

This paper has been prepared by the EFRAG Secretariat for discussion at a public meeting of EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board. The paper does not represent the official views of EFRAG or any individual member of the EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board, EFRAG PTF-ESRS of the EFRAG Administrative Board. The paper is made available to enable the public to follow the discussions in the meeting. Tentative decisions are made in public and reported in the EFRAG Update. EFRAG positions, as approved by the EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board, are published as draft standards, discussion or position papers, or in any other form considered appropriate in the circumstances.

## **Draft Cover note for ESRS public consultation**

### **Table of content**

#### **Part I – The context and the process**

1. The Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and the contribution expected from EFRAG
2. EFRAG's governance reform
3. The work carried out in project mode to elaborate exposure drafts
4. The public consultation

#### **Part II - The 7 key features of the exposure drafts**

1. Exposure Drafts may need to be adjusted to meet the requirements of the final CSRD
2. Exposure Drafts take account of existing European legislation and initiatives
3. Exposure Drafts take account of European and international sustainability reporting initiatives
4. The overall architecture of Exposure Drafts is designed to ensure that sustainability information is reported in a carefully articulated manner
5. Exposure Drafts cover sustainability matters as per Article 19b of the CSRD proposal
6. Exposure Drafts are a first step of journey towards a faithful representation of sustainability performance
7. The public consultation will help to strike the right balance between proper relevance and comparability on the one hand and proportionality on the other hand

#### **Part III – Objectives and practical aspects of the public consultation**

#### **Part IV – Consultation questions**

1. ESRS architecture, content and substance
2. ESRS set 1 prioritisation



**Appendices *[all appendices are still being developed and are not available yet]***

Appendix 1: Navigating the ESRS: ESRS index (Standards / DR / AG)

Appendix 2: ESRS and Article 19a & 19b requirements reconciliation table

Appendix 3: SFDR PAI KPIs and ESRS mapping table

Appendix 4: GRI / ESRS set 1 reconciliation table

Appendix 5: SASB / ESRS SEC 1 reconciliation table

Appendix 6: TCFD & ESRS reconciliation table

Appendix 7: ISSB & ESRS reconciliation table

DRAFT



## Part I – The context and the process

### 1. *The Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and the contribution expected from EFRAG*

- 1 On 21 April 2021, The European Commission adopted a legislative proposal for a Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD). One of the key provisions of the CSRD is that companies in scope would have to report in compliance with European sustainability reporting standards (ESRS) adopted by the European Commission as delegated acts, on the basis of technical advice provided by EFRAG.
- 2 Article 19b.1.a of the [CSRD proposal](#) states that the European Commission is expected to adopt two sets of ESRS taking into consideration the technical advice from EFRAG. This has resulted in the elaboration of draft sustainability reporting standards in parallel to both the legislative process of the proposed CSRD and the revision of EFRAG's governance. In this context, in a letter dated 12 May 2021, Commissioner McGuinness requested EFRAG to:
  - (a) reform its governance following the recommendations made by Jean-Paul Gauzès in his [report](#) issued in March 2021; and
  - (b) put in place interim working methods to start the technical work immediately building on the membership, leadership, expertise and recommendations of the Project Task Force that undertook preparatory work for the elaboration of possible EU non-financial reporting standards (PTF-NFRS), with reference to its report issued in [March 2021](#).

### 2. *EFRAG's governance reform*

- 3 Executing on Commissioner McGuinness' invitation, EFRAG immediately engaged in moving the reform of its governance along. In December to February 2022, EFRAG's General Assembly approved its enlarged membership, including organisations of a new Civil Society Organisations Chapter that was included in the membership of the EFRAG Sustainability reporting pillar. On 21 January 2022 the EFRAG General Assembly approved its new Statutes and Internal Rules, integrating a new Sustainability reporting pillar in EFRAG's organisational structure mirroring its Financial reporting pillar and organising a clear allocation of responsibilities between the Financial Reporting Board (FRB) and the EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board (SRB) on the one hand (technical matters) and the newly created EFRAG Administrative Board on the other hand (administrative, governance, oversight and due process). The EFRAG Administrative Board was appointed in December (and its President and Vice-President and the Civil Societies Organisations' representative in February) and became operational after the approval of the EFRAG Internal Rules and EFRAG Statutes in January.
- 4 EFRAG Administrative Board supported by its Nominating Committee then proceeded with selecting the members of the EFRAG SRB, following a public call for candidates, and recommending its composition to the EFRAG General Assembly. Members of the EFRAG SRB were appointed by the EFRAG General Assembly in its 1 March meeting. The first EFRAG SRB meetings took place on 31 March 2022, [x and 22 April 2022].
- 5 On 15 March 2022, the EFRAG General Assembly also approved EFRAG's [Due Process Procedures EU Sustainability Reporting Standard- Setting](#). Following a public call for candidates, the EFRAG Administrative Board supported by the Extended SRB EFRAG Administrative Board Nominating Committee recommended the composition of the EFRAG Sustainability Reporting



Technical Expert Group (SR TEG), who was appointed by the EFRAG SRB on [x] April 2022]. The first SR TEG meeting took place on [insert date].

### 3. The work carried out in project mode to elaborate exposure drafts

6 In parallel with the governance reform, and in order to ensure that EFRAG's new SRB would be in a position to deliver its technical advice to the European Commission in time for the European Commission to meet its own deadline to adopt the first set of ESRS, the PTF-NFRS was invited by EFRAG, following Commissioner McGuinness recommendation, to launch the preparation of a first set of ESRS Exposure Drafts based on the CSRD mandate. The PTF-NFRS became the Project Task Force on the elaboration of ESRS (PTF-ESRS) and started working in June 2021.

7 Members of the PTF itself were selected following a public call for candidates in July 2020. Beyond PTF-wide consensus building presentations, surveys and debates, preparatory work of the ESRS exposure drafts also involved interactions with external Expert Working Groups, the members of which were selected following a public call for candidates. All intermediary Working Papers were made publicly available on EFRAG's website as they were presented and debated by the PTF-ESRS in plenary meetings.

8 **Tentative. Subject to EFRAG SRB decision.**

*[On [22 April 2022], the PTF-ESRS submitted its proposed public consultation package, including the first set of Exposure Drafts, to EFRAG SRB. Using the possibility given by paragraph 1.5 of its Sustainability Reporting Due Process Procedures to go through an accelerated due process<sup>1</sup> the EFRAG SRB decided, in its [22 April 2022] session, to submit these Exposure Drafts to public consultation immediately.]*

9 **Tentative. Subject to EFRAG SRB decision.**

*[It is indeed critical that stakeholders are given enough time to consider the Exposure Drafts of ESRS and submit their comments that will then be considered by EFRAG SR TEG and EFRAG SRB when finalising EFRAG's technical advice to the European Commission on the first set of ESRS to be adopted by delegated act, as set by the CSRD proposal. The EFRAG SRB approved to launch the consultation without further delay and to grant to the constituents 90 days of consultation period. As per the Due Process Procedures, the EFRAG Administrative Board was consulted on these decisions and did not object].*

10 **Tentative. Subject to EFRAG SRB decision.**

*[For similar reasons, the EFRAG SRB also decided to progress in parallel with the public consultation in respect of three key components of the due process:*

*(a) Finalisation of the Bases for Conclusions in relation to the ESRS Exposure Drafts.*

*As a reminder, Bases for Conclusions are not part of a standard per se – and for this reason will not be part of the delegated act adopted by the European Commission – but aim to clarify the reasoning and logic followed by the standard setter in drafting the relevant disclosure*

---

<sup>1</sup> EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Due Process Procedures, paragraph 1.5: "A robust, agile and adaptable due process is necessary to meet urgent standard-setting needs within a rapidly-moving landscape. Therefore, all the steps described in this document may not need to be applied mechanically or sequentially in all instances. In some circumstances, an accelerated due process may be appropriate whereby a core of necessary due process steps will be defined. In such cases, the EFRAG Administrative Board, in its oversight role of due process, will be consulted."



requirements. Bases for conclusions will be made publicly available on EFRAG's website and will be announced by a dedicated news item.

(b) *Cost-Benefit Analysis*

*In consideration of the very tight timeline and of the available resources, the PTF-ESRS prioritised the preparation of the ESRS Exposure Drafts. The Cost-Benefit analysis, which is an important aspect of the standard setting process, will be managed by EFRAG in parallel to the public consultation, in order for the EFRAG SRB supported by the EFRAG SR TEG to be in a position to provide a complete technical advice to the European Commission, as per the CSRD proposal.*

(c) *Digital Guidance.*

*The digital guidance aims at helping reporting undertakings to publish their ESRS compliant information in an ESAP-compatible digital format. This will be considered in due course when following the public consultation and deliberations by the EFRAG TEG and SRB the technical advice will be delivered to the European Commission.]*

4. *The public consultation*

- 11 The current public consultation is organised to receive feed-back from constituents on both relevance and priorities of the ESRS Exposure Drafts (including disclosure requirements and application guidance) designed to cover the first set of ESRS defined by Article 19b.1.a of the CSRD proposal.

**Part II – The 7 key features of the exposure drafts**

- 12 Articles 19a, 19b, 19c and 19d provisions of the CSRD proposal provide key elements framing and driving the architecture and content of the ESRS. The following paragraphs illustrate the way these provisions have guided the standard setting process and are covered by the ESRS Exposure Drafts submitted to this public consultation.

**1. Exposure Drafts may need to be adjusted to meet the requirements of the final CSRD**

- 13 Exposure Drafts were prepared on the basis of the April 2021 CRSD legal mandate, as at the time of their issuance the final revised text of the Directive is not available, pending the ongoing legislative negotiation by European Council and Parliament.
- 14 Therefore, any change adopted in the final CSRD (potentially during the public consultation period) will have to be reflected in the final draft standards approved by the EFRAG SRB and submitted to the European Commission.

**2. Exposure Drafts take account of existing European law and initiatives**

- 15 As clearly articulated in the March 2018 EU action plan financing sustainable growth, robust, reliable, and relevant sustainability information is a key element of success for a number of leading



initiatives embedded in the action plan. Some of which create sustainability reporting obligations, sometimes with specific disclosures being defined, while others influence or frame the definition of relevant sustainability information.

- 16 SFDR Principal Adverse Impact metrics (PAI KPIs) are indicators required to be reported by Financial Market Participants subject to the SFDR<sup>2</sup>. In order for Financial Market Participants to be able to collect such indicators from their clients, these SFDR PAI KPIs as defined by the RTS adopted by the European Commission on 6 April 2022, are included in the Exposure Drafts and specifically flagged as being SFRD PAI KPIs<sup>3</sup>.
- 17 The Taxonomy “Article 8” delegated act<sup>4</sup> defines disclosure requirements for undertakings subject to the Taxonomy regulation. Exposure Draft ESRS E1 on Climate includes dedicated placeholders to host taxonomy “Article 8” disclosure requirements.
- 18 Included in the list of European texts to be considered are the Benchmark Regulation, the GHG allowance Directive, the EMAS regulation or European Commission recommendation on the life cycle environmental performance of products and services. All have direct or indirect implications for the climate and other environmental standards. The way and extent to which they are taken into account in the definition of the disclosure requirements and application guidance of the environmental standards will be found in their respective basis for conclusions.
- 19 Beyond this list, other key ongoing European initiatives have been considered in the drafting of the ESRS. This was notably the case for the recently released proposal by the European Commission of a Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive. Due diligence related disclosure requirements found throughout the ESRS Exposure Drafts – the overview of which can be found in ESRS 1 General provisions and ESRS 2 General, strategy, governance, and materiality assessment disclosure requirements – are designed to provide transparency on the undertaking’s approach to due diligence. The related disclosure requirements may need to be adjusted in the future, following the completion of the ongoing legislative process.

### **3. Exposure Drafts take account of European and international sustainability reporting initiatives**

- 20 Another direct request of article 19b.3 relates to the consideration to be given to international standard setters and other frameworks or initiatives pertaining to sustainability reporting.
- 21 Aiming to capitalise upon and consolidate the sustainability reporting achievements to date the PTF-ESRS fully considered the lessons learned from the implementation of the current European legislation, the Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD), the existing related guidelines and the best practices that have developed in such a context.
- 22 It is with this objective in mind that the PTF-ESRS signed statements of cooperation with the GRI<sup>5</sup>, Shift<sup>6</sup> and WICI<sup>7</sup>. Doing so enabled the PTF-ESRS to work closely with representatives of these three institutions, being direct contributors to the drafting work and ensuring the appropriate

<sup>2</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019R2088&from=EN>

<sup>3</sup> A mapping of where SFDR PAI KPIs are covered in the ESRS can be found in appendix 3.

<sup>4</sup> [taxonomy-regulation-delegated-act-2021-4987\\_en.pdf \(europa.eu\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32021L0498&from=EN)

<sup>5</sup> [GRI - Home \(globalreporting.org\)](https://www.globalreporting.org/). A mapping of the GRI standards and the draft ESRS can be found in appendix 2.

<sup>6</sup> [Shift Home - Shift \(shiftproject.org\)](https://www.shiftproject.org/)

<sup>7</sup> [WICI - the world's business reporting network- \(wici-global.com\)](https://www.wici-global.com/)



inclusion of impact related information, human rights principles, and best practices, and, in preparation of future Exposure Drafts, intangible-related sustainability information.

- 23 Robust and constructive dialogue was also entertained with other leading international initiatives regardless of any cooperation agreement being formalised, with the common goal of both mutual understanding of approach and goals and search for ways to facilitate compatibility and convergence wherever possible. With this in mind, the PTF-ESRS had regular technical dialogue with a delegation of experts of the IFRS Foundation's TRWG and now of the ISSB on their two recently issued Exposure Drafts<sup>8</sup>. This was also the case with the Value Reporting Foundation with which the PTF-ESRS discussed both the approach to sector classification and sector specific metrics as proposed by the SASB, for consideration and possible inclusion in the future sector-specific ESRS<sup>9</sup>.
- 24 Other international initiatives were also considered. A comparison between the ESRS on climate-related disclosures and the recently issued proposal of the US Securities and Exchange Commission was prepared<sup>10</sup>. The reconciliation with the TCFD framework<sup>11</sup> was also discussed with the delegation of experts from the TRWG and then the ISSB when comparing approaches to climate-related disclosures. And experts from the TNFD were invited to compare approaches on biodiversity-related disclosures.

#### ***4. The overall architecture of Exposure Drafts is designed to ensure that sustainability information is reported in a carefully articulated manner***

- 25 Article 19a.2 of the CSRD proposal gives a list of sustainability information to be covered by the ESRS. Many elements of information contained in this list would apply to all sustainability subject matters – also identified as sustainability topics, subtopics or even sub-subtopics in the Exposure Drafts – listed in article 19b.
- 26 Therefore, the Exposure Drafts architecture is designed r a) to guide the reporting of the relevant information over generally agreed upon sustainability subject matters on the basis of relevant disclosures, b) to also foster maximum comparability across sectors while ensuring appropriate room for and balance between sector-agnostic, sector-specific and entity-specific information, and c) to facilitate the navigation through the reported information.
- 27 Following this approach, standards are organised by categories which all complement and interact with each other. There are three categories of standards:
  - (a) The **cross-cutting standards** cover the general provisions applying to sustainability reporting under the CSRD (ESRS 1) and the sustainability disclosure requirements (ESRS 2) that relate to how the undertaking complies with ESRS, to the way sustainability is embedded in the undertaking's "company-wide" business strategy and business model(s), its governance and to how the undertaking identifies and manages its principal sustainability impacts, risks and opportunities. These aspects are meant to be transversal to all sustainability subject matters, as defined in article 19b (hence the name "cross-cutting" standards). The related disclosure requirements correspond to the governance, strategy and risk management reporting pillars of the TCFD and the ISSB<sup>12</sup>. The cross—cutting standards also frame how to report with a single

<sup>8</sup> A mapping of the ISSB exposure drafts and the draft ESRS 1 on General provisions and ESRS E1 on climate can be found in appendix 7.

<sup>9</sup> A mapping of the SASB standards and the draft ESRS SEC 1 can be found in appendix 5.

<sup>10</sup> A comparative analysis of the SEC climate risk-related disclosure draft rule and the draft ESRS E1 on climate can be found in appendix 8.

<sup>11</sup> A mapping of the TCFD recommendations and the draft ESRS can be found in appendix 6.

<sup>12</sup> See appendix 6 and 7 for a mapping of TCFD and ISSB recommendations and ESRS disclosure requirements.



approach under topical standards (sector-agnostic and sector-specific) for disclosure requirements related to *policies, targets, actions and action plans, resources* across all sustainability subject matters.

- (b) **Topical standards** cover a specific sustainability topic or sub-topic – as defined by article 19b and described in the next section – from a sector agnostic perspective. They set disclosure requirements relating to sustainability impacts, risks and opportunities that are deemed to be material for all undertakings, regardless of the sectors they operate in. Such disclosure requirements complement those prescribed by the cross-cutting standards and cover information to be reported on
- the *policies, targets, actions and action plans, resources* adopted by the undertaking on a given sustainability topic or subtopic,
  - as well as corresponding *performance measurement metrics* for each sustainability topic or subtopic.

Such targets and performance measurement metrics correspond to the TCFD and ISSB targets & metrics fourth and last reporting pillar<sup>13</sup>.

- (c) The ESRS architecture foresees the preparation of **sector-specific standards**, not yet included in this consultation. Such standards will prescribe disclosure requirements designed to provide for the preparation of information relating to sustainability risks, impacts and opportunities that are deemed to be material for all undertakings operating in a given sector. Such disclosure requirements complement those prescribed by the cross-cutting standards and the topical (sector-agnostic) standards and cover additional information to be reported on the *policies, targets, actions and action plans, resources* adopted by the undertaking on a given sustainability subject matter, as well as on the corresponding *performance measurement metrics*.

28 All three categories of standards are meant to organise the reporting of information in a way that will foster relevance and comparability (across sectors and within sectors) while being reader / user friendly. They also prescribe how mandatory information resulting from all other ESRS should be organised and presented in the Management Report.

### **5. Exposure Drafts address sustainability matters<sup>14</sup> as per Article 19b of the CSRD proposal**

- 29 Article 19b.2 of the CSRD proposal provides a list of sustainability subject matters to be covered by the ESRS. The ESRS structure is designed to organise the coverage of listed matters in a way that avoids duplication and confusion.
- 30 Article 19b.2(a) covers **environment-related matters** and identifies six specific subtopics. Five environmental Exposure Drafts have been designed to cover these six subtopics, with the two climate-related subtopics of mitigation and adaptation being covered by one single climate standard – ESRS E1. Other environmental standards include ESRS E2 on *Pollutions*, ESRS E3 on *Water and marine resources*, ESRS E4 on *Biodiversity and ecosystems*, and ESRS E5 on *Circular economy*.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Referred to as sustainability topics or subtopics in the Exposure Drafts.





- 31 Article 19b.2(b) covers **social-related matters**. The approach taken to organise the social-related standards to cover all listed matters is driven by the category of population potentially concerned by the listed social matters. Therefore, the PTF-ESRS proposes to organise the social ESRS around the categories of affected population: own workforce, workforce in the value chain, affected communities and end-users / consumers. Yet, the number of social matters to be addressed for each category being potentially very extensive, another level of subdivision of the ESRS is proposed. This is why social matters pertaining to an undertaking's own workforce are covered by four distinct Exposure Drafts: ESRS S1: *Own workforce – general*, ESRS S2: *Own workforce – working conditions*, ESRS S3: *Own workforce – equal opportunities* and ESRS S4: *Own workforce – other work-related rights*.
- 32 Article 19b.2(c) covers **governance-related matters**. These are addressed by two governance Exposure Drafts: ESRS G1 on *Governance, risk management and internal control*, ESRS G2 on *Business conduct*. The governance topical standards aim at prescribing disclosure requirements pertaining to governance aspects, as sustainability matters *per se* (i.e. not limited to governance of sustainability matters), like business ethics and conduct, Board diversity and inclusion.

### **6. Exposure Drafts are a first step of journey towards a faithful representation of sustainability performance**

- 33 In its article 19b.1 the CRSD proposal calls for an adoption of ESRS, in the form of a delegated act, in two subsequent sets. The first one shall cover sustainability information over all sustainability subject matters, as identified in articles 19a.2 and 19b.2 – i.e. all cross-cutting and topical (sector-agnostic) standards meant to be used by large undertakings. The second set of ESRS shall cover SME-proportionate standards and sector-specific standards.
- 34 ESRS Exposure Drafts submitted to this public consultation follow this phased-in approach and, as a consequence, do not include SME-proportionate standards nor sector-specific standards. Such standards are still being developed and will be submitted to a separate public consultation in due time<sup>15</sup>.
- 35 Article 19b.1 also requires the European Commission to review, at least every three years, any previously adopted delegated act (i.e. ESRS). This continuous enhancement approach aims at ensuring that the ESRS remain relevant and up-to-date with recent developments, should such developments result from the evolution of European law and/or from progress made by international sustainability reporting standard setters and frameworks, as well as addressing any challenge or potential need for improvement arising from the implementation of the already applied standards. This means that the ESRS submitted to this public consultation will most likely evolve in the future, as the legislative and standard setting environment and actual reporting practices evolve, in the EU and on the global stage.
- 36 For the time being, they represent the PTF-ESRS's best assessment of the right balance between the consolidation of observed best practices to date in terms of sustainability reporting by large undertakings and the Commission's goal as set in the April 2021 CSRD proposal to enhance the quality of sustainability reporting in Europe fast enough that it can support its sustainable development and sustainable finance agenda.

<sup>15</sup> See appendix 1 for a comprehensive mapping of all ESRS and tentative scope for set 1 and set 2 submission by EFRAG.



**7. The public consultation will help to strike the right balance between proper relevance and comparability on the one hand and proportionality on the other hand**

- 37 Exposure Drafts were thought in search of the right balance between:
- the need to make significant progress in improving the quality of sustainability information (enhancing relevance, verifiability, and comparability, among other things),
  - meeting the growing needs of users (some of which derive from a number of sustainable finance-related regulations with tight implementation deadlines)
  - while not overburdening preparers (some of which will be first time preparers).
- 38 Given the time constraints and the sequencing of adoption of sector-specific and SME-proportionate standards in a second step, Exposure Drafts may need to additional fine-tuning to better strike the optimal balance between maximum comparability and proportionality. The comments collected as part of the public consultation will help in that regard.
- 39 Some aspects have already been considered to foster a proportionate implementation of the Exposure Drafts:
- (a) **Entity-specific materiality assessment as the primary proportionality lever.** The presumption that all disclosure requirements covered by the sector-agnostic topical standards are material is rebuttable on the basis of the undertaking’s own materiality assessment of its risks, impacts and opportunities. The presumption of materiality can be rebutted at the level of sub/sub-subtopic or an aspect of them. When presumption can be properly rebutted, the undertaking will be allowed to simply report “not material”. The disclosure requirements included in the Exposure Drafts mainly result from the consolidation of current best practices, based on the use of existing international standards and frameworks, complemented by new sustainability reporting obligations resulting from recent European regulations and legislation (like SFDR and Taxonomy, for example). It was decided to include them in the sector-agnostic standards in order to foster relevance and faithful information for all sectors. Keeping in mind that, as said above, the primary and ultimate gauge of what has to be ultimately reported is based upon the undertaking’s own materiality assessment, the undertaking shall be able to mitigate any risk of over-burden while offering a mapping of its impacts, risks and opportunities against a broad spectrum of disclosure requirements providing for maximum comparability, including by reference to their « not material » nature.
- (b) **Prioritising and potentially phasing-in reaching the end game vision of comprehensive sustainability reporting.** 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 levers to smoothen out the implementation of the first set of standards. These would include, for example:
- i) considering prioritising reporting on the most mature sustainability topics and leaving the reporting on less mature topics to voluntary reporting (except for the mandatory disclosures imposed by existing EU law, such as the SFDR PAI KPIs for example) for a transition period to be defined.
  - ii) phasing-in over time the ramp-up to full disclosure on some sustainability topics, even the most mature ones, by introducing optional disclosures that would convert – or not – into mandatory disclosures over time.



- iii) introducing transitional provisions to ease the first-time application of the ESRS, like postponing the requirements for comparatives to year 2 and for long term forward-looking metrics to a later stage to be defined.

The list is indicative and for illustration purpose only. One of the objectives of this public consultation is to solicit feedback and input from the various stakeholder categories on the adequacy of such prioritisation levers and on potential other prioritisation solutions that would be appropriate for consideration.

## Part III – The objectives and practical aspects of this public consultation:

### 1. Objectives of the public consultation

40 EFRAG is consulting on:

(a) The overall ESRS architecture, content and substance, and specifically:

- i) Whether the ESRS and the proposed disclosure requirements do promote relevant, verifiable, understandable, comparable information and ultimately are adequate to support the production of faithful information,
- ii) Whether the ESRS and the proposed disclosure requirements do strike the right balance between feasibility, preparation costs and decision-usefulness.
- iii) The completeness of the ESRS, in terms of datapoints and of disclosure requirements, per each sustainability topics / subtopics.

(b) The prioritisation opportunities and options to further ensure that the ESRS strike the right balance between covering all CSRD requirements while achieving a reasonably ambitious enhancement of current reporting practices.

41 As mentioned above, EFRAG is not consulting on standards that are due to be considered and adopted by the European Commission in a second set, namely the sector-specific and SME-proportionate standards.

### 2. Practical aspects of the consultation

42 EFRAG will hold outreach events in a number of geographies to engage more closely with stakeholders. For more information on these events, see here: [xxx](#)

43 You are invited to reply by **31 July 2022** at the latest to the **online questionnaire** available on the following webpage: [xxx](#)

44 Please note that in order to ensure a fair and transparent consultation process **only responses received through the online questionnaire will be taken into account and included in the report summarising the responses.**



- 45 This consultation follows the normal rules of EFRAG for public consultations. Responses will be published unless respondents indicate otherwise in the online questionnaire.
- 46 Responses authorised for publication will be published on the following webpage: [xxx](#)

DRAFT

This paper has been prepared by the EFRAG Secretariat for discussion at a public meeting of EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board. The paper does not represent the official views of EFRAG or any individual member of the EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board, EFRAG PTF-ESRS of the EFRAG Administrative Board. The paper is made available to enable the public to follow the discussions in the meeting. Tentative decisions are made in public and reported in the EFRAG Update. EFRAG positions, as approved by the EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board, are published as draft standards, discussion or position papers, or in any other form considered appropriate in the circumstances.

## Public Consultation on EDs Draft European sustainability reporting standards (ESRS)

### Objective

- 1 The objective of this session is;
  - (a) to provide a progress report on the preparation of the public consultation of the Exposure Drafts on the first set of draft ESRS;
  - (b) to discuss on the cover note to be published with the Exposure Drafts on the first set of draft ESRS;
  - (c) to discuss and agree the public consultation period and to consult the EFRAG Administrative Board supported by its Due Process Committee if there is a deviation of the Sustainability Reporting Due Process Procedures,
  - (d) to have an initial discussion on the questions to be raised in the public consultation
  - (e) to discuss and provide directions on the outreach activities including outreach events during the public consultation

### Background and context

- 2 In order to meet the tight and ambitious deadlines for the first set of draft ESRS, EFRAG following the request of Commissioner McGuinness in May 2021 has swiftly started the work on the preparation of draft European sustainability reporting standards (ESRS) in project mode undertaken by the PTF-ESRS from June 2021. In parallel also following the request of the Commissioner, EFRAG undertook the governance reform to integrate the Sustainability reporting pillar in its structure with a target deadline of 31 March for the new structure to be in place. The EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board (EFRAG SRB) was appointed by the EFRAG General Assembly on 1 March and the EFRAG Sustainability Reporting TEG (EFRAG SR TEG) will be appointed by the EFRAG SRB in the current meeting.
- 3 With the main elements of the governance structure in place, the transition from the project work undertaken by the PTF-ESRS to the permanent structure has started.
- 4 The ambitious deadlines for submitting the first set of draft ESRS to the European Commission can only be met if the public consultation on the Exposure Drafts of the first set of draft ESRS as prepared by the PTF- ESRS is launched as soon as possible on the basis of the PTF-ESRS proposed EDs under the oversight and responsibility of the EFRAG SRB. This launch is aimed to take place before the end

of April. This is outlined in the draft cover note that will accompany the Exposure Drafts of the first set of draft ESRS.

- 5 The EFRAG SRB and the ERAG SR TEG will discuss the Exposure Drafts of the first set of draft ESRS and form their own views during the public consultation period in the beginning of which a detailed handover by the PTF- ESRS to the EFRAG SRB and EFRAG SR TEG will take place. Together with the input and results from the public consultation, the EFRAG SRB supported by the EFRAG TEG will agree the final first set of draft ESRS to be submitted to the European Commission. The EFRAG SRB is fully responsible for the final draft ESRS.
- 6 It is also proposed for the public consultation to take the accelerated option possibility included in the Sustainability Reporting Due Process Procedures. The EFRAG Administrative Board supported by its Due Process Committee needs to be consulted in this respect. A public consultation period of 90 days is proposed, 30 days shorter than the minimum public consultation period of 120 days. The shorter public consultation period is needed to meet the envisaged deadlines.
- 7 The Exposure Drafts of the first set of draft ESRS will be accompanied by a cover note including series of questions. Both will be discussed and agreed by the EFRAG SRB. The cover note contains the following elements:
  - (a) Part I- The context and the process
  - (b) Part II- The 7 key features of the exposure drafts
  - (c) Part III- Objectives and practical aspects of the public consultation
  - (d) Part IV- Consultation questions
  - (e) Appendices (under development)
- 8 In parallel with the public consultation a number of issues need still to be progressed:
  - (a) Finalisation and publication of Bases for Conclusions in relation to the Exposure Drafts
  - (b) Cost- benefit analysis: a public call for tender has been issued with as deadline 28 April with as aim to assist EFRAG in the cost-benefit analysis which need to accompany the first set of draft-ESRS. The interim report will be presented to and discussed by the EFRAG permanent bodies.
  - (c) Digital guidance to publish the ESRS compliant information in an ESAP-compatible digital format
- 9 During the public consultation outreach activities will take place. The EFRAG SRB supported by the EFRAG SR TEG will give direction for these outreach events and activities.

**Questions for the EFRAG SRB**

- 10 Do you agree with the public consultation period of 90 days ending 31 July 2022 (on which the EFRAG Administrative Board supported by its Due Process Committee will be consulted)?
- 11 Do you agree with the structure of the cover note to accompany the Exposure Drafts for the first set of draft ESRS? Do you have suggestions on the contents?
- 12 Do you agree with the structure of the questions for public consultation? Do you have suggestions on the contents?
- 13 What are your directions for the outreach activities and outreach events?


**Agenda Papers**

- 14 In addition to this cover note, agenda papers for this session are:
- (a) Agenda paper 05-02 – Cover note to accompany the public consultation
  - (b) Agenda paper 05-03 – Draft questions for the public consultation
  - (c) Agenda paper 05-04 – Outreach activities including Outreach events

# Approach to the consultation: tentative questions to respondents

**AGENDA PAPER 05-03**

**EFRAG SR Board 13 April 2022**





# DISCLAIMER

---

This paper has been prepared by the EFRAG Secretariat for discussion at a public meeting of EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board. The paper does not represent the official views of EFRAG or any individual member of the EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board, EFRAG PTF-ESRS of the EFRAG Administrative Board. The paper is made available to enable the public to follow the discussions in the meeting. Tentative decisions are made in public and reported in the EFRAG Update. EFRAG positions, as approved by the EFRAG Sustainability Reporting Board, are published as draft standards, discussion or position papers, or in any other form considered appropriate in the circumstances.

## Structure of the questions for the consultation

- The slides in this presentation illustrate the proposed approach to the consultation. The consultation will be structured in 3 levels:
  1. **Substance**
    - 1.1 Architecture – 5 questions
    - 1.2 Implementation of CSRD principles – 9 questions
    - 1.3 Overall relevance on an ESRS by ESRS basis – 14 questions
  2. **Prioritisation – 5 questions**
  3. **Adequacy on a DR by DR basis – could be included as 1.4 depending on the technicalities of the EU survey platform**
- Each question will be introduced by a summary of the context/provisions covered by the question. However, for more details, the respondents will have to refer to the relevant paragraphs of the ESRS (including AGs). A specific annex will support the identification of the relevant paragraphs per each ESRS.
- Respondents do not have to reply to all the questions. Answers to levels 1 and 2 are recommended.

CAVEAT - References to Exposure Drafts specific paragraphs to be added once Eds are finalised



# 1. RESPONDENT DETAILS AND PROFILE

---

## ***1. Personal details:***

- Organisation name,
- First name,
- Surname,
- Email (this won't be published),
- Country of origin

## **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 (Financial Market Participant)
- Financial institution (Insurance)
- National Standard Setter
- Non-governmental organisation
- Non-financial corporations with securities listed on 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)

### **4. User/Preparer perspective**

- User
- Preparer
- Both
- Neither



## 2. ARCHITECTURE

---

*To achieve an optimal balance between comparability and relevance, the Exposure Drafts (EDs) architecture is based upon three layers of disclosure requirements (DR) that will be built overtime:*

- **Sector-agnostic:** mandated for all undertakings, as a basis, and complemented by:
- **Sector-specific:** mandated for undertakings in a specific sector, complemented by
- **Entity-specific:** additional disclosures that best illustrate specific facts and circumstances of the undertaking, when they are necessary.

*The EDs correspond to the sector-agnostic layer. As per the CSRD April 2021 proposal, sector-specific DRs will be developed in the next phase and are not included in this consultation.*

## **Q1A: To what extent do you support the proposed 3 layers approach?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q1B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q1C: Other comments, if applicable**



## 2 Topical and cross-cutting standards (1/2)

*To facilitate a coherent coverage of the CSRD topics and reporting areas, the EDs submitted for public consultation are based upon two categories of standards:*

- **Cross-cutting ESRS** which:
  - *Establish the general principles to be followed when preparing sustainability reporting in line with the CSRD provisions,*
  - *Mandate DRs aimed at providing an understanding of (i) strategy and business model, (ii) governance and organization, (iii) materiality assessment, covering all topics.*
- **Topical ESRS** which, from a sector-agnostic perspective:
  - (i) *Provide application guidance in relation to the cross-cutting DRs on strategy and business model, governance, materiality assessment;*
  - (ii) *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);*
  - (iii) *Mandate performance measurement metrics.*

*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.*

## 2 Topical and cross-cutting standards (2/2)

**Q2A: To what extent do you support the structure and articulation of cross-cutting and topical standards?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q2B: Please explain your reservations or your suggestions for improvements, if applicable**

**Q2C: To what extent do you support the approach taken to structure the reporting areas to promote interoperability between the ESRS and existing international standards and frameworks (please refer to appendices 4 to 7)?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree, 5/ No opinion

**Q2D: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q2E: Other comments, if applicable**

# 3 Coverage of sustainability topics (1/2)

Eds have been designed to cover the topics listed in the CRSD April 2021 proposal. **The first set includes drafts for:**

## Cross Cutting Standards

### ESRS 1 – General principles <sup>(1)</sup>

General provisions on how to report according to CSRD

### ESRS 2 - General and cross-cutting requirements <sup>(2)</sup>

Required information covering strategy, governance, sustainability impacts, risks and opportunities assessment and management

## Topical Sector - Agnostic Standards

### ENVIRONEMENT

- ESRS E1 - Climate
- ESRS E2 - Pollution
- ESRS E3 - Water and marine resources
- ESRS E4 - Biodiversity
- ESRS E5 – Circular economy

### SOCIAL

- ESRS S1 – Own workforce
- ESRS S2 – Workers in the value chain
- ESRS S3 – End users / consumers
- ESRS S4 – Affected communities

### GOVERNANCE

- ESRS G1 - Governance, risk management and internal control
- ESRS G2 – Business conduct

## ESRS SEC 1 - Sector classification

(1) Including part of the previous ESRