

EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board Consultation Survey 1

Fields marked with * are mandatory.



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

Consultation survey structure

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

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

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

3. Adequacy of Disclosure Requirements (Survey 2)

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

Respondent Profile

1. Personal details

* Organisation name

50 character(s) maximum

Krajowa Izba Gospodarcza

* First name

50 character(s) maximum

Karolina

* Surname

50 character(s) maximum

Opielewicz

* Email (this information will not be published or made public)

50 character(s) maximum

kopielewicz@kig.pl

* Country of origin

50 character(s) maximum

Poland

* 2. Type of respondent

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

* 3. Size

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

*** 4. User/Preparer perspective**

- User
- Preparer
- Both
- Neither

*** 5. Subject to CSRD**

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

- Yes
- No

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

1A. Overall ESRS Exposure Drafts' relevance – Architecture

Cross-cutting and topical standards

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

• **Cross-cutting ESRS** which:

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

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

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

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

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

- Not at all

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

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

Alignment and interoperability with international standards and frameworks

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

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

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

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

n/a

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

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

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

n/a

Consideration given to EU policies and legislation

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

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

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

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

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

The size and scope of European legislation that the European Commission takes into account may cause problems with reporting obligations for smaller undertakings and additional costs.

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

No, those listed are detailed enough.

Coverage of sustainability topics

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No opinion

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

n/a

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

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

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

n/a

Sustainability statements and the links with other parts of corporate reporting

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

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

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

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

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

Q8: Do you agree with the proposed three options?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

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

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

No, the proposed options seem sufficient.

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

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

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

n/a

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

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

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

Such reference may make the whole Sustainability section less understandable.

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

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

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

In the case of smaller undertakings (smaller organizational structure: 250-500 people) it will be a challenge to implement these requirements (the separation of additional financial parts, previously outside the financial statements).

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

Characteristics of information quality

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

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

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

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

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

No opinion

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

The description uses phrases that can be interpreted in various ways and hence the principle of relevance of sustainability information may be applied improperly and not uniformly which will distort competition.

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

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

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

The description uses phrases that can be interpreted in various ways and hence the principle of faithful representation of sustainability information may be applied improperly and not uniformly which will distort competition.

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

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

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

The description uses phrases that can be interpreted in various ways and hence the principle of comparability of sustainability information may be applied improperly and not uniformly which will distort competition.

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

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

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

The description uses phrases that can be interpreted in various ways and hence the principle of verifiability of sustainability information may be applied improperly and not uniformly which will distort competition.

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

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

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

The description uses phrases that can be interpreted in various ways and hence the principle of understandability of sustainability information may be applied improperly and not uniformly which will distort competition.

Double materiality

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

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

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

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

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

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

The definition uses phrases that can be interpreted in various ways and hence the double materiality may be applied improperly and not uniformly which will distort competition.

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

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

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

In the case of smaller undertakings (smaller organizational structure: 250-500 people) it will be a challenge to implement these requirements.
Especially due to the fact that the proposed implementation of double materiality is very onerous. In particular the necessity to take into account in this process a “business relationships” makes it – due to the imprecise definition of “business relationships” – blurred and exposed to confusion and thus diminishing comparability of approaches taken by particular undertakings. It is difficult to understand the boundary of such assessment concerning “business relationships” and hence it will be difficult to apply this in practice. Moreover, assessment of e.g. impacts resulting from business relationships of the undertaking will be difficult in practice due to problem with accessing to the proper information.

Impact materiality

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

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

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

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

n/a

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

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

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

In the case of smaller undertakings (smaller organizational structure: 250-500 people) it will be a challenge to implement these requirements.

The proposed determination and implementation of impact materiality as prescribed in ESRS 2 Disclosure Requirement 2IRO 1, paragraph 74b(iii), AG 64 and AG 68 is very onerous. In particular the necessity to take into account in this process a “business relationships” makes it – due to the imprecise definition of “business relationships” – blurred and exposed to confusion and thus diminishing comparability of approaches taken by particular undertakings. It is difficult to understand the boundary of such assessment concerning “business relationships” and hence it will be difficult to apply this in practice. Moreover, assessment of e.g. impacts resulting from business relationships of the undertaking will be difficult in practice due to problem with accessing to the proper information.

