest, similarly to the recently discussed CSRD, a transition period for undertakings which would consist of:

- i. First and second years of application: the performance metrics would not cover the value chain and only the undertaking's own operations (except for scope 3 GHG emissions under ESRS E1 Climate change and SFRD indicators);
- ii. The third year of application: the performance metrics would start covering the value chain. Where the current year information related to the value chain would not yet be available and the undertaking has to estimate performance metrics for the value chain, the undertaking should prepare the performance metrics

by using information published by the value chain the previous year.

Moreover, we have the following comment: "Reasonable efforts" (mentioned in paragraphs 67, 69 and 71) should be defined in AP6 Glossary.

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

The possibility should be given to not report information when it is deemed impracticable to approximate, with a commitment to a timeframe for collecting the information.

Please also refer to Q28 part 1B.

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

Care should be given not to ask too granular information.

IFRS 8 already requires to disclose revenues, profit & loss and assets per operating segments > 10% of consolidated financial statements. Information provided according to DR2-GR2 should be reconciled with IFRS 8 disclosures.

Concerning more specifically the volume and granularity of information, as stated in our cover letter (Appendix, point 4), we find that the information requested by ESRS, when aggregated together, can result in too voluminous and granular information, in particular, for the first-time implementation (including for NFRD undertakings).

EFRAG might want to improve the scalability of its standards by defining which disclosures are required irrespective of the size and activity of the entity. Also, we are conscious that the maturity of the undertakings in terms of degree of preparedness for providing the information requested will be very different from one entity to another.

Based on those observations, we consider that EFRAG should:

- ii. Revise the need for certain requirements and their level of granularity, to avoid leading to box-ticking exercise - see our detailed suggestions in our responses to the Consultation Survey questionnaires;
- iii. Phase-in certain disclosure requirements, particularly in relation to value chain and due diligence (which would benefit from the finalisation of the CSDDD), certain performance metrics and financial effects. For example, we recommend that the performance measurement metrics in ESRS E4 Biodiversity and ecosystems (DR E4-5 to DR E4-10) be phased in. Currently, there is no global consensus on biodiversity metrics. However, methodologies need to be sufficiently detailed and operationalised to allow for meaningful comparison of impacts and mitigation activities over time;
- iv. Focus first on the description and assessment of impacts, risks and opportunities, and the provision of information satisfying the needs of SFDR indicators.

As stated in our cover letter (Appendix, point 6), in order to reduce the burden while at the same time improving the relevance of the information provided, some disclosures requirements could be reclassified as sector specific rather than sector agnostic, either permanently or temporarily during the phasing in of the

implementation of the standards.

This could be the case for example for certain disclosure requirements related to pollution, water consumption or biodiversity, for which certain service activities clearly have no impact (see other proposals in our responses to the Consultation Survey questionnaires).

Finally , as stated in our cover letter, we support a set of reporting standards that leads to sustainability information of quality that is both sufficiently balanced and focused, so that it can be produced by the undertakings at optimal cost/benefits and does not turn into a compliance exercise.

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

See below at Q33.

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

Paragraph 83: a), b), c) give a time horizon.

Taking in account various life cycles, this time horizon should introduce a very long-term horizon, in particular to be consistent with time horizons defined in some topical standards (e.g., Climate change ESRS E1 AG18). To summarise, the suggestion is as follows:

- i. short term: until 1 year;
- ii. medium term: 1 to 5 years;
- iii. long term: from 5 years:
1. Including a very long term horizon: from 10 years, in particular in terms of climate change horizons

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

The undertaking could also disclose how implementation of policies by third parties has been addressed when setting a new/or renewal of a relationship within the value chain.
Undertaking shall disclose precise but concise information in order for the reader to obtain a global understanding of the policies in place. Information shall remain synthetic.

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

We consider that the reason of change of base year (as mentioned in Paragraph 82 of ESRS 1) should be required to be disclosed.

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

1/ Paragraph 104: Key actions taken in the reporting year and planned for the future and how their implementation addresses material impacts, risks and opportunities are not defined in Appendix 6
2/ Paragraph 105: we consider that

- The required information is not precise enough (what are “operational expenses”? what time horizon considered? What are “financial and other resources”?)
- As far as prospective information is concerned, paragraph 105 should be amended to refer to the latest commitments approved by the management through dedicated approval bodies (as in IAS 36.33 b) on significant investments and operational expenses related to ESG matters). This would increase responsibility of management and facilitate auditability for external auditors.

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)

Changes in preparing or presenting sustainability information: we believe that undertaking should mention whether the change is voluntary or results from the application of a new standard.

Paragraph 71 should:

- apply only where there is a significant or material change;
- ask undertaking to explain which nature of business relationships are/were (not already) included in the group of “legal” or “operational structure” or “products and services” or “supply chain”.

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

ISSB and ESRS have different objectives and materiality scopes, so complete alignment is not relevant. Nevertheless, when a topic/notion is common between ESRS 1 and IFRS S1, definitions and requirements should be aligned (e.g. financial materiality, faithful representation of sustainability information, etc.). Please also refer to Q3, part 1A and Q18-23, part 1B.

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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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

For A

CSRD covers business model, interest of stakeholders, implementation of strategies, role of governance bodies on sustainable matters, due diligence process, adverse impact, risks and dependencies, time horizon. CSRD mentions: (ii) the principal actual or potential adverse impacts connected with the undertaking's value chain, including its own operations, its products and services, its business relationships, and its supply chain; ESRS 2 only mentions adverse impacts among due diligence analysis. Adverse impacts must be integrated in the wording used when analysing risks and opportunities.

For B & G

We highly recommend developing an illustrative guidance in order to illustrate the process to be implemented to define the materiality of sustainability topics. At this stage, there is only few guidance in order to show the feasibility of the exercise (AG 56 – AG 72).

For C

The rebuttable materiality concept can cause omission that can give rise to "non-comparable" disclosures.

For D & E

Improvement needed on “Every reasonable effort” and introduce a progressivity principle (value chain)
We welcome the wording of the ED to invite undertaking to provide “every reasonable effort” to obtain information related to the value chain and disclose how they would improve their reporting in the future (ESRS2.23b) which invites undertakings to implement continuous improvement. Still “every” could be deleted in “every reasonable effort” to reduce the burden of trying to collect the information directly from the value chain.

We believe “every reasonable effort” or a “progressivity principle” could be better defined and become more explicit. For example, a list of (not too complex) mandatory disclosure could be specified for year 1 implementation whereas more complex mandatory disclosures list would be required on year 2 or 3.

Also, the definition of value chain provided in appendix A of ESRS 2 is not the same as the one provided by article 3 of the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD). ESRS should also include application guidance on the value chain.

For F

Information related to value chain could be difficult to obtain for the undertaking. Considering the entirety of the value chain, a transition period could be authorized for the value chain disclosure requirements. This would allow benchmarks to become available for estimates for the first year of application of DR related to value chain. Please refer to Q16 part 1B.

For I

Definition of value chain in ESRS is different from the one included in CSDDD. In addition, scope of ESRS /CSRD and scope of CSDDD are not the same.

For J

When topic/notion is common between ESRS 1 and ISSB, definitions, wording and requirements should be aligned. For example, financial materiality. Refer to previous comments at Q3, Part 1A, Q18-Q23, Part 1B.

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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

Refers to question B

To ensure the relevance of information, it is important to specify the end of the value chain. How far up and down the value chain does reporting entities need to look when assessing IRO (impact, risks and opportunities). For example, when does a reporting entity need to disclose the effects of sustainability-related risks and opportunities relating to its customers' customers and/or its suppliers' suppliers and beyond?

Refers to question C

Comparability (especially across sectors) for GHG emissions requires a higher level of methodological advice than provided by ESRS, e.g. on the choice of emission factors used for calculations.

Refers to question E

Illustrative guidelines will be needed to help companies present a faithful information from a financial perspective with regards to financial effect metrics:

- (a) Disclosure Requirement E1-15 – Potential financial effects from material physical risks.
- (b) Disclosure Requirement E1-16 – Potential financial effects from material transition risks

There is an information on what shall be disclosed (% of assets exposed to climate risks...) but information is missing on how this information shall be prepared.

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

Refers to question C

E2-2 on targets is clearly sector specific and no comparability will be achieved. A limited number of undertakings will set targets on pollution. References to sector regulation like IED, BREF, BAT, E-PRTR demonstrate that this DR should be sector specific.

Refers to question E

Guidelines will be needed to help companies present a faithful information from financial perspective (with regards to financial effect metrics). No guidance/explanation what shall be disclosed.

Refers to question B

ESRS E2.Par 9: The seven greenhouse gases listed are connected to pollution, but are covered under the Disclosure Requirements of ESRS E1 Climate change: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs),perfluorocarbons (PCFs), sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆) and nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃).

Not clear whether GHG gasses of Kyoto protocol are to be covered in the pollution ESRS. Clarify “but are covered” (does it mean exclusion?). It is important because of certain GHG (PCFs, CH₄. HFCs) have an impact not only on climate but on pollution. We therefore recommend clarifying ESRS E2 par 9 with regards to “but are covered”. It would also be relevant to specify that these pollutants are to be included in the performance indicators monitored for pollution.

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

Refers to question C – Comparability across sectors

Lack of methodological precision will make it difficult to compare data between sectors. DR E3-4 (p.16 AG 24-29) and (DR E3-6 p.17 AG 34-36). The definitions of the performance indicators are too generic to allow comparable reporting between entities.

More precise calculation rules should be provided to cover the main methodological aspects that can have a significant impact on the data reported.

Refers to question E – faithful information

Guidelines (example, methodologies) will be needed to help companies present a faithful information from financial perspective (with regards to financial effect metrics)

Refers to question B – relevance of information

We have doubts whether marine resources (discharges and emissions ending up in the oceans, activities in maritime areas) are sector agnostic? By definition, activities in marine areas would be sector specific. We believe that water could be a material topic for all sectors but marine resources as such should probably be defined on a more limited scope and remain a sector specific subtopic.

Redundancies: E3-4 28c total water discharge requirement is already covered by pollution of water ESRS E2 par. 5: "Pollution of water covers disclosure requirements related to the undertaking's emissions into water (including groundwater), and prevention, control and reduction of such emissions and thus pollution."

The line between Pollution of water and Water discharges should be better specified; water discharges could be all disclosed in Pollution.

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

Refers to question C – comparability across sectors

We understand that the biodiversity standard wants to apply the notion of scope (like Scope 1, 2 and 3 for climate). Draft ESRS E4 is less elaborated and mature as the topic of biodiversity is only just emerging. The standard covers comprehensive (mostly principles-based) requirements, while the guidance on how and what to exactly measure is vague. There will be difficulties in comparability if no guidance is provided. The application guidance refers to numerous frameworks, databases, methodologies and tools that are currently under development or not ready to use yet (see AG 46). Several initiatives (TNFD, IPBES, CDSB, GRI 304 is undergoing a revision; ISO TS 331) are currently working on the development of biodiversity disclosure requirements, but commonly agreed methodologies do not exist. At this stage, there is no internationally approved method or tool for biodiversity KPIs (the work is still in progress within the framework of the ISO TC 331 standard). Therefore, a progressive implementation of KPI is critical. Because of the currently missing common understanding of biodiversity reporting and the lack of reporting experience, we are concerned that the application of the standard will lead to unreliable and therefore irrelevant information.

Refers to question E: - faithful representation from a financial perspective

Guidelines will be needed to help companies present a faithful information from financial perspective (with regards to financial effect metrics).

Refers to question D: - faithful representation from an impact perspective

Guidelines will be needed to help companies present a faithful information from impact perspective.

Refers to question G: - quality of information

With regards to understandability of information. There is a lack of universal definitions of targets. For example, how to understand no net loss target, do we have a universally accepted definition? We believe that “No net loss” is not a sector-agnostic target, it is rather a global or public policy target. Currently there is no commonly agreed understanding of what exactly are targets for no net loss by 2030, net gain from 2030 and full recovery by 2050. It will be challenging to judge the quality of information if the definitions or target are missing.

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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

Refers to question C – comparability across sectors

- Some key technical aspects are not defined (and therefore data disclosed by companies will not be comparable) and framed, which will lead to disparities in data reporting and interpretation of the expectations: virgin and non-virgin material inflows [DR E5-4], sustainable opposed to regenerative sources [DR E5-4], depletion of stock of renewable resources [AG 4.c)], intensity of materials and products use [DR E5-7]. decouple (Objective 1 b)

- It should be made clear what the regeneration of renewable resources and ecosystems technically covers [DR E5-1]. Circular material use rate: if a rate is expected as a target, it should be made clear how this indicator is defined and can be calculated in the performance measurement section [DR E5-2 25.b)].

Refers to question G – quality of information

- Redundancy: AG1 is near ESRS E5-4 (Resource inflows). We also recommend deleting AG2 as it is already covered by several DR (ESRS E5-2 and E5-3, SMB 3 and 4, AG1b(ii)). ESRS E5-8 on circularity support could also be merged with ESRS E5-1, 2 and 3 as it contains requirements on actions, targets and policies and some elements are already covered by those ESRS.

- Missing points: In AG1, we recommend adding a reference to Paragraph 16 of ESRS 2 (“(b) a description of the key resources the undertaking leverages in relation to the activities it carries out”). Same for ESRS E5-4 on resource inflows, it should be linked to ESRS 2 / DR2 GR3 on key features of the value chain (key resources).

- Structure issue: AG3 and 4 are covering a lot of different concepts (resources, actions plan, resilience, performance, risks...) and are very long. They could be reorganized, and some could be deleted when covered by other ESRS. For example, AG4a is already covered by ESRS 2 GR3 on key features of the value chain and covers the same concept as AG4c; potential merger?

- AG on IRO (impact, risks, and opportunities): we do not think AG5 to 9 guide preparers in assessing IROs. We consider that AG 5 to 8 could be simplified and streamlined in a more relevant way (for example AG5a (iv) is the same as AG6a on optimization of resources). About AG9 we suggest adding examples of major risks related to circular economy: resources dependencies (supply), resources price volatility, resource efficiency (costs), reputation/brand image (waste management).

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,

- 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:

- working conditions (impacts related to e.g. living wage, health and safety, social security, working hours, water and sanitation);
- 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);
- 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*

	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 checked="" 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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

Before going into the details of our review on the ESRS S1, we would like to highlight the importance of having a better description of the risks and the stakes covered by this social standard. Indeed, this would help to:

- have a better understanding of the social topics to be covered and how to apply the disclosure requirements;
- reduce the amount of required information (limiting the number of entry points and the use of “shall”);
- clarify some missing definitions (“outcome”, “employee”, “non-employee workers”, etc.);
- separate the narrative elements and the elements to be disclosed in the application guidance.

Refers to question A – Alignment with the articles 19a and 19b of CSRD proposal

Information mentioned in CSRD paragraph 19.b.2.(i) and (ii) is covered by ESRS S1. The main concepts of 19b.2.(iii) are covered but we have not performed a gap analysis on the different standards (or equivalent).

Refers to question B – Production of relevant information

Required information related to policies and procedures is unnecessarily very detailed. We believe that a more pragmatic approach could facilitate readers’ understanding, providers’ data production process and audit work. We propose to:

- create a direct link to the formalized policies/procedures instead of describing them in the sustainability report;
- reduce the number of required information within the DRs (reducing the use of the word “shall” in the DRs, define minimum requirements);
- When asked to describe and demonstrate compliance with an existing regulation (e.g. Privacy at Work (S1-26)), we recommend a succinct presentation, focusing on countries at risk where regulations are less restrictive than in EU countries, and a presentation of how the company goes beyond the existing regulation.

Well-known and defined key performance indicators used in France are not requested by ESRS S1 (severity rate, turnover and absenteeism rate).

The requirements related to grievance mechanisms in the following DRs: S1-3, S1-18, S1-21, S1-25 should be harmonized.

Refers to question C – Comparability across sectors

Key definitions (in particular, “employee” and “non-employee workers”) are not sufficiently precise.

Therefore, data disclosed by companies will not be comparable.

The lack of calculation methodology and/or the authorization for use of estimates on “employee” and “non-employee workers” will not contribute to a good comparability of data.

Refers to question D – faithful representation from an impact perspective

The required information in the DR S1-13 on work-life balance focuses on family-related leaves, and does not cover work-life balance issues such as flexible working hours, the right to disconnect, etc.

Refers to question F – information that can be verified and assured

The methodologies for calculating KPIs or outcomes are sometimes inadequate or non-existent:

- The key notions of "employee" and "non-employee workers" is not sufficiently precise (inclusion / exclusion of interns, subcontractors, consultants, etc.). The lack of definition of “non-employee workers” has an impact on the following DRs: S1-9, S1-10, S1-11, S1-12, S1-14, S1-15, S1-18, S1-19, S1-21, S1-22, S1-23, S1-24, S1-25, S1-26.
- Reference is regularly made to the measurement of "outcomes", without specifying how they are to be measured (e.g. [DR S1-2]: "outcomes and agreements from engagements are monitored").

Illustrative guidance and case studies will facilitate the understanding of the DRs, especially for companies that were not included in the scope of the NFRD.

As the application of materiality and rebuttable presumption is not sufficiently precise, we do not know whether the auditors should assess all the entry points listed in the DRs. Even more, there is no guidance on how auditors should assess the materiality of a "positive" or "negative" impact [DR S1-4].

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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

Refers to question C - Comparability across sectors

The definition / scope of non-employee workers of ESRS S2 and those of ESRS S1 must be clarified to ensure the reporting of the same scope between companies.

Due to the absence of quantitative data (indicators), the relevance of the comparison between companies may be limited.

Refers to question F - information that can be verified and assured

ESRS S2 covers topics that are highly anticipated by stakeholders and do not require quantitative information. Therefore, the auditor will only be able to judge the transparency of the processes used.

Furthermore, collecting data from companies' value chain is very difficult (accessibility of data). How will the companies be able to provide auditors with the required information and its evidence? Because of this difficulty in collecting data on the value chain, a phasing-in for the undertakings that were not covered by the NFRD or a phasing-in of the Disclosure Requirements should be carried out.

The disclosure requirements on targets ask for an explanation of the targets for "positive impacts" or "negative impacts": How should auditors assess the materiality of a "positive" or "negative" impact?

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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

Please refers to the comments in Q46 hereabove.

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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

Please refers to the comments in Q46 hereabove.

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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 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

General comments

We believe the proposed standard (ESRS G1) on governance is relevant and to a great extent in line with the CSRD requirements. However, we have several reservations about the standard's usability and prescriptiveness. We invite EFRAG to read our ratings in light of the following general comments:

1. Standards lack proportionality/scalability

The disclosure requirements (DRs) go significantly beyond the necessary level of detail. They are overly prescriptive and lack the necessary scalability for all entities included in the scope. This may lead to less focused and relevant reporting.

In many instances, we are concerned that this will result in boilerplate reporting and generic descriptions of governance.

EFRAG could consider:

- i) the possibility of introducing a transition period for companies such as mid-size PIEs (currently not covered by the requirement to produce a corporate governance statement in line with Article 20 of the Accounting Directive) and non-PIEs
- ii) scalable standards for different types of companies within the CSRD scope e.g. in accordance with their legal form, their activity, size, risk profile.

Overlap with existing national requirements

We noted that EFRAG does not provide any clarifications on how the DRs will interact with existing national laws and governance soft laws.

This may create redundancies and confusion for report preparers and its users. EFRAG should clarify whether these DRs are expected to exist on a stand-alone basis, complement or supersede the existing obligations.

2. Lack of connection with the rest of EFRAG standards

As to facilitate the reporting and to increase connectivity and readability, we took note of EFRAG's indication that ESRS G1 needs to be read and applied in conjunction with the other relevant standards such as ESRS 2.

We recommend EFRAG merges ESRS 2 and ESRS G1.

3. Alignment to international sustainability standards

We note that the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards and GRI standards do not require such detailed disclosures compared to the ESRS G1 Disclosure Requirements.

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 checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

General observation

The proposed draft standard (ESRS G2) on governance is relevant and in line with the CSRD requirements to a great extent.

- Lack of clarity and definitions

However, we noted issues such as the lack of precision and definitions. For example, concepts such as 'business conduct', 'business conduct culture', are not clearly defined in G2 and are used in different ways. Therefore, we recommend including clear definitions of the key terms used e.g. 'business conduct', 'business conduct culture', 'bribery' and 'corruption' in Appendix A.

- Alignment with national legislation

There is a great disparity in national anti-corruption legislative frameworks across the EU. EFRAG needs to add a general paragraph specifying how these DRs interact with national laws.

- Level of detail and granularity

The information requested in the DRs is too detailed and prescriptive.

- Disclosure requirements need to be proportionate

Therefore, standards need to be proportionate and scalable. Materiality alone may not resolve the issue of proportionality.

As for ESRS G1, EFRAG should consider:

- the possibility of introducing a transition period for companies such as mid-size PIEs (currently not covered by the requirement to produce a corporate governance statement in line with Article 20 of the Accounting Directive) and non-PIEs
- scalable standards for different types of companies within the CSRD scope e.g. in accordance with their activity, size, risk profile.

- Alignment to international sustainability standards

We note that the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards and GRI standards do not require such detailed disclosures compared to the ESRS G1 Disclosure Requirements.

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?

Not at all

Please explain why

As stated in our cover letter, we find that the overall volume and complexity of the disclosure requirements need to be phased-in.

The principle of transition from existing reporting to the ESRS should address first the General Provision and then the Sector specific requirements, before addressing entity specific requirements.

In our cover letter, we indicate the need for general phase-in as follows:

1. Focus first on the description and assessment of impacts, risks and opportunities, and the provision of information satisfying the needs of SFDR indicators.

2. Certain disclosure requirements, particularly in relation to value chain and due diligence (which would benefit from the finalisation of the CSDDD), certain (complex) performance metrics and financial effects, could be presented in a second step.

For example, we recommend that the performance measurement metrics in ESRS E4 Biodiversity and ecosystems (DR E4-5 to DR E4-10) be phased in. Currently, there is no global consensus on biodiversity metrics. However, methodologies need to be sufficiently detailed and operationalised to allow for meaningful comparison of impacts and mitigation activities over time.

Value chain

As collecting, estimating and verifying information in relation to the value chain presents very significant challenges both for the preparer and the auditor, due to the lack of data and recognised methodologies to provide approximations and internal control, we suggest, similarly to the recently discussed CSRD, a transition period for undertakings which would consist of:

- a) First and second years of application: the performance metrics would not cover the value chain and only the undertaking's own operations (except may be for scope 3 GHG emissions under ESRS E1 Climate change and SFRD indicators);
- b) The third year of application: the performance metrics would start covering the value chain. Where the current year information related to the value chain would not yet be available and the undertaking has to estimate performance metrics for the value chain, the undertaking should prepare the performance metrics by using information published by the value chain the previous year.

Information related to financial effects

EFRAG should phase-in the related disclosure requirements as companies first need to get up to speed in the assessment of their impacts, risks and opportunities in relation to the topics and subtopics covered by EFRAG, before being able to make any determination of financial effects.

However, we recognise the importance of the interconnection between financial and sustainability information, and we propose, in the context of the phasing-in, that companies first give a narrative description of the intended financial effects, then provide ranges of expected financial effects and later on more precise estimates.

Information related to governance

EFRAG should consider the possibility of introducing a transition period for companies such as mid-size PIEs (currently not covered by the requirement to produce a corporate governance statement in line with Article 20 of the Accounting Directive) and non-PIEs, as the DRs in ESRS G1 and G2 make reference to governance practices that have not been asked from them in most cases.

To summarise, we believe transitional provision should be better organized, while differentiating:

- (not too complex) mandatory disclosure, which could be specified for year 1 implementation, in particular those under the undertaking's operational control (ex: information on operations or GHG scope 1 emissions)
- more complex mandatory disclosures, which list would be required on year 2 or 3 (in particular information regarding value chain or scope 3 emissions)

We refer you to responses we make at the level of each DR.

