

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

Organismo Italiano di Contabilità (OIC)

* First name

Angelo

* Surname

Casò

* Email (this information will not be published or made public)

presidenza@fondazioneoic.it

* Country of origin

Italy

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

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

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

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

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

Given that the final CSRD requires that “sustainability information shall be clearly identifiable within the management report, through a dedicated section of the management report”, it seems that the option 1 is the only viable option.

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

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

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

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

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

In the para 12b) is required the total number of headcount. However, it is not clear what the standard refers to "headcount" (for example if it includes only the employees).

With reference to the incorporation by reference as commented in Q11 of ESRS 1, we strongly recommend to introduce the possibility of incorporating information required by ESRSs by reference to the financial statements and other external documents as long as they are made available on the same terms (e.g. digitalisation) and at the same time of the sustainability statement.

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

The undertaking shall describe its value chain.

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 para 15 states that: 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.

Our stakeholders have represented that it could be difficult for the undertaking respond to this detail. In particular, with reference to end-users it seems not feasible for the undertaking to assess the impact generated by them on the external environment/people through the use of the product/service.

For more details on concerns regarding the value chain information please see Q28 in ESRS1.

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

The undertaking shall describe how it creates value.

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

It is not clear what information must be reported with reference to the creation of value for stakeholders other than the investor (AG 21).

For details on potential financial effects (AG 17a) please see Q23 of ESRS1.

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

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

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

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

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

Please see Q28 of ESRS1.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

It would be appropriate to clarify the difference between the requirements proposed in point a) and b) of para 24.

For a better understanding, it is necessary to insert a reference in ESRS 1 para 4.3 that links to this disclosure requirement.

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

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

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

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

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

It may be complex to identify in which circumstances it is relevant to change preparation/presentation.

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

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

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

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

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

It may be difficult to apply the correction of error procedure.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 better understanding, it is necessary to insert a reference in ESRS 1 para 4.10 that links to this disclosure requirement.

DR 2-GR 10 – General statement of compliance

The undertaking shall provide a statement of compliance with ESRS.

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

It should be clarified the process for engaging the stakeholders and how it is to be connected with the materiality assessment.

Moreover, we observe that the para 38 a) refer to “key stakeholders”. It would be necessary to clarify which stakeholders the entity shall include in this category considering the “User” and “Affected Stakeholder” definitions in ESRS 1.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 observe that the DR 2-SBM 3 and 4 require, among other things, information proposed also by DR 2-IRO 2 and 3 with reference to impacts, risks and opportunities identified through the materiality assessment. Therefore, we suggest to avoid duplication.

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

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

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 observe that the DR 2-SBM 3 and 4 require, among other things, information proposed also by DR 2-IRO 2 and 3 with reference to impacts, risks and opportunities identified through the materiality assessment. Therefore, we suggest to avoid duplication.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR 2 GOV 1 seems to go partially beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD when:

- extends the information to “senior executives and operational levels” and “key personnel”

(see para 52),

- requires the criteria for nominating and selecting members of bodies and other key personnel (see para 52d)).

Therefore, we suggest to delete these requests of information.

In addition, we suggest to include in this DR information on composition of bodies as proposed in ESRS G1 (see Q117).

Finally, we observe that some information is already provided by listed undertakings in the Corporate Governance Statement. Therefore, in order to avoid duplication, incorporation by reference should be permitted to this statement.

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

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

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

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

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

Management level senior executives should be excluded from the scope (para 55) since those are not government bodies.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR 2 GOV 4 seems to go partially beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD when it extends the information to “other employees” and “senior executives” (see para 63-64).

Our stakeholders have represented the need to better clarify how the disclosure should be in detail because the entities are often not willing to give this kind of disclosure in detail given that it could be a sensitive information.

Moreover, data could be not always available in time.

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

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

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

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

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

Although the CSRD requires a description of the due diligence process implemented by the undertaking with regard to sustainability matters, this disclosure requirement may go beyond the Directive. Moreover, we believe important to clarify that the appendix C “Explanations on sustainability due diligence” in ESRS 1 is not integral part of ED because otherwise the ED would prescribe how to carry out the due diligence process.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 ESRS should define more clearly the criteria that the entity must adopt to determine the material impacts.

For more details, please refer to our comment on impact materiality in ESRS 1 (Q21).

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

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

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

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

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

See above Q20, Q13 and Q14.
On rebuttable presumption see Q24 in ESRS 1.

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

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

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

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

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

See above Q20, Q21, Q13 and Q14.

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

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

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

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

DR E1-1 – Transition plan for climate change mitigation

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

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Our stakeholders have represented the following issues:

-Alignment transition plan to 1.5° C: this requirement is considered critical because:

- (i) it is excessively binding given the current state of the average level of maturity of companies (in particular for small-medium sized and for certain large undertakings);
- (ii) Science Based targets developed at 1.5° C are not available for some sectors (e.g. Oil & Gas).

-Locked-in emissions: this requirement is considered critical because it is not feasible to hypothesize the future GHG emissions from key assets or products because it is not possible to know the context in which companies will operate until 2050 (e.g. evolution of decarbonisation technologies, intended use of products).

We recommend to make this requirement optional, or alternatively to require it only at a sector-specific level.

-Other:

- (i) In order to ensure greater clarity, it could be useful to move the following paragraph from the Appendix B to the main section of the standard:

“In case the undertaking does not or not yet have a transition plan in place that ensures compatibility with limiting of global warming to 1.5°C and reaching net-zero GHG emissions by 2050 at latest, it shall provide an explanation of its climate change mitigation ambition and whether and when it will adopt a transition plan.”

- (ii) The climate-related scenario analysis (AG19) seems very challenging even for a large and well-structured entity, and almost impossible for a smaller entity.

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

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

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 DR E1-2, para 17 requires 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.

With reference to the value chain, the following problems arise:

- definition of the subjects to be considered in the value chain: the concept of value chain is not sufficiently clear for the purposes of determining the extent to which the value chain needs to be considered;
- definition of the information to be acquired from these subjects: the undertaking may not be able to collect information and manage its GHG emissions throughout the full value chain;
- availability and verifiability of the information.

For more details, please refer to our comments on Q28 ESRS 1.

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

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

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

TARGET: absolute/relative value

The paragraph 24 (b) requires the undertaking to provide information on the GHG emission reduction targets in absolute value and, if deemed significant, also in intensity value (relative).

In order to providing higher flexibility, our stakeholders (preparers) indicated that it would be preferable to provide information on the GHG emission reduction targets in absolute value or in intensity value (relative).

CARBON OFFSET

Our stakeholders have represented that the exclusion of carbon credits etc. proposed by paragraph 24 (c) may not be compatible with net zero trajectories for some sectors.

Therefore, it is suggested that their inclusion should be permitted and in this case the entity should disclose the fact.

BASE YEAR

It is suggested to consider the alignment of the timeframe for GHG reduction targets to the Science Based Target Initiative criteria in particular with regard the choice and update of base year to ensure that corporate targets certified through SBTi are also valid for the CSRD.

TIME – Horizon for GHG emission reduction targets

The paragraph 24 (e) requires the revision of GHG emission reduction targets on the basis of rolling 5-year periods. We recommend that the time horizon for interim GHG targets should be aligned with the time horizon of the business plan.

The level of detail required in AG30 may not be available and/or sensitive.

Methodologies and significant assumptions for each target.

Our stakeholders have highlighted that for some sectors (e.g. Oil & Gas) there are not shared methodologies for the definition of science-based targets that ensure the alignment with international climate objectives.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

It is suggested to aggregate the required information using as indicator "sustainable energy consumption".

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 observe that such indicator should be more properly differentiated at sector level also correlating it to more typical industrial parameters. Requirements of sector-specific disclosure should be checked with respect to this.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 paragraph 46 requires that “from significant scope 3 categories and presented as a breakdown by GHG emissions from: (i) upstream purchasing, (ii) downstream sold products, (iii) goods transportation, (iv) travel and (v) financial investments” be provided.

The paragraph AG 48 requests that breakdown of the same scope 3 emissions be given on the basis of the 15 categories provided for by the GHG protocol.

Our stakeholders suggest to align the 5 categories proposed in paragraph 46 for Scope 3 emissions to the specific 15 categories of the GHG protocol, in order to ensure comparability at international level.

The value chain model (Scope 3) is already defined by other initiatives companies taken as a reference (GHG Protocol), and there are also tables of conversion that allow companies to independently estimate the GHG emissions of scope 3 without the need to request such data from counterparties (e.g. customers, suppliers, etc.).

However, our stakeholders have highlighted that today, even companies in the same sector, calculate this indicator differently.

Therefore, in the interest of comparability and verifiability of information it would be appropriate that clearer criteria be defined:

- to determine the perimeter of the value chain by providing a rationale at the base. For example, delimiting the value chain to significant and stable relationships over time, in line with the contents of the proposed Directive on Due Diligence;

- to provide more guidance to calculate GHG in order to favor comparability between entities.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 (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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Please see Q28 of ESRS E1.

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

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

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

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

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

With reference to the GHG removals our stakeholders highlighted the following concerns:

-it is an aspect not yet mature for which does not exist international standards for its calculation.

-It is difficult to collect the information from the whole value chain. For more details, please refer to our comments on Q28 of ESRS 1;

-the information proposed in para 55a) (“the total amount of GHG removals in metric tons of CO₂eq, separated for own operations and the value chain and broken down by removal activity”) results in double burden for the entity in terms of costs and availability of information.

Therefore, we suggest to postpone the implementation of this disclosure requirement.

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

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

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

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

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Our stakeholders have highlighted that there is a need to identify “recognized national or international quality standard” against which to verify the project carbon credit in the absence of a global register of carbon credit.

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

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

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

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

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

With reference to the avoided GHG emissions our stakeholders highlighted that generally accepted methodologies for this indicator do not exist.
Therefore, its calculation involves a high degree of subjectivity.
They questioned the usefulness of this information considering that entities should focus on their own impacts, reducing their emissions and developing sustainable business rather than estimating the possible avoided emissions.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 disclosure requirements are complex to report and as indicated also in the application guidance currently no commonly agreed methodology exists to assess or measure how climate-related risks and opportunities may affect the future financial position and performance of the undertaking. Moreover, the disclosure requirements do not provide clear guidance on how to calculate these effects.

Therefore, this could compromise the reliability, comparability and verifiability of such data. Potential financial effects as required by the ESRS E1 refers to timelines that may not always coincide with the time frames of the financial planning of companies.

Since this is a forecast information, and therefore delicate by definition, it was represented by our stakeholders that the lack of link with the financial planning, which follows a preparatory and approval process by the company, could jeopardize the quality of financial information provided over different time horizons.

For both the observations, given that today, at least from the feedbacks gained from our stakeholders, the companies do not provide such information, we suggest to introduce a phase-in solution. In addition, we suggest to adopt specific sector guidance in order to ensure comparability of the data of the various companies.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

See above Q37 on DR E1-15.

(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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 DR E1-17 introduces metrics relating to "cost savings" and "potential market-size" regarding climate-related opportunities which have no methodology or criteria defined for their calculation.

In addition, it is not clear why the ED considers as opportunities only cost savings and not also revenues generated.

For more details please also see Q37 on DR E1-15.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Overall, the information required on policies (e.g. paragraphs 20, 21) is very detailed.

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

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

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

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

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

Our stakeholders have represented the following issues:

- information required goes beyond the current international best practices;
- the time horizon for targets and their interim presentation (para 27(c)) should be aligned with the time horizon of the business plan;
- details on material cost (para 26(e)(iii)) may be a sensitive information.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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:

-to include an application guidance for the information required by para 31 (b) ("a list of the stakeholders involved in the actions or action plan and how they are involved, and/or a list of stakeholders impacted negatively or positively by the actions or action plan and how they are impacted");

-to clarify what is meant by "a description of whether the action is individual or collective: For a collective action, the undertaking shall explain its role and contribution" (para 31(d)).

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that the information required is very detailed and specific and not all companies may be able to provide it. Sometimes it goes beyond the current international best practices.

The absence of clear methodologies and standards for collecting data can affect the comparability of information.

Some stakeholders also indicated that there is an inconsistency between the thresholds regarding the pollutants to be disclosed by the undertaking: the individual site required by E-PRTR Regulation versus the company as a whole proposed by the para 34 of ESRS E2.

Finally, we remind that as of today entities do not disclose information on pollution along the value chain. Therefore, it is impractical to extend the reporting to the entire 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 highlight that the standard requires very complex information and no relevant threshold is indicated for considering the significance of the use of substances of concern and most harmful substances.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that the time frame in the paragraph 47 is in contrast with paragraph 46 (“past reporting year” vs “potential future financial effects”).

Therefore, we suggest to better clarify what kind of information the undertaking has to provide and the connectivity with financial statements.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 DR E2-7 requires information on the potential short-, medium-, and long-term financial effects of pollution-related material risks/opportunities arising from “impacts and dependencies”.

Unlike the climate standard, which indicates the quantities on which these effects must be determined (assets and net turnover), in this standard ESRS E2 the financial indicators are not defined and any application guidance is provided.

It should also be noted that the potential information as required by the ESRS refers to timelines that may not always coincide with the time frames of the financial planning of companies.

Since this is a forecast information, and therefore delicate by definition, it was represented by our stakeholders that the lack of link with the financial planning, which follows a preparatory and approval process by the company, could jeopardize the quality of financial information provided over different time horizons.

For both the observations, given that today, at least from the feedbacks gained from our stakeholders, the companies do not provide such information, we suggest to introduce a phase-in solution and, in any case, to provide that the undertaking discloses qualitative information if providing quantitative information is impracticable to do as already required only for the climate standard.

Finally, a clear definition of “market size” metric is necessary to introduce.

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

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

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

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

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

DR E3-2 – Measurable targets for water and marine resources

The undertaking shall disclose the water and marine resources-related targets it has adopted.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide an understanding of the targets the undertaking has adopted to support its water and marine resources policies and address its material related impacts, risks and opportunities.

Q48: Please, rate to what extent do you think DR E3-2 – Measurable targets for water and marine resources

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that the information required is very detailed.

Moreover we have been informed that the requirement goes beyond the current practices (eg GRI does not cover marine resources).

The time horizon for targets and their interim presentation should be always aligned with the time horizon of the business plan.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that the information required is very detailed and it goes beyond the GRI requirements.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Our stakeholders have represented the following issues:

- marine resources topic could be more characteristic for specific sectors and therefore it would be better if addressed at the level of sector-specific standards;
- regarding the disaggregation of water withdrawals, discharges, consumptions currently required at least by geographical area and business segment, a more representative breakdown of the impacts could be that between areas with water and non-water stress (AG24-30).

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 Disclosure requirement E3-5 requires the reporting of the water withdrawal, consumption and discharge indicators related to turnover.

This is an indicator that, although optional, makes little sense because the denominator (net turnover) varies for other reasons, not for water withdrawals / consumption / discharges.

These values (water withdrawals /consumption / discharges) should be related to industry-specific parameters (such as per unit of product).

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

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

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

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

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

Marine resources are a new topic and therefore difficult to apply for undertakings.
We recommend to define the concept of marine resources.
This topic could be more characteristic for specific sectors and therefore it would be better if it were addressed at the level of sector-specific standards.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

As indicated in Q23 of ESRS 1, unlike the climate standard, which indicates the quantities on which these effects must be determined (assets and net turnover), in this standard ESRS E3 the financial indicators are not defined and any application guidance is provided.

It should also be noted that the potential information as required by the ESRS refers to timelines that may not always coincide with the time frames of the financial planning of companies.

Since this is a forecast information, and therefore delicate by definition, it was represented by our stakeholders that the lack of link with the financial planning, which follows a preparatory and approval process by the company, could jeopardize the quality of financial information provided over different time horizons.

For both the observations, given that today, at least from the feedbacks gained from our stakeholders, the companies do not provide such information, we suggest to introduce a phase-in solution and, in any case, to provide that the undertaking discloses qualitative information if providing quantitative information is impracticable to do as already required only for the climate standard.

Finally, our stakeholders have represented that the classification of risks in physical and transition while is now consolidated for climate change issues, it may not be immediately and easily applicable to water and marine resource standards. It may be useful to introduce examples or macro-types of risks and opportunities related to water and marine resources.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Our stakeholders have represented that it is very difficult to disclose:

-the transition plan with regard the value chain as proposed by para 14 “The undertaking shall disclose its plans for its own operations and throughout its upstream and downstream value chain”;

-transition plans, business models and strategies compatible with undefined target regarding the preservation and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems in line with the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (1st Draft) and the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Our stakeholders have represented:

-The general difficulty in defining and presenting target in the absence of a common scientific methodology to support the identification of metrics;

-These are elements that are difficult to measure by the entity, which are found in a medium-long term time horizon. From one year to the next it is difficult to achieve results in terms of animal species, size of protected areas. In addition, an area is not impacted by a single entity, it could suffer positive effects from one entity but much worse effects from other entities.

-The time horizon of the targets should be aligned with the time horizon of the business plan.

Therefore, we recommend in the first phase of implementation of this standard, to require only qualitative information.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that:

- Information to be provided for each action plan is too detailed and should be limited to a few essential elements. There is a risk that the large amount of information to be collected and reported compromises the relevance and priority of the information.
- Information requested under this disclosure requirement (i.e, allocation of resources) may be considered confidential.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Performance measures on biodiversity and ecosystems are currently the subject of much ongoing work at the time of writing this draft standard. While ESRS E4 requires that metrics should use technically sound and verifiable information, data and methods, no metric is stated in ESRS E4.

In the meantime that a common scientific basis to support the identification of metrics is defined, we recommend in the first phase of implementation of this standard, to require only qualitative information.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Please see Q58 of ESRS E4.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Please see Q58 of ESRS E4.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that there is a need to:

- clearly defined the term "biodiversity-friendly";
- identify the "third-party certification schemes" that are relevant or at least to list which characteristics such "certification scheme" should have to qualify as such in the interest of comparability and verifiability.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 recommend to:

- identify the characteristics that qualify “ecosystem mitigation projects” as relevant in order to compensate for a company's negative impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems;
- explicitly require that negative impacts and compensation projects are presented gross.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Unlike the climate standard, which indicates the quantities on which these effects must be determined (assets and net turnover), in this standard ESRS E4 the financial indicators are not defined and any application guidance is provided.

It should also be noted that the potential information as required by the ESRS refers to timelines that may not always coincide with the time frames of the financial planning of companies.

Since this is a forecast information, and therefore delicate by definition, it was represented by our stakeholders that the lack of link with the financial planning, which follows a preparatory and approval process by the company, could jeopardize the quality of financial information provided over different time horizons.

For both the observations, given that today, at least from the feedbacks gained from our stakeholders, the companies do not provide such information, we suggest to introduce a phase-in solution and, in any case, to provide that the undertaking discloses qualitative information if providing quantitative information is impracticable to do as already required only for the climate standard.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Our main issues are:

- the need to clarify or define a series of concepts (e.g. Decoupling: (relative or absolute), Highest value /value, Linear to circular ecosystem, what “regeneration of renewable resources and ecosystems” technically covers);
- the opportunity that the resource concept regards all type of raw materials (not only the ones used for products manufacturing but also materials used for asset/infrastructure construction), fuels and renewable sources. It is suggested to add some examples in order to help entities to identify the resources to be considered in the application of the standard;
- to extend to all the disclosure requirements of ESRS E5 the provision in para 19 (“If the undertaking does not disclose the information required by paragraph 17, because it does not believe it has material impacts, risks or opportunities in relation to resource use and circular economy or it has not adopted a policy and/or objectives as outlined in ESRS 1, it shall disclose this to be the case, shall provide reasons for not having adopted a policy or objectives, and may report a timeframe in which it aims to have such policy or objectives in place”);
- the application of the concept of value chain (see Q28 of ESRS 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 would like to highlight the following:

- the need to clarify or define a series of concepts (e.g. Regeneration/restoration, Circular material);
- the classification of targets provided by para. 25 is too much detailed;
- the time horizon for targets and their interim presentation should be always aligned with the time horizon of the business plan.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

There is impossibility to describe, with the list, stakeholders impacted negatively or positively by the action plan or action as required by para. 29(c).

It is suggested to meet the requirement through a general description, also for cost reasons.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Our main concerns are:

- the difficulty to disclose (and the impossibility for some sector) the weight and percentage of the input material, recommending to provide more indications in the sector-specific standards;
- the need to clarify if the indicator of para. 33(a) includes both the material used for the product and for the packaging.

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

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

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

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

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

There is a need to provide more details about the disclosure of para. 37 regarding “the amount in both absolute and percentage terms of material and products that are designed along circular principles: durability, reusability, repairability, disassembly, remanufacturing/refurbishment, recycling or other optimisation of the use of the resource”.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR E5-7 – 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that there is:

- a need to provide additional guide/examples respect the current guidance in para. AG 35 and AG 36, to favor the consistent implementation of the DR;
- a need to clarify some concepts (e.g. Highest value/value, intensity of materials).

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

It appears that this requirement is new compared to the GRI. It is suggested to integrate the request with practical guidance/examples to better outline the type of disclosure required.

In order to avoid unreasonable reporting efforts, it is suggested to harmonize the list of actions already required under DR E5-3 with that in this DR.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 DR E5-9 requires information on financial effects of material risks and opportunities arising from resource use and circular economy-related impacts and dependencies.

Unlike the climate standard, which indicates the quantities on which these effects must be determined (assets and net turnover), in this standard ESRS E5 the financial indicators are not defined and any application guidance is provided. It should also be noted that the potential information as required by the ESRS refers to timelines that may not always coincide with the time frames of the financial planning of companies.

Since this is a forecast information, and therefore delicate by definition, it was represented by our stakeholders that the lack of link with the financial planning, which follows a preparatory and approval process by the company, could jeopardize the quality of financial information provided over different time horizons.

For both the observations, given that today, at least from the feedbacks gained from our stakeholders, the companies do not provide such information, we suggest to introduce a phase-in solution and, in any case, to provide that the undertaking discloses qualitative information if providing quantitative information is impracticable to do as already required only for the climate standard.

In addition, a “market size” metric is introduced. It is not easy to understand, and a clear definition is needed.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 disclosure requirement is very detailed.

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

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

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

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

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

DR S1-3 – Channels for own workers and workers’ representatives to raise concerns

The undertaking shall describe:

- the channels it has in place for own workers and workers’ representatives to raise their concerns or needs directly with the undertaking, and / or
- the processes through which the undertaking supports the availability of such channels through the workplace of own workers, and
- how it monitors issues raised and addressed.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the formal means by which the undertaking’s own workers and workers’ representatives can make their concerns and needs known directly to the undertaking and/or through which the undertaking supports the availability of grievance mechanisms in the workplace of their own workers and workers’ representatives, how follow up is done with these own workers and workers’ representatives regarding the issues raised, and the effectiveness of these channels.

Q75: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-3 – Channels for own workers and workers' representatives to raise concerns

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-4 - Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities

The undertaking shall explain any outcome-oriented targets it may have related to:

1. Reducing negative impacts on its own workforce; and/or
2. Advancing positive impacts on its own workforce; and/or
3. Managing material risks and opportunities related to its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the undertaking is using outcome-oriented targets to drive and measure its progress in addressing its negative impacts and/or advancing positive impacts on its own workforce, and/or in managing material risks and opportunities related to its own workforce.

Q76: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-4 - Targets related to managing material negative impacts, advancing positive impacts, and managing material risks and opportunities

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-5 – Taking action on material impacts on own workforce and effectiveness of those actions

The undertaking shall explain:

1. What action is planned or underway to prevent, mitigate or remedy material negative impacts on its own workforce that are connected to its operations, products or services;
2. Any additional initiatives or processes it has in place with the primary purpose of delivering positive impacts for its own workforce; and
3. How it assesses the effectiveness of these actions, programmes and processes in delivering outcomes or its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the types of processes, initiatives or engagements through which the undertaking:

1. Works to prevent, mitigate and remedy material impacts on its own workforce; or
2. Seeks to achieve positive impacts for its own workforce, recognizing that in both instances, the ultimate aim is to deliver improved outcomes in workers' lives.

Q77: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-5 – Taking action on material impacts on own workforce and effectiveness of those actions

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-6 - Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to own workforce

The undertaking shall explain:

- What action is planned or underway to mitigate material risks for the undertaking arising from its impacts and dependencies on its own workers; and
- What action is planned or underway to pursue material opportunities for the undertaking in relation to own workers.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the ways in which the undertaking is addressing material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to its own workforce.

Q78: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-6 - Approaches to mitigating material risks and pursuing material opportunities related to own workforce

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 requirement implies the disclosure by companies of forward-looking information, which inevitably refers to the company's strategy and to sensitive information (eg commercial information).

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

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

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

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

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

DR S1-8 – Characteristics of non-employee workers in the undertaking’s own workforce

The undertaking shall describe key characteristics of non-employee workers in its own workforce. The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is, in conjunction with Disclosure Requirement S1-7, to provide insight into the undertaking’s approach to employment, including the scope and nature of impacts arising from its employment practices, to provide contextual information that aids an understanding of the information reported in other disclosures, and to serve as the basis for calculation for quantitative metrics to be disclosed under other Disclosure Requirements in this Standard, in particular on Working Conditions, Equal Opportunities and Other Work-Related Rights.

Q80: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-8 – Characteristics of non-employee workers in the undertaking’s own workforce

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

EFRAG may consider the opportunity to split this DR between ESRS 2 (qualitative part) and S1 (quantitative part).

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

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

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

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

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

DR S1-10 – Coverage of the health and safety management system

The undertaking shall disclose information on the extent to which its own employees are covered by its health and safety management system.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the coverage of the undertaking's management system to prevent harm and promote health amongst the undertaking's employees.

Q82: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-10 – Coverage of the health and safety management system

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

3C. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Social standards (2/4)

DR S1-11 – Performance of the health and safety management system

The undertaking shall disclose the number of incidents associated with work-related injuries, ill health and fatalities of its own workers.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the quality and performance of the established health and safety management system to prevent work-related incidents. The undertaking shall provide the following information to comply with paragraph this Disclosure Requirement:

- the number of fatalities as a result of work-related injuries and work-related ill health;
- the number and rate^[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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

(Optional) DR S1-12 – Working hours

The undertaking shall disclose the percentage of its own workers that exceed 48 hours of work per week over the applicable reference period.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of whether the undertaking respects the thresholds established by the EU and ILO standards on weekly working hours (48 hours per week over a reference period) to protect own workers' physical and mental health and their safety and work-life balance.

Q84: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-12 – Working hours

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-13 – Work-life balance indicators

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the actual practices amongst the employees to take family-related leave in a gender equitable manner.

Q85: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-13 – Work-life balance indicators

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-14 – Fair remuneration

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of whether all of an undertaking's own workers are earning a fair wage, and, if this is not the case, an understanding of what percentage of own workers are earning less than a fair wage.

Q86: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-14 – Fair remuneration

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-15 – Social security eligibility coverage

The undertaking shall disclose the percentage of its own workers eligible for social security.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to understand whether there are own workers of the undertaking that are not eligible for social security and, as a result, are especially vulnerable to major social risks.

Q87: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-15 – Social security eligibility coverage

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-16 – Pay gap between women and men

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent of any gap in the pay between women and men amongst the undertaking's employees.

Q88: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-16 – Pay gap between women and men

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-17 – Annual total compensation ratio

The undertaking shall disclose the ratio between the compensation of its highest paid individual and the median compensation for its employees.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the level of compensation inequality inside the undertaking, whether wide pay disparities exist and how such disparities have evolved over time.

Q89: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-17 – Annual total compensation ratio

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-18 – Discrimination incidents related to equal opportunities

The undertaking shall disclose the number of work-related discrimination incidents, any corrective actions taken during the reporting period and any related material fines or sanctions.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the incidence of work-related discrimination, including sexual and non-sexual harassment, the corrective actions that the undertaking has taken for its own workforce, and any related material fines and sanctions.

Q90: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-18 – Discrimination incidents related to equal opportunities

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-19 – Employment of persons with disabilities

The undertaking shall disclose the percentage of persons with disabilities amongst its own workforce. The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which persons with disabilities are included in an undertaking's workforce, and its composition by gender.

Q91: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-19 – Employment of persons with disabilities

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Our stakeholders have represented that this requirement could be difficult to apply because the definition can be different across the EU and disability legislation could be not so radicated outside EU.

DR S1-20 – Differences in the provision of benefit to employees with different employment contract types

The undertaking shall disclose information on benefits which are standard for full-time permanent employees but are not provided to employees with temporary, part-time and non-guaranteed hour contracts. The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which certain employees (those with temporary, part-time and/or non-guaranteed hour contracts) do not receive the same benefits as full-time, permanent employees.

Q92: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-20 – Differences in the provision of benefits to employees with different employment contract types

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Our stakeholders have observed that the collecting of data could be complex and difficult to assure.

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

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

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

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

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

DR S1-22 – Collective bargaining coverage

The undertaking shall disclose information on the extent to which the working conditions and terms of employment of its own workforce are determined or influenced by collective bargaining agreements. The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the importance of collective bargaining agreements for its own workforce.

Q94: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-22 – Collective bargaining coverage

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-23 – Work stoppages

The undertaking shall disclose the extent of major work stoppages (including both strikes and lockouts) because of disputes between the undertaking and its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent of worker disputes and their impact on the undertaking's operations.

Q95: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-23 – Work stoppages

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-24 – Social dialogue

The undertaking shall disclose the extent and functioning of social dialogue with workers' representatives of its own workforce.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which the institutional prerequisites for social dialogue in the undertaking exist and the extent to which rights to social dialogue are respected in the undertaking's operations, particularly for those which are located in the European Economic Area (EEA).

Q96: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-24 – Social dialogue

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-25 – Identified cases of severe human rights issues and incidents

The undertaking shall disclose the number of severe human rights issues and incidents connected to own workforce which occurred in the reporting year.

The principle to be followed under this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of the extent to which severe human rights issues (e.g. forced labour, human trafficking or child labour) and incidents affecting the undertaking's own workforce through its activities or business relationships occurred in the reporting year.

Q97: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-25 – Identified cases of severe human rights issues and incidents

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR S1-26 – Privacy at work

The undertaking shall disclose the right to privacy at work for its own workforce.

The principle underlying this Disclosure Requirement is to provide an understanding of an undertaking's measures on personal data protection concerning its workforce and the nature and extent of worker surveillance that is conducted.

Q98: Please, rate to what extent do you think S1-26 – Privacy at work

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Disclosing this kind of information may imply that the company becomes vulnerable to leaks, and involuntary publication of cybersecurity weaknesses.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Although the ED requires high-level qualitative information and not specific quantitative disclosure the requirements are very detailed.

The main concern is the high difficulty and excessive costs for companies in finding information on workers throughout the value chain due to the broad definition of 'value chain' and 'workers in the value chain'.

We note that the companies reporting this information today focus on supply chain, so to adding information about the downstream value chain would be challenging in terms of faithful representation, verifiability and comparability.

This disclosure seems very broad and not aligned with the proportionality approach adopted by the CSRD final version, in particular when it states that "standards shall also take into account of the difficulties that undertaking may encounter in gathering information from actors throughout their value chain, especially from those that" are not subject to the CSRD (art. 29b, par. 2b CSRD).

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

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

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

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

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

Please see Q99.

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

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

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

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

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

Please see Q99.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that the companies reporting this information today focus on supply chain, so to adding information about the downstream value chain would be challenging in terms of faithful representation, verifiability and comparability. In addition, considering that the average level of maturity of entities does not include the disclosure of «Targets», «action on material impacts» and «Approaches to mitigating risks», we suggest to prioritize only the DR S2-1, S2-2 and S2-3 in the first year and to postpone the implementation of DR S2-4, S2-5 and S2-6.

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

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

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

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

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

Please see Q102.

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

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

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

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

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

Please see Q102.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 scope of the reporting requirement appears very broad, considering that reporting information about the value chain could be very complex and burdensome, also with regard to costs, and lead to an information overload and unclarity. In particular, para 1 requires information that will enable users to understand “how the undertaking affects its local communities through its operations and its upstream and downstream value chain”. This provision appears very broad and not aligned with the proportionality approach established in the CSRD final version, where it clarifies that “standards shall also take into account of the difficulties that undertaking may encounter in gathering information from actors throughout their value chain, especially from those that” are not subject to the CSRD (art. 29b, par. 2b CSRD).

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 observe that the average level of maturity of entities does not include the disclosure of «Targets», «action on material impacts» and «Approaches to mitigating risks». Therefore, we suggest to make these three disclosures (S3-4, S3-5 and S3-6) only optional for the first application.

Moreover, we observe that the disclosure requirement does not provide for any parameter for the definition of targets and plans. In particular, how to define targets in the absence of performance indicators should be indicated.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Q108.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Q108.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 believe that the information about the policies are very granular resulting in excessive disclosure. We observe that AG9 states that the undertaking “shall ensure that all consumers and end-users who can be materially impacted through the undertaking’s own operations or in its upstream or downstream value chain by a business relationship related to the undertaking’s products, services and activities are included in the scope of its reporting under ESRS 2”.

This disclosure seems very broad and not aligned with the proportionality approach adopted by the CSRD final version, in particular when it states that “standards shall also take into account of the difficulties that undertaking may encounter in gathering information from actors throughout their value chain, especially from those that” are not subject to the CSRD (art. 29b, par. 2b CSRD).

Finally, we suggest to delete the reference to stakeholders in para. 13(a) and (c) and to only refer to the category of “consumers and end-users” in order to avoid confusion.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that both requirements make mandatory an information requirement that is only optional in international standards; therefore, we suggest a strong simplification of this requirement.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 observe that the average level of maturity of entities does not include the disclosure of «Targets», «action on material impacts» and «Approaches to mitigating risks». Therefore, we suggest to make these three disclosures (S4-4, S4-5 and S4-6) only optional for the first application.

Moreover, we observe that the disclosure requirement does not provide for any parameter for the definition of targets and plans. In particular, how to define targets in the absence of performance indicators should be indicated.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Q114.

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

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

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

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

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

Please refer to Q114.

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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 G1-1 seems to go beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD.

Indeed the final CSRD requires “the role of the undertaking’s administrative, management and supervisory bodies with regard to sustainability matters, and their composition, and their expertise and skills to fulfil this role or access to such expertise and skills” therefore referring only to sustainability matters.

Giving that ESRS 2 already covers the role of these bodies with reference to sustainability and their expertise and skills, it would be appropriate that ESRS 2 would cover also information on the composition of these bodies. Moreover the extension of this information to “executives and operational levels” (see para 13 of G1) seems to go beyond the final CSRD and therefore should be deleted.

Paragraph 14 requires some information usually provided only by listed undertakings according to Article 20 of the Accounting Directive and, in some cases, on a voluntary basis (eg tenure of members on the governance body; number of significant positions and commitments).

We think that this disclosure requirement with the suggested amendments (moved to ESRS 2) shall be prioritised in the first year of implementation.

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 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR G1-2 seems to go beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD, it does not reflect GRI Standards and it extends to unlisted undertakings a mandatory requirement provided explicitly for listed undertakings according to Article 20 of Accounting Directive.

Should EFRAG decide to retain the DR G1-2, it should be limited to a general disclosure requirement regarding (only) the adoption of any code of corporate governance or best practices (if any).

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 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Represent information that must be prioritised in first year of implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR G1-3 seems to go beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD.
Therefore, we suggest to delete it from this standard.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 information of DR G1-4 is currently required only by listed undertakings according to Article 20 of Accounting Directive.

DR G1-4 could be an information to provide in the context of the description of the undertaking's policies in relation to sustainability matters. (art. 19a(2)(d) final CSRD)

Therefore, we suggest requiring more general information about the policy, if and only the policy has been actually adopted (if any).

Moreover, in order to avoid duplication, we suggest to amend para AG13 to allow a cross-reference also to the corporate governance statement (for more details please refer to our comments on Q11 of ESRS 1).

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 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR G1-5 seems to go beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD.
Therefore, we suggest to delete it from this standard.

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 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 final text of CSRD requires that the sustainability report shall contain, among the others, only "information about the existence of incentive schemes offered to members of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies which are linked to sustainability matters".

Therefore, DR G1-6 seems to go beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD and moreover this information is already covered by the ESRS 2 (DR2-GOV 4).

We suggest to delete the DR G1-6.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR G1-7 is in the scope of CSRD but it should be aligned to the final text of CSRD that limits the risk management system to the sustainability reporting process.
However, the scope of para 34 is not clear when it refers to the “risk for the stakeholder” considering also that the rest of the disclosure requirement seems to focus only on risks for the undertaking (e.g. paragraphs 36, AG16(a)).
More practical examples in the application guidance would be needed.
We suggest moving this DR to the cross-cutting standard 2.

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

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

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

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

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

DR G1-8 is in the scope of CSRD but it should be aligned to the final text of CSRD that limits the internal control system to the sustainability reporting process.

Moreover, more guidance and examples are needed, also in light of the assurance. This is a completely brand new kind of disclosure requirement, with a potential broad scope and not easy to face for unlisted undertakings.

We suggest moving this DR to the cross-cutting standard 2.

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

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

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

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

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

Please see our comments on Q117 of ESRS G1.

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 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR G1-10 seems to go beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD.
Therefore, we suggest to delete it from this standard.

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

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

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

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

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

As said in our general comment on G2 (see Survey 1 - Q50) it is necessary to limit the concept of “business conduct” to the governance factors mentioned in the final text of CSRD.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

See Q127 of ESRS G2.

With reference to this disclosure see also our concerns on value chain information in Q28 of ESRS 1.

3D. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements – Governance standards (2/2)

DR G2-3 – Prevention and detection of corruption and bribery

The undertaking shall provide information about its system to prevent and detect, investigate, and respond to allegations or incidents relating to corruption and bribery.

The principle to be followed under this disclosure requirement is to provide transparency on the key procedures of the undertaking to prevent and detect, investigate and respond to corruption or bribery-related incidents or allegations.

Q129: Please, rate to what extent do you think G2-3 – Prevention and detection of corruption and bribery

	Not at all	To a limited extent with strong reservations	To a large extent with some reservations	Fully	No opinion	Not applicable
A. Requires relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

As said in our general comment on G2 (see Survey 1 - Q50) we believe that it should be possible to make reference also to the information reported in other documents than the management report.

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 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 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 type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR G2-4 seems to go beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD.
Therefore we suggest to delete it from this standard.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that details suggested by the Application Guidance as per para AG 13 seem too broad.

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

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

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

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

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

Disclosures should be limited to those required as part of financial reporting, with cross-reference to that.

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 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 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 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR G2-7 seems to go beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD.
Therefore, we suggest to delete it from this standard.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Requires information that is relevant for all sectors (sector-agnostic only information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input 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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I. Is well suited to be transformed in a digital reporting taxonomy that will avoid creating misunderstandings or practical complexities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

DR G2-8 seems to go beyond the scope of the final text of CSRD.
Therefore we suggest to delete it from this standard.

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

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

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

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

Please share any comment and 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 note that:

- a strict definition of “lobbying activities” should be used, which should cover only payments toward political parties and associations;
- to provide for a materiality threshold;
- the DR should be limited to high-level disclosures without going in too much detail.

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

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

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

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

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

In the light of the final text of CSRD (recital 44) in accordance with the payment practices are referenced to the relationships with suppliers and not also with customers, the provision in para 53(b) that requires the standard contractual payment terms for sales should be deleted.

In addition, it should be noted that:

- requiring aggregated information on payment practices would be recommended, especially for groups that usually operate with several counterparties. Providing detailed information, as requested by paragraph 53, appears to be extremely expensive and burdensome;
- the information required by paragraph 53(b) may be sensitive in terms of market competition.

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

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

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

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

Contact

[Contact Form](#)