Financial materiality

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

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

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

No opinion

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

n/a

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

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

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

In the case of smaller undertakings (smaller organizational structure: 250-500 people) it will be a challenge to implement these requirements.

(Materiality) Rebuttable presumption

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is essential that undertakings are permitted to rebut the materiality presumption. The description of the rebuttable presumption and in particular of its implementation is rather short. In particular the information on implementation of the rebuttable presumption is very limited. This can be seen as positive from the perspective of undertakings as they will have significant space to rebut the presumption. However, the risk is that due to absence of specific requirements in this respect there will be many discrepancies in how particular undertakings approached the issue and when it considered to have rebutted the presumption – this will result in various approaches to disclosures and distort competition. Thus, it would seem reasonable to for example expressly require that the “explicit statement” as referred to in ESRS 1 paragraph 59 be supplemented with a summary of the “reasonable and supportable evidence” based on which the relevant presumption has been rebutted (such summary could be included in the explanation referred to in ESRS 2 AG 76). One may expect that such additional requirement could additionally limit discretion of undertakings while assessing materiality.

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

That as a principle all mandatory disclosure requirements established by ESRS are presumed to be material for each undertaking and that such presumption may be rebutted only based on reasonable and supportable evidence and following a materiality assessment by an undertaking. This gives the undertakings the necessary flexibility.

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

The possible discrepancies between the approaches taken by the undertakings which may distort competition.

Q27: how would you suggest it can be improved?

We suggest to provide more guidance as to what the reasonable and supportable evidence is.

Reporting boundary and value chain

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

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

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

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

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

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

From the perspective of the Polish business reality and based on our experience in this jurisdiction we assume that it will be difficult to obtain necessary information from the supply chain (especially initially), hence the approximation will have to be applied quite often. Taking the above into account, there is a risk that in Poland the information about the value chain will in fact have a fictional character as it will be mostly based on approximation. Moreover, it will be difficult to obtain the necessary external information from peer groups or sector data. Hence, the approximation mechanism will not work properly. Hence, approximation of missing information about the undertaking's upstream and downstream value chain should be limited as it may adversely affect verifiability and faithfulness of information.

Having said this, we are of the opinion that information on value chain should be excluded from the reporting, delayed or limited only to some areas. The comments made above should be read in this light.

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

We are of the opinion that information on value chain should be excluded from the reporting, delayed or limited only to some areas. In particular we suggest narrowing down requirements concerning the value chain to really essential matter as for example GHG emission and making it very explicit what elements of value chain have to obligatory mandatorily be taken into account. This will allow to focus the efforts of undertakings from value chain on the important issues and at least try to provide necessary information. It will make the whole system much more closely reflect the reality as opposed to overambitions aims. When providing such information on value chain will still not be possible, then we suggest to resign from reporting in this regard. This is due to the fact that approximated information may not always correctly present the undertaking's material impacts or how material sustainability-related risks and opportunities affect the undertaking's development, performance and position.

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

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

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

n/a

Time horizon

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

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

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

- Yes
- No
- I do not know

Please explain why

Periods are generally well defined, perhaps a modification would be needed due to the particularities of specific industries.

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

- Yes
- No
- I do not know

Please explain why

Time horizons are essential to properly understand the undertaking's reporting areas (strategy, implementation and performance measurement). Proposed time horizons are well defined, perhaps a modification would be needed due to the particularities of specific industries.

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

n/a

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

n/a

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

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

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

n/a

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

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

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

n/a

Bases for preparation

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

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

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

- Yes
- No
- I do not know

If yes, please indicate which one(s).

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

The requirements presented in 4.4. on updating disclosures about events after the end of the reporting period are too onerous. This concerns especially paragraph 116.

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

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

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

ESRS 1 – General Principles

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

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

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

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

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

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

Looking from the perspective of future local user of ESRS this in not a critical issue whether there is this type of alignment.

ESRS 2 – General, strategy, governance and materiality assessment

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

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

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

--	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

With respect to part F & G: The requirements are very imprecise in particular with respect to value chain and hence it will be difficult to verify the information. Objectively the information obtained from the value chain may be verifiable but due to fact that the value chain boundaries are blurred that information will not really be useful.

With respect to part H: The requirements with respect to reporting are set at very demanding level which will result in high costs in order to meet the reporting requirements (including administrative and consulting

costs), however the outcome due to numerous requirements will not necessarily be clear and provide important information due to the fact that so much information has to be presented.

ESRS E1 – Climate change

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With respect to part F & G: The requirements are very imprecise in particular with respect to value chain and hence it will be difficult to verify the information. Objectively the information obtained from the value chain may be verifiable but due to fact that the value chain boundaries are blurred that information will not really be useful.

With respect to part H: The requirements with respect to reporting are set at very demanding level which will result in high costs in order to meet the reporting requirements, however the outcome due to numerous requirements will not necessarily be clear and provide important information due to the fact that so much information has to be presented.

ESRS E2 – Pollution

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

1. how the undertaking affects pollution of air (both indoor and outdoor), water (including groundwater) and soil, living organisms and food resources (referred to in this [draft] Standard as “pollution”), in terms of positive and negative material actual or potential adverse impacts;
2. any actions taken, and the result of such actions, to prevent, mitigate or remediate actual or potential adverse impacts;
3. the plans and capacity of the undertaking to adapt its strategy, business model(s) and operations in line with the transition to a sustainable economy concurring with the needs for prevention, control and elimination of pollution across air (both indoor and outdoor), water (including groundwater), soil,

living organisms and food resources, thereby creating a toxic-free environment with zero pollution also in support of the EU Action Plan 'Towards a Zero Pollution for Air, Water and Soil';

4. the nature, type and extent of the undertaking's material risks and opportunities related to the undertaking's impacts and dependencies arising from pollution, as well as from the prevention, control, elimination or reduction of pollution (including from regulations) and how the undertaking manages them; and
5. the effects of risks and opportunities, related to the undertaking's impacts and dependencies on pollution, on the undertaking's development, performance and position over the short, medium and long term and therefore on its ability to create enterprise value.

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

With respect to part F & G: The requirements are very imprecise in particular with respect to value chain and hence it will be difficult to verify the information. Objectively the information obtained from the value chain may be verifiable but due to fact that the value chain boundaries are blurred that information will not really be useful.

With respect to part H: The requirements with respect to reporting are set at very demanding level which will result in high costs in order to meet the reporting requirements, however the outcome due to numerous requirements will not necessarily be clear and provide important information due to the fact that so many information has to be presented.

For DR E2-1 par. 20 (c) necessity to present reference to possible upcoming regulations is too far reaching.

For DR E2-4 par. 35 necessity to apply to value chain is too far reaching and will generate the unnecessary cost and effort. If anything it should be phased-out.

For DR E2-4 par. 38 necessity to present all this information with respect to activity taking place outside EU will result in very heavy burden on such activity. With respect to EU placed activity some of the information required under par. 38 was gathered for years. The requirement should be excluded.

For DR E2-6 it should be explicit that it refers only to known and identified deposits, contamination etc.

For definition of "pollutant" – heat, light and odor as pollutant are not addressed in EU law and have not been defined from this perspective so it is impossible to say when they constitute pollutant. This way the DRs will be dead in this scope.

With respect to AG 25 please note that information about pollution fines and penalties is not public in many countries.

ESRS E3 – Water and marine resources

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

1. how the undertaking affects water and marine resources, in terms of positive and negative material actual or potential adverse impacts;
2. any actions taken, and the result of such actions, to protect water and marine resources, also with reference to reduction of water withdrawals, water consumption, water use, water discharges in water bodies and in the oceans, habitat degradation and the intensity of pressure on marine resources;
3. to what extent the undertaking is contributing to the European Green Deal's ambitions for fresh air, clean water, a healthy soil and biodiversity as well as to ensuring the sustainability of the blue economy and fisheries sectors, to the EU water framework directive, to the EU marine strategy framework, to the EU maritime spatial planning directive, the SDGs 6 Clean water and sanitation and

14 Life below water, and respect of global environmental limits (e.g. the biosphere integrity, ocean acidification, freshwater use, and biogeochemical flows planetary boundaries) in line with the vision for 2050 of 'living well within the ecological limits of our planet' set out in the 7th Environmental Action Programme, and in the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and the Council on the 8th Environmental Action Programme;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With respect to part F & G: The requirements are very imprecise in particular with respect to value chain and hence it will be difficult to verify the information. Objectively the information obtained from the value chain may be verifiable but due to fact that the value chain boundaries are blurred that information will not really be useful.

With respect to part H: The requirements with respect to reporting are set at very demanding level which will result in high costs in order to meet the reporting requirements, however the outcome due to numerous requirements will not necessarily be clear and provide important information due to the fact that so much information has to be presented.

ESRS E4 – Biodiversity and ecosystems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In general ESRS E4 is very demanding but yet vague. It will result in need to create numerous volumes of analysis which will have a quality of scientific research. At the current stage the bar is definitely set too high and some phasing-in is necessary as well as lowering the bar in general. All reference to value chain should be removed as unnecessary burden.

ESRS E5 – Resource use and circular economy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With respect to part F & G: The requirements are imprecise in particular with respect to value chain and hence it will be difficult to verify the information. Objectively the information obtained from the value chain may be verifiable but due to fact that the value chain boundaries are blurred that information will not really be useful.

With respect to part H: The requirements with respect to reporting are set at very demanding level which will result in high costs in order to meet the reporting requirements, however the outcome due to numerous requirements will not necessarily be clear and provide important information due to the fact that so much information has to be presented.

All reference to value chain should be removed as unnecessary burden.

ESRS S1 – Own workforce

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

1. how they affect the undertaking affects own workforce, in terms of positive and negative material impacts;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No comment.

ESRS S2 – Workers in the value chain

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With respect to part H: The requirements with respect to reporting are set at very demanding level which will result in high costs in order to meet the reporting requirements, however the outcome due to numerous requirements will not necessarily be clear and provide important information due to the fact that so much information has to be presented.

ESRS S3 – Affected communities

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

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

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

1. impacts on communities' economic, social and cultural rights (e.g. adequate housing, adequate food, water and sanitation, land-related and security-related impacts);
2. impacts on communities' civil and political rights (e.g. freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, impacts on human rights defenders); and

3. impacts on particular rights of Indigenous communities (e.g. free, prior and informed consent, self-determination, cultural rights).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With respect to part H: The requirements with respect to reporting are set at very demanding level which will result in high costs in order to meet the reporting requirements, however the outcome due to numerous requirements will not necessarily be clear and provide important information due to the fact that so much information has to be presented.

ESRS S4 – Consumers and end-users

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. Covers sustainability information required by articles 19a and 19b of the CSRD proposal (see Appendix II for CSRD detailed requirements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B. Supports the production of relevant information about the sustainability matter covered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
C. Fosters comparability across sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
E. Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
F. Prescribes information that can be verified / assured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
G. Meets the other objectives of the CSRD in term of quality of information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
H. Reaches a reasonable cost / benefit balance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I. Is sufficiently consistent with relevant EU policies and other EU legislation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
J. Is as aligned as possible to international sustainability standards given the CSRD requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

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

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

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

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

With respect to part H: The requirements with respect to reporting are set at very demanding level which will result in high costs in order to meet the reporting requirements, however the outcome due to numerous requirements will not necessarily be clear and provide important information due to the fact that so much information has to be presented.

ESRS G1 – Governance, risk management and internal control

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No comment.

ESRS G2 – Business conduct

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No comment.

2. ESRS implementation prioritisation / phasing-in

Application provisions

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

- Application Provision AP1 which exempts undertaking to reports comparatives for the first reporting period, and

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

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

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

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

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

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

We suggest considering delaying/phasing-in of application of provisions concerning value chain (in particular point 2.3) which is critical from the perspective of less developed EU markets.

Also we anticipate that meeting the ESRS requirements for the companies reporting for the first time under ESRS will be very challenging, hence some sort for mechanism for co-financing the costs of external consulting for companies applying for the first time should be introduced.

Please explain why

In first-time application the undertakings should focus on their own impact and should be released from obligation to reach out to its value chain. Only once the first-time application under ESRS is done by the particular undertakings can they move on to organizing information from the value chain which, based on our experience, will be a massive challenge. This challenge results from the fact that in many cases the companies from the value chain will be smaller undertakings not having sufficient structure nor personnel in place to gather necessary information and in particular to take any further steps with respect to ESG. Taking all this into account we suggest to even prolong this exemption to two reporting periods so that the value chain is educated enough in the meantime.

As for the co-financing mechanism the idea is based on the fact that the ESRS is very demanding and the first time reporters will need some sort of external knowledge based support to deal with it which will result in significant financial costs of preparing the report.

ESRS implementation prioritisation / phasing-in options

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

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

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

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

At least in the first reporting period:

- ESR1DP1- the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, setting targets should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESR1DP1-3 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, determining actions should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESR2DR2-GR 3 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, describing in details it's value chain should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESR2DR2-GR5 As for ESRS 2 DR2-GR3.
- ESR2DR2-SBM2 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, verifying and describing in details shareholders views, interests and expectations should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESR2DR 2-IRO 1 AG66 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, verifying and describing in details business relationships should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSE1DRE1-1 Preparation of transition plan should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum. This concern in particular requirements under section 15(b) with respect to product and service portfolio and section 15(e) concerning alignment with Taxonomy.
- ESRSE1DR E1-3 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, setting targets should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSE1DRE1-4 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, preparation of mitigation and adaptation action plans and resources should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSE1DR E1-9 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Obtaining the necessary data for Scope 3 GHG emissions will be very difficult and will require a lot of effort and education. Thus, disclosing Scope 3 GHG emissions should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSE1DRE1-15 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, estimation of potential financial effects from material physical risks should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSE1DRE1-16 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, estimation of potential financial effects from material transition risks should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSE1DRE1-17 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, estimation of potential financial effects from material climate-related opportunities should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.

- ESRSE2 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, any requirements regarding pollution in the value chain should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSE3 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, any requirements regarding water and marine resources in the value chain should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSE4 The requirements concerning biodiversity and ecosystems are very demanding and ambitious. It will be very challenging to meet them especially with respect to the necessary extensive, almost academic analyses of this difficult subject. Hence, all the requirements regarding biodiversity and ecosystems should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSE5 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, any requirements regarding resources use and circular economy in the value chain should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum
- ESRSS2 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, any requirements regarding workers in the value chain should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSS3 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, any requirements regarding affected communities in the value chain should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.
- ESRSS4 the main challenge for many undertakings will be gathering information inside the organization. Thus, any requirements regarding consumers&end-users should be moved to second reporting period at a minimum.

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

Please see justification above. In general please note that in the areas where we consider phasing-in justified there is no immediate data available, additional data will be needed, there will be a need for additional consulting from currently very limited resourcing, preparation of report will generate significant additional costs.

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

The minimum phasing-in period should be 1 year, however any further delay (for example 5 years) will be much appreciated and very helpful not to say critical for the less developed EU countries such as Poland. In particular, we recommend serious consideration which steps are necessary initially (e.g. gathering data on undertakings own impact and preparing strategies), and which may follow then (e.g. preparing all the executive actions for the undertaking) and which may follow next (e.g. reaching out to value chain). This sequence should be expressed in the way phasing-in is structured. Otherwise it will not be possible in our opinion to meet all these requirements in the first reporting period.

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

Please see justification above. Additionally, please also take into account the current economic situation: The crisis and the war have depleted the resources of companies. Time is needed for their rational recovery and reporting is not a priority at this moment. The way it is structured under the ESRS it will impose serious burden on many undertakings which will further weaken their economic position. We understand that in the

long run the innovation that will be triggered by ESRS may be beneficial to many undertakings, but for now it is not possible to ignore the difficult economic situation on many EU undertakings.

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

No comment.

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

No comment.

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

We believe that it is of pivotal importance to conduct information campaign for companies that are subject to the ESRS obligation and also to accompany the release of ESRS with extensive yet easily understandable training programs in local languages. Such training program can be conducted in cooperation with business chambers for example. The purpose of this assistance package is to increase currently low chance that EU undertakings will be able to apply ESRS especially for the first reporting period. Also financial support schemed for ESRS implementation could be envisaged.

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

5afa6ba3-064f-4f27-943a-9e42caf1df2c

/KIG_Letter_to_EFRAG_master_FINAL_clean_version_640691308_1_.pdf

Contact

[Contact Form](#)