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?

Please refer to our responses at Q53, Part 2.

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?

Please refer to our responses at Q53, Part 2.

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?

Please refer to our responses at Q53, Part 2.

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

N/A

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

CNCC

* First name

Cédric

* Surname

Gélard

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

cedric.gelard@cncf.fr

* Country of origin

France

*** 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For part E

As the undertaking has the option to split the information by ESRS and disclose in different parts of the management report, this can reduce cost of implementation and improve the communication (“story telling” / “ESG story”).

For I & G

In case the undertaking chooses the option c) of ESRS 2 paragraph 6, the information is less accessible for readers not using digital information (individual shareholders), audit of the information and digitalization are more complex. Nevertheless, these negative effects are limited.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

For part E

Information requested seems too granular and not easy to collect (by location and by sector of activity). The details required by location does not seem necessary and will have high implementation cost.

For A

Information requested by location does not seem necessary and will have high implementation cost.

For C

“Market” and “customer group” are not defined in Appendix VI.

Paragraph AG5: Reporting on « significant internal transactions » will be difficult to implement.

For G

IFRS 8 already requires disclosing revenues, profit & loss and assets per operating segments > 10% of consolidated financial statements. Information provided according to DR2-GR2 should be reconciled and consistent with IFRS 8 disclosures.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 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

For A, D & E

DR 2-GR 3 should be merged with SBM 1 – Overview of strategy and business model – to reduce the number of disclosure requirements and avoid duplication of information.

For C

“Key resources” are not defined in Appendix VI.

As far as audit is concerned, it will be feasible to identify relationships with third parties with direct impact in the financial statements. Identifying third parties of third parties will be an exercise more difficult.

For F

Definition of value chain in ESRS is different from the one included in the CSDDD. In addition, scope of ESRS and scope of CSDDD are not the same.

For G

When topic/notion is common between ESRS 1 and ISSB, definitions and requirements should be aligned. As it is qualitative information, it is complex to compare information even if digital.

Other comments:

Information asked in AG14 is likely to cause problems for business confidentiality.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

For A, D & E

DR 2-GR 4 should be merged with SBM 1 – Overview of strategy and business model – to reduce the number of requests and avoid duplication of information.

For C

“Value” is not defined in Appendix VI.

The broad definition of stakeholders raises issues on the scope of information to be given and will raise application issues from an assurance perspective.

For G

Concepts and definitions should be aligned with ISSB to have comparability.

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input checked="" 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 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

For C, D and H

There is a lack of guidance on pre-required conditions for using approximations. These approximations should only be used as a last resort and avoided as much as possible. We would prefer a delay to provide value chain data with possible omission of information at first if not available.

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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

The undertaking shall communicate whether the change is voluntary or resulting from new standard to be applied.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input checked="" 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 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

For G

"In full or in part": the declaration of compliance with other sustainability reporting pronouncements must be made in full. Partial compliance must not be possible because it would leave the possibility of unclear and misleading statements. From an assurance perspective, we understand that such declaration of compliance will imply that compliance with other sustainability reporting pronouncements will be assessed and validated so that it can be put into the report.

However, the auditor may not be familiar with other standards the undertaking communicates as applied. List of frameworks can be very large (country/sector/topic...). Role of auditor under CSRD is not to check that law or regulation is applied on other frameworks than ESRS.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 recognise the importance of the statement of compliance. Nevertheless, we do not consider it appropriate to publish the details of the application of the rebuttable presumption (AG 23).

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 consider that GR-3 and GR-4 could be merged and included into this DR.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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

For A

Which perimeter of stakeholders shall be considered? Is the undertaking allowed to consider that a group of stakeholders won't be significant? Need for clarification on the level of granularity required.

For C

Auditor may have issues to challenge aspirations of stakeholders.

Other observations:

- a) The terms "all stakeholders" in AG 24 deserves to be more defined. In other words, what is it targeting?
- b) We question the legal basis of "how the undertaking creates value for stakeholders" (AG 25 f)).

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

Part A & E :

We suggest merging these elements with SBM 1 – Overview of strategy and business model – to reduce the number of disclosure requirements and avoid duplication of information.

Part D :

Impact, interactions, material impacts are not defined. Are material impacts equal to impact materiality?
Considering absence of definitions, this DR will be difficult to apply.

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 suggest merging these elements with SBM 1 – Overview of strategy and business model – to reduce the number of requests and avoid duplication of information.

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Part A & C

Goal of this DR seems to give information of expertise level of management members. This assessment will be difficult for the auditor if no specific diploma and only few training hours.

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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

Part A, D & E:

DR 2-GOV 2 and DR 2-GOV 3 could be merged into one DR to reduce the number of requests and avoid duplication of information.

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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

Part A, D & E:

DR 2-GOV 2 and DR 2-GOV 3 could be merged into one DR to reduce the number of requests and avoid duplication of information.

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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

These incentive schemes are taken in account by the auditor in the risk approach of the audit.

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 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 checked="" 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 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

Delivering a reference table between sustainability information and main aspects of sustainability due diligence as required by AG 55 could represent a significant effort for companies.

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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

Care should be given not to ask too granular information in the description of the processes.

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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

This DR requires companies to justify why certain mandatory information are considered non-material for the undertaking. On principle, it does not seem appropriate to ask for justification and appropriate evidence for each of these exclusions. It should be understood implicitly that the non-disclosed matters have been considered as non-material as a result of the materiality analysis conducted by the company and reviewed by its independent auditor. By exception, a justification could be required, only for disclosures considered material to meet stakeholders' needs.

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 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 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 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

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all the sectors

The way it is drafted, several disclosure requirements seem to impose an approach without giving companies the opportunity to specify whether they use this approach or not (i.e., scenario analysis). To reflect transparency, the "whether and how" principle could be more adequately used across the standard.

Refers to question H – prioritisation

DR 1 shall be prioritized at the first year of reporting, except for locked - in emissions.

Locked-in emissions require quantitative information and it is a relatively new concept. We would suggest making this part of the DR (not the entire DR) non-binding and rather propose a discussion on GHG- and energy-intensive assets and products (qualitative approach).

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all the sectors

In the current wording of ESRS E1 AG 24-25, we understand that entities will have to list all policies that have a direct and indirect impact on the management of climate change. This request does not seem proportionate. It would seem more relevant to adopt the approach proposed in AG 26 instead: encourage entities to report on other policies that may have a positive or negative indirect material impact only.

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

The “2” rating for C reflects the fact that this DR will be difficult to verify, as this information is difficult to prepare.

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question H – prioritisation

Please consider a phase - in approach for “action plans and resources”.

For example:

1 year – qualitative information: only actions (decarbonisation levers) without CAPEX

2 year - CAPEX (only CAPEX without OPEX)

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

SFDR indicator

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

SFDR indicator

DR E1-7 – Scope 1 GHG emissions

The undertaking shall disclose its gross Scope 1 GHG emissions in metric tons of CO2 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 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 checked="" 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 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

SFDR indicator

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

Scope 1 is relevant for all sectors. Please consider Scope 1 to be non-rebuttable information. Referring to the final CRSD text Art 29 b(a), 2 a (i):

“The sustainability reporting standards shall, taking into account the subject matter of a particular standard:

(a) specify the information that undertakings are to disclose about the following environmental factors: (i) climate change mitigation, including emissions on scope 1, scope 2 and, where relevant, scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions”

E1-7 & 8 Scope 1 should not be rebuttable as it is considered by the standard setter as material in any case.

DR E1-8 – Scope 2 GHG emissions

The undertaking shall disclose its gross indirect energy Scope 2 GHG emissions in metric tons of CO₂ 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 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 checked="" 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 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

SFDR indicator.

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

Scope 2 is relevant for all sectors. Please consider Scope 2 to be non-rebuttable information. Referring to the final CRSD text Art 29 b(a), 2 a (i):

“The sustainability reporting standards shall, taking into account the subject matter of a particular standard:

(a) specify the information that undertakings are to disclose about the following environmental factors: (i) climate change mitigation, including emissions on scope 1, scope 2 and, where relevant, scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions”

E1-7 & 8 Scope 2 should not be rebuttable as it is considered by the standard setter as material in any case.

DR E1-9 – Scope 3 GHG emissions

The undertaking shall disclose its gross indirect Scope 3 GHG emissions in metric tons of CO2 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question C – assurance

We suggest that the DR asks companies to specify the level of uncertainty (or % of data coming from primary and secondary sources).

Refers to question H – prioritisation

We believe that reporting on Scope 3 is important to achieving the objectives of the EU Climate Action Plan /the Green Deal and shall be prioritised at the first years of application.

We also acknowledge the importance of Scope 3 for investors (SFDR requirements to report on Scope 3). We draw your attention that many approximations and imprecisions in calculating Scope 3 are to be expected if required the first year of reporting. A phase - in approach in the level of granularity will be needed.

For example, for the first year, undertakings could start by screening its Scope 3 to identify significant categories. Next year, qualitative disclosures should be required. When a sufficient maturity is reached, it will then be possible to disclose significant Scope 3 GHG emissions.

We welcome the CSRD provisions that allow companies an additional three years to report on their value chain on a comply or explain basis.

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 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

SFDR indicator

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 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

SFDR indicator

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 CO2 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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question C – assurance

Assurance of carbon removals is challenging given the significant assumptions that need to be made and that are subject to debate. We would therefore welcome further reporting requirements on the definition details (including assumptions and approach).

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

(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 CO₂ 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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

E1-14 Avoided emissions should be shifted to sector specific standards as they are relevant only for some sectors.

Refers to question C – Verifiability/Assurance

The “2” rating for C reflects the fact that this DR will be difficult to verify, as this information is difficult to prepare.

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 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input checked="" 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 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

Refers to question H – prioritisation

- DR15 should be postponed by at least three years, so that undertakings have more time to prepare adequately;
- It is not explicitly stated that climate scenarios are required for the assessment of financial effect. Please consider using “whether and how” undertakings use scenarios analysis for assessment of financial effect (AG 71).
- Also, please refer to Q12 Survey 1A

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input checked="" 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 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

Refers to question H – prioritization

- DR16 should be postponed by at least three years, so that undertakings have more time to prepare adequately;
- It is not explicitly stated that climate scenarios are required for assessment of financial effect. Please consider using “whether and how” undertakings use scenarios analysis for assessment of financial effect (AG 80).
- Also, please refer to our comments at Q12 Survey 1A

(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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

- Potential financial opportunities should be shifted to sector specific standards as they are relevant only for some sectors. We also note that this information may be subject to competitive sensitivities and therefore, as applicable, companies should be allowed to refrain from reporting if that is the case. We welcome the fact that the final text of the CSRD allows companies not to disclose confidential information.

Question C/H: please refer to Q12 Survey 1A

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

E2-2 on targets is clearly sector specific. A limited number of undertaking will set targets on pollution.

References to sector regulation like IED, BREF, BAT, E-PRTR demonstrate that this DR should be sector specific.

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

It does not seem relevant for all sectors to request a performance measurement on "Pollution of air, water and soil" on the scope stated in paragraph 35 "its operations, products and services all along the value chain and product life-cycle" because the level of quality and availability of information on the value chain will be limited.

We propose to require this DR only for own operations, with the other aspects being addressed in other requirements in the standard and through the materiality analysis.

The list of pollutants which quantities are to be reported is not relevant from the perspective of the technical feasibility of their measurement. Also, the list of pollutants from the Platform on Sustainable Finance's report on the four remaining environmental objectives from March 2022, page 102, is not specific enough to describe the types of pollutants selected in a rigorous scientific manner. The list should be reviewed and based on existing frameworks or regulations in this area for greater rigor.

C: the "1" rating reflects that more specification is needed in what is expected to be disclosed by companies, plus the difficulty to verify the information from the value chain.

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

"Most harmful substances" are intended to cover substances as listed in the EU Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability. Not every company will be concerned by this requirement, please consider shifting this DR to sector specific sectors.

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

E2-7 on potential financial effects of pollution-related IROs is overlapping with E2-6 on financial exposure.

The market size of products at risk is not relevant: products at risk generate risks on turnover, not on market size. If we want to address here products and their related opportunities, please, consider shifting these DR to sector specific standards.

Refers to question C – Verifiability/assurance

Refer to our comments at Q12, Part 1A.

The DR is too vague to be implemented and verified consistently.

DR E3-1 – Policies implemented to manage water and marine resources

The undertaking shall disclose its policies related to water and marine resources².

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

E3-1 & 2 on Policies and Targets are too prescriptive in the wording: "shall include" followed by a list of subjects and possible targets. Not every company will be concerned by this "shall". Please consider putting a "may".

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

C: This information will be complex to prepare and verify.

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question C – assurance

The definitions of the performance indicators are too generic to allow comparable reporting between entities. More precise calculation rules should be provided to cover the main methodological aspects that can have a significant impact on the data reported

H: These are complex metrics to determine. Phase-in would be appropriate

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 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 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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

Are all subsubtopics on water (Withdrawals, consumptions, discharged, water risks) and on marine resources (discharges and emissions ending up in the oceans, activities in maritime areas) sector agnostic ?
By definition, activities in marine areas would be sector specific.

Water is probably a material topic for all sectors as water ends up into oceans, but marine resources as such should probably be defined on a more limited scope and remain a sector specific subtopic.

C/H: These are complex metrics to determine, and verify. Phase-in would be appropriate

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

E3-7 on potential financial effects of pollution-related IROs is not clear. The market size of products at risk is not relevant: products at risk generate risks on turnover, not on market size. If we want to address here products and their related opportunities, please consider shifting this DR to sector specific standards.

C/H: The DR is too vague to be implemented and verified consistently.

Phase-in would be appropriate

Also, please refer to our comments at Q12 Survey 1A

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

- In AG 7, we think that resilience is only relevant for undertakings with material biodiversity matters.
- Resilience is a good question, but we think companies should start with impacts, risks and opportunities assessment. We think that elevating the biodiversity issue to the highest governance body may be too early.
- We recommend to replace “shall include” by “may include” or to add a provision application of 3 years.

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

Targets (DR 3) → operationalisation is unclear: “No net loss” is not a sector-agnostic target, it is rather a global public policy target. Currently there is no commonly agreed understanding of what exactly are targets for no net loss by 2030, net gain from 2030 and full recovery by 2050. This makes it difficult for undertakings to comply in a meaningful and comparable manner, and verification to be made. Operationalisation is needed.

The requirements are too prescriptive. Definition of targets should be at the discretion of the undertaking.

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Regarding B/C/H – Prioritization

Performance measurement (DR 5 to DR 10) → phase-in approach

Currently, there is no global consensus on biodiversity KPIs. Methodologies must be sufficiently detailed to allow for meaningful comparison of impacts and mitigation activities over time. Information gathering processes and definitions must be systematically applied. This allows a meaningful review of an undertaking's performance over time and helps internal and peer comparison. Limitations may include incompleteness of datasets, lag in responsiveness of the indicators that can obscure performance, difficulty to communicate complex results.

Because of the currently missing common understanding of biodiversity reporting and the lack of reporting experience, we are concerned that the application of the standard will lead to difficult information to prepare and verify, and incomparable information.

At this stage, we strongly recommend to phase-in the performance measurement pillar. This gives EFRAG together with other initiatives more time to elaborate and work on performance indicators and the methodologies and tools to calculate them ("time to develop gold standard"). The performance measurement pillar can then be included in a second set of standards. This would be consistent with the PTF-ESRS's decision to shift performance indicators for ESRS S2-S4 to the second set of standards (as sector specific standards). Internationally approved KPIs, methods and tools for biodiversity would increase the provision of comparable information in a later stage of implementation. This would also allow capacity and data building on the side of undertakings which has not yet happened for biodiversity.

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refer to question B, C and H

Impact metrics (DR 6) → Report on a yearly basis is complicated or nearly impossible

Impact metrics measure the long term effect on biodiversity. It is complicated or nearly impossible to measure the effect from one year to the other (e.g.: forestry company is not able to do an inventory on a yearly basis, probably on 3 or 5 year basis). Clarification on measurement frequency is needed.

Also, see comment at Q58.

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Regarding B, C, H

Performance measurement (DR 5 to DR 10) → phase-in approach – refer to comment at Q58.

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Regarding B, C, H

Performance measurement (DR 5 to DR 10) → phase-in approach. Also refer to comments at Q58.

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Regarding B, C, H

Performance measurement (DR 5 to DR 10) → phase-in approach. Also refer to comments at Q58.

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B, C, H

There is no guidance included in the standard to enable this DR to be consistently implemented, and verified. Common methodologies do not exist.

Proposal: Defer DR 9.

Also, please refer to our comments at Q58, and Q12 Survey 1A.

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question C

It should be made clear what the regeneration of renewable resources and ecosystems technically covers [DR E5-1].

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance for all sectors

ESRS E5-2 on targets adopted: the classification of the targets (Par 25) is too prescriptive and not compatible for all sectors. We suggest: “The disclosure required by paragraph 21 may relate to the following targets: a,b,c,d”. We would also suggest limiting the target to eliminate waste to its own operation (Par 25a).

Refers to question C – assurance

'Circular material use rate': if a rate is expected as a target, it should be made clear how this indicator is defined and can be calculated in the performance measurement section [DR E5-2 25.b)].

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance

ESRS E5-3 on actions plans: the “resources allocated” are relevant and should be added to the disclosure requirement.

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance

ESRS E5-4 on resource inflows: The requirement should be about the key resources used by the undertaking and split by category of material (not a total weight). Why the “reused or recycled input materials used” only concerns packaging materials?

Refers to question C – assurance

Some key technical aspects are not defined and specified, which will lead to disparities in data reporting and interpretation of the expectations: virgin and non-virgin material inflows [DR E5-4], sustainable opposed to regenerative sources [DR E5-4], depletion of stock of renewable resources [AG 4.c)], intensity of materials and products use [DR E5-7].

Refers to question F

Alignment with the EU Taxonomy: ESRS E2 (targets adopted) and E5 (resource outflows) could have a requirement expressed in percentage of green turnover based on substantial contribution to circular economy. A link to the EU Taxonomy could also be included in ESRS E5-7 on resource optimization.

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question B – relevance

ESRS E5-5 on resource outflows: We recommend requiring information only about the most significant outflows of the undertaking

Refers to question C – assurance

It should be made explicit in the disclosure requirements that resource inflows used and waste generated outside of the production process are also expected (required to answer to SFDR requirements as regards to waste).

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question G

ESRS E5-6 on waste: this DR should be aligned with GRI 306 as it is probably representing the best practices regarding the reporting on waste.

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Regarding B, C, H

Some key technical aspects are not defined and specified, which will lead to disparities in data reporting and interpretation of the expectations: e.g. "intensity of materials and products use" "highest value/value".

Also, this metric is going to be difficult to prepare and verify => suggest to phase-in.

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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Regarding B, C, H

There is not sufficient guidance to understand what is expected to be disclosed. It is a vague DR, hence difficult to verify. => suggest to phase-in.

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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Refers to question C/H:

The DR is too vague to be implemented and verified consistently.

Also, please refer to our comments at Q12 Survey 1A

Please consider a phase in approach for financial effects.

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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

For C – Please refers to the part 1C – Q45.

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 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 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 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 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 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

For C

There are references to "outcomes" without specifying how they are to be measured (e.g. S1-2: "outcomes and agreements from engagements are monitored"). This can have an impact on the comparability of data.

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 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 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 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 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

For A

- Increase qualitative information on the alert system by describing the accessibility of the platform that collects complaints, the organization of the reporting and processing of information (time, governance, etc.).
- Refers to 1C – Q45 on the harmonization of the following DRs: S1-3, S1-18, S1-21, S1-25.

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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

For C

The objectives mentioned in AG.53 are not precise enough, for example: "improving privacy at work", "reducing overtime and split shifts". This could mislead the preparers and the reviewers.

For F

No objective is specified, unlike the ESRS environmental standards. Do preparers have to search for those defined by the EU, in particular in the framework of the European social rights base?

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 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 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 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 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

For A

- The variation of a social indicator and the effectiveness of the associated policy are not directly correlated. For example, the reduction of one point in the frequency rate is not directly correlated to an implemented action but may be the result of other factors. We then propose to explain the actions that limit the deterioration of the indicator, and to explain the measures implemented in case of deterioration of the indicator.

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 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 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 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

No comment.

To be prioritized in the first year of the implementation

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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

For B

The absence of calculation methodology to report the required information has an impact on the comparability of data.

For C

In order to limit room for interpretation, the notions of “employees” (inclusion of trainees? work-study contracts? interim? etc.) and “non-guaranteed hours employees” must be clarified.

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For C

- Make explicit the risk covered by this DR.
- In order to limit room for interpretation, the notions of “non-employee workers” (inclusion of consultants? etc.) could be clarified in the text.
- The paragraph 54 (d) allows the use of estimates in the absence of data. This affects the comparability and the auditability of the information. See below (For H).

For H

- Quantitative information related to non-employee workers could be difficult to obtain for the undertaking. This DR should not be prioritized, as the information related to non-employee workers in the following DRs: S1-9, S1-10, S1-11, S1-12, S1-14, S1-15, S1-18, S1-19, S1-21, S1-22, S1-23, S1-24, S1-25, S1-26. It could also be possible to report only qualitative information for this DR for the first year.

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For C

We recommend keeping only indicators related to training expenses. Indeed, our experience shows that the indicator on the number of training hours is not tracked in a robust and reliable way by preparers, is difficult to benchmark, and is of little interest for stakeholders and for the undertaking.

Need to clarify the type of training (certification trainings, one-time trainings, distance learning...) to be considered in this DR.

Need to clarify what type of training for non-employee workers should be considered in this DR.

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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^[1] 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A

Include the severity rate and review the accounting of "fatalities" (to be excluded from the number of days lost).

For C

Clarify the definitions of the terms used (e.g. occupational diseases) by specifying the different cases to be reported.

Specify the denominator of the ratio requested for the number of lost-time accidents.

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

(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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A

- Change the optional nature of this disclosure to mandatory (importance of the disclosure topic).
- Align language in paragraph 64 (shall/may) with the mandatory/optional nature of the disclosure.
- Review the relevance of the indicator for day contracts that may mask the number of hours of those contracts.

For F

Align the consideration of overtime with existing benchmarks (Hours of Work (Industry) Convention, 1919). According to this standard, overtime is excluded from the 48 hours. We question the relevance of the ceiling of hours chosen because other standards report different ceilings. For example, the SA8000 standard proposes a ceiling of 60 hours/week (standard hours + overtime)."

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A and H

- The indicators reported in this DR are more related to gender equality than to work/life balance (decorrelation between the risk and the indicators to be reported).
- We believe that the indicator "return to work and retention rates of employees that took maternity, paternity and/or parental leave" is not relevant as we do not understand the risk covered by this indicator.
- The indicators to be reported in this chapter do not cover the whole risk: work/life balance includes other issues, such as flexible working hours, the right to disconnect, etc.

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A and H

Review the relevance of the indicator with respect to current practices of preparers. Indeed, most French international groups offer compensation above fair wages.

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 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

For A
Present the breakdown of men and women pay gap by grade

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 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 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 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

For A

This indicator is related to fair remuneration and should be presented in the disclosure requirement S1-14 - Fair remuneration.

It would be more appropriate to use the simple median as the denominator for the calculation of the ratio presented in paragraph 84.a.

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A

- See 1C – ESRS S1: Align the requirements for the 4 DRs: S1-3, S1-18, S1-21, S1-25.
- The indicator on the number of proven incidents does not reflect the effectiveness of the discrimination alert system. Some preparers in France reports an indicator on the effectiveness of the handling of complaints (e.g., percentage of complaints handled within X days). Qualitative information on the whistleblowing system should be strengthened by describing the accessibility of the platform collecting complaints, the organization of the reporting and processing of information (time, governance, etc.).
- Discrimination in hiring should be included to ensure completeness of the risk.

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A

The gender breakdown of indicator 93.b: "total number of own workers with disabilities" is not relevant.

For C

The reporting of quantitative data on disability varies from country to country (heterogeneity of the definition of disability, barriers to the recognition and declaration of disability by the disabled person).

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 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

For A

As we do not understand the risk to be covered with this DR, we believe that it is not relevant.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A

- Align the requirements for the 4 DRs: S1-3, S1-18, S1-21, S1-25.
- Emphasize qualitative aspects: qualitative information on the whistleblowing system should be strengthened by describing the accessibility of the platform collecting complaints, the organization of the reporting of information and its processing (time, governance...).

For C

- Define "complaint", to allow for consistent verification.
- Clarify the definition of "other work-related rights".

For E and C

In order to be able to verify the information, ensure the availability of data from National Contacts Points for issuers concerning indicators 100.b.iv. and v. (number of complaints raised to National Contact Points for the OECD Multinational Enterprises, number of complaints resolved through National Contact Points for the OECD Multinational Enterprises).

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A

- It would be preferable to ask companies highlighting how they are going beyond existing regulations, instead of providing evidence of compliance, because we believe that this is what this DR is aiming at currently.
- Employee representation rights could be addressed in this DR.

For C

- Provide for a more auditable data, for example by linking the findings of regulatory bodies responsible for monitoring compliance with local laws related to this DR.

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A

- Ask companies to contextualize paragraph 113 points (a), (b) and (c) with qualitative information (typology of reported incidents, description showing the effectiveness of the alert system...)
- The relevance of the indicators could be strengthened. For example, by proposing the following indicators: number of incidents identified/reported and number of incidents resolved. Incident handling time could also be tracked.
- From our understanding, the company should report incidents that are the subject of a complaint. Clarify whether non-complaint observations, e.g. identified during an internal audit, should also be reported.

For C

- Define "severe", "issues" and relate to "incident" and "confirmed incident", so that auditors can verify.
- Homogenize the terminology between the body of the text and the application guidelines, especially the number of confirmed incidents.
- Specify how the number of "issues" should be counted.

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

For A and C

- Required information is redundant with other existing data protection laws (ex: GDPR).
- Processes are very detailed despite the measurement of the undertaking's CSR impact and the effectiveness of its actions.

For H

Please refers to Q80, for our phase-in request for non-employees.

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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 (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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

General comments related to ESRS G1 overall

The scope of so-called “administrative management and supervisory bodies” should be clarified to allow for a homogenous application across the EU.

Part E:

- High level of detail and granularity

For example, paragraph 13 requires entities to provide information about the distribution of roles and responsibilities on an “operational level”.

In addition, the related application guidance (AG) includes conflicting requirements on the level of detail entities are expected to report. In specific: AG 1 requires entities to “provide a concise description of its highest decision-making authority”. On the contrary, AG 6-9 ask for more detailed requirements.

Besides, the concept of cost / benefit depends on the stakeholder.

Part G:

The ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standard S1 is principle-based and does not addresses general aspects of governance.

Part F:

- Overlap with existing obligations

We are concerned that the DRs on governance structure and composition, risk creating duplications for entities subject to similar national requirements. It is not clear whether the information requested in ESRS G1-1 aims to complement, repeat or supersede the existing obligations. We recommend EFRAG streamlines this DR to take into account existing rules and regulations in national laws.

Other suggestions for improvement

Issues with the DR's current wording

Independence of members (paragraph 14 (d))

Paragraph 14 (d) requires disclosing information about the governing bodies' independence. We foresee potential issues in practical implementation of this DR and verification/assurance of this information. It is not clear how EFRAG's definition of 'independence' (as detailed in AG 5) aligns with the definition of 'independence' as stipulated in national legislation. So as to foster comparability across countries and to make the criteria more objective, it would be necessary to have a single definition of “independence” at the level of the European Union.

Competency (paragraph 14 (h))

The term “competency” could be subject to differences in interpretations. It could be replaced by experience.

Representation of stakeholder groups (paragraph 14 (g))

It is not clear whether the DR only asks for a factual statement i.e. whether stakeholders are represented or whether stakeholders should fulfill specific criteria. This unclarity may cause issues for verification/assurance of this information.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

Part C: It is not clear whether verification of governance related information means a factual 'existence check' (i.e. was this information disclosed or not), or whether this means (verifying that) the governance policies are implemented and operationally effective.

Part E:

High level of detail and granularity

Due to high level of detail and granularity the DR may result in less focused and relevant reporting.

Part E&H: In most jurisdictions listed PIEs are already required to disclose their corporate governance codes or policies. The other entities do not have such formal obligations.

We invite EFRAG to read our rating in light of the need for proportionate and scalable DRs for non-PIEs notably.

Part G: We would like to point out that the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards do not require disclosures about corporate governance code or policy. The GRI standards also do not cover this topic. Moreover, corporate governance code or policy is not explicitly referenced among the required governance factors to be disclosed under the CSRD.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

Parts A & H:

Providing detailed information on the nomination process will be new to most non-PIEs covered by the CSRD. This DR is important for robust corporate governance processes and procedures. Still, we question whether the level of detail requested in this DR is necessary to meet the objectives of sustainability information for those entities in the first year of implementation.

The undertaking shall provide information about the nomination and selection processes for its administrative, management and supervisory bodies and notably competencies relevant to the sector of the undertaking are considered in the selection process. Sectoral skills are not necessarily relevant. Cross-cutting skills may be relevant and sufficient.

Part C:

We believe that this DR is verifiable. However, regarding specifically consideration of independence in the nomination and selection process, we foresee potential issues in practical implementation.

Part G:

We would like to point out that the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards do not require disclosures of the nomination process.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

Part G:

The IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards do not require disclosure of the diversity policy.

In addition, GRI recommend disclosing this information, but it is not a requirement.

Points A and H:

Practical challenges and relevance

We foresee important challenges with implementing this DR due to high level of detail requested. The requested information tackles specific personal information, which is often subject to data protection rules (GDPR), constitutional or human rights laws.

In some jurisdictions it can be against the law to require information to identify minority or vulnerable groups or disability. Therefore, we encourage the standard setter to simplify this DR and reconsider the level of detail included.

Relevance

In addition, disclosing highly detailed personal information could turn this information into a tick-box exercise rather than improving company governance. The information on diversity policy could be more qualitative and less data driven.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Part A:

We understand that the purpose of paragraph 32 is to know the extent to which the company applies good practices in the remuneration process and not to set an obligation to do. If so, paragraph 32 could be clarified, explaining it gives good practices examples that can be covered in the process description.

Part C:

The audit/verification of the requirement 32(c) related to “whether stakeholders’ views are sought and taken into account” may be difficult

Part G:

The ISSB IFRS Sustainability disclosure requirement on remuneration is significantly less extensive. In addition, IFRS S1 links remuneration practices with sustainability performance metrics (not the case here).

Other suggestions for improvement:

We recommend including as part of this DR “if no such policy is applied, the entity shall provide an explanation as to why that is the case and where applicable the timing and plans to have such a policy”.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Suggestions for improvement

Clarify the risk management scope

We encourage EFRAG to clarify this DR's scope. Paragraph 34 states that the DR covers risks arising for the undertaking and for the stakeholders. However, the rest of the DR seems to focus only on risks for the undertaking (see paragraph 36, and AG 16-a, AG 17).

Contrary to the DR 1-8 on internal controls, we note that this DR does not refer to risk management processes over sustainability reporting. Is there a requirement to describe the risk management process for sustainability related items?

We note that AG 17, 18 and 19 are very detailed. We question the relevance of such detail and recommend summarizing them.

Integrate 'risk management' and 'internal controls'

Considering risk management and internal control are highly interconnected processes, DRs 1-7 and 1-8 could be merged.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 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

This DR makes reference to internal controls including in relation to the sustainability reporting process. In line with our comment to G1-7, we recommend EFRAG clarifies whether this DR reflects the internal control process of the undertaking and notably in relation to the sustainability reporting process or only in relation to the sustainability reporting process.

Part G:

G1-8 includes more extensive DRs compared with the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards.

Other suggestions for improvement

Integrate 'risk management' and 'internal controls'

In line with our comment under G1-7, EFRAG could merge DR1-7 and DR1-8 (DRs on risk management and internal controls processes).

Assessment of internal controls

We suggest including how controls over the main risks are implemented; currently the DR focuses on processes only.

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 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 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

Point C : Suggestions for improvement

A clear definition of independence is needed to ensure comparability and faithfulness of information.

Therefore, our remark on the definition of independence for G1-1 also applies to this point.

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 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 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 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

Part G: Neither ISSB IFRS SDS nor GRI standards cover this topic. Therefore, we have opted for 'no opinion'.

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

General comments

Lack of consistency with the CSRD terminology

We note that several new concepts such as 'business conduct', 'business conduct culture', are not clearly defined in this DR and are used in different ways. As these are key concepts, their use needs to be consistent and we recommend including definitions of 'business conduct', 'business conduct culture' among 'defined terms' as part of Appendix A.

In this respect, we recommend adhering as much as possible to the CSRD terminology (cf. article 19 (b)). If the DR uses other terms, they need to be defined or referenced to an existing definition.

Part C: Assurance/verification of business conduct culture

It is not clear whether assurance of the DR on 'business conduct culture' entails verification of the outcome i. e. that such culture exists within the organisation or verifying that measures to foster that culture were taken i. e. providing evidence that 'business conduct culture' requirements are fulfilled. For example, paragraph 14 asks for 'how the outcome is evaluated' but paragraph 17 does not include any aspects of expected evaluation.

Part G: Alignment with international sustainability standards

The ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standard does not have references to business conduct culture. According to the GRI feedback, GRI standards do not use the concept of business 'culture' but include disclosures on general policy commitments and practices regarding responsible business conduct.

Other suggestions for improvement

- Paragraph 17 (d): It is appropriate to include incentives for employees to foster the achievement of specific action plans and/or objectives, if possible translated into KPIs. However, it is not relevant to include incentives to foster business conduct culture. This is a prerequisite.

- Paragraph 17 (e): It is not clear whether this 'communication' refers to internal or external communication.

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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

General observations

This DR focuses on business conduct risks throughout value chain (refer paragraphs 19, 20 and AG 5).

Part C: the information requested is auditable. But considering our suggestions above, EFRAG needs to be clearer with the text and more specific to facilitate assurance.

Part G: This topic is not specifically covered in the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards.

DR G2-2- requires more detailed information than GRI (GRI 2-23, 24, and 25) (e.g. protection of whistleblowers, incident investigation, while in GRI this information is optional).

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

The term “bribery” needs to be defined in Appendix A.

Part A and E: This DR is very detailed. We question the relevance of disclosing quantitative KPIs such as “the number of reported allegations of corruption or bribery received through whistleblowing channels” or “the number of internal investigations launched in response to allegations or incidents relating to corruption or bribery”.

It is not clear what value this information will bring to the report users. It would be more relevant to disclose qualitative information that describes the process for reporting these allegations or incidents to the governance, in line with paragraph 17 (a). Therefore, we recommend deleting points 24 (c), (d).

Part C: The reservation is closely linked to the relevance and the practicality of disclosing the quantitative KPIs required by paragraphs 24 (c) and (d). The relevance is indeed one of the criteria underlying the “auditability”.

Part F: In certain jurisdictions these topics are covered in the national law. The DR does not make any reference to the existing national laws and if they can be applied. For example, in France, there is the Sapin law for the protection of whistle-blowers or anti-corruption and anti-bribery. There is also specific EU level legislation e.g. the EU Directive on whistle-blower protection.

Part G: This topic is not specifically addressed in the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards.

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 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

Part C/E: As stated in Q129, this DR is very detailed and we also question the relevance of the quantitative KPIs. It will be difficult to verify the information provided.

Part F: We refer to our comment under G2-3, pointing out that in some jurisdictions these topics are covered by the national law.

Part G: The IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards do not cover this topic. Regarding the alignment with the GRI standards, we note that DR G2-4 requires more detailed information on several aspects (e.g. example, the number of reported allegations received through whistleblowing channels and the number of internal investigations).

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 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

Part A: We question the relevance of several provisions included in this DR due to the high, and sometimes irrelevant, level of detail requested (e.g. points 32a, d, e).

Part E: We believe that training on anti-corruption and anti-bribery is imperative to ensuring good business conduct. However, training is only one element of a more global policy and therefore we question the level of detail required for such a component. Moreover, it should be a component of an anti-corruption and anti-bribery policy.

Point G: The IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards do not cover this topic.

Point I: Reporting information on anti-corruption training is critical and must be prioritised. However, we invite EFRAG to redraft the current DR to improve its relevance.

Suggestions for improvement

- Point 32a (identification of the persons who are most at risk of bribery and corruption) cannot be disclosed as it is not public information. Instead, it can be replaced by reference to the type of activity e.g. sales function.
- We recommend that EFRAG integrates information on training as per info requested to be disclosed in para 32 (b) and (c). This will be in line with this DR's objective to report on the processes and procedures in place to manage the risks of bribery and corruption. However, we do not believe there is merit in disclosing information in (a), (d) and (e).
- We question the relevance and appropriateness of the very specific information requested in para 34, which seems to go beyond the role of the standard setter.
- Paragraph 35: The terms "transparency on political engagements" should be explained (does it deal with contributions to political parties?).

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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

Part A: Key concepts used such as 'event', 'legal proceedings' could be clarified and defined. It could be specified whether this includes any type of an 'event' e.g. on-going investigations vs closed cases, officially reported public cases.

Point C: For undertakings with global supply chains, verification of processes and procedures will be rather complex and will involve significant audit work. The scope of the verification should also be clarified with greater clarity of the requirement (verification whether relevant procedures are put in place or their operational effectiveness?).

Part G: This topic is not covered by the ISSB IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards.

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 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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

Part G: IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards do not address this topic.

Other comment: It should be mentioned that the related disclosure should be consistent with the information disclosed in the financial statements.

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 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 checked="" 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 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 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

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

General comments

Although we remain in favour of being transparent on lobbying activities and political engagement, we have doubts on how this DR will be implemented and whether there is a need to prioritise it at this stage.

The definition of 'lobbying activities' is very broad and we are concerned about the extent of the granularity and detail sought in this DR e.g. paragraph 49 (a), (b). For large undertaking who may have membership in several associations it may not be feasible to collect this highly detailed information. (hence our "2" rating for C/E/H)

Part G: IFRS Sustainability Disclosure standards do not cover this topic.

Other comment: The terms "political engagement" should be defined and the difference between "political engagement" and "political contribution" should be clarified.

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 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 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 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 checked="" 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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

Point A:

We welcome the transparency on the payment practices in the context of responsible business conduct culture. 'Payment practices' is a useful KPI to assess the business conduct. We consider this information relevant because it helps to better understand sustainability of the company's supply chain.

The requirement of paragraph 53 (a) is relevant. However, we question the relevance of the proposed KPIs because the undertakings will not be in position to consolidate multiple contractual payment terms (refer to paragraph 53 (b)). We propose to replace this requirement by calculating the percentage of invoices paid on time.

Other comment

The undertakings could mention if they have responsible sustainable purchasing policies.

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

[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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
the fairness of the undertaking's payment practices	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If not, please provide your rationale and indicate the sector(s) for which you deem add-ons necessary.

The proposed disclosure should be applied in conjunction with the disclosure in the financial statements prepared in accordance with IFRS.

Q 138: what alternative indicators would you propose? Please specify whether your proposal(s) are of sector-agnostic or sector-specific nature.

Please refer to our above-mentioned proposal.

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

[a82dd384-3315-4823-ad94-b463ae04d4f2/CNCC_R_ponse_Consultation_EFRAG_220726.pdf](#)

Contact

[Contact Form](#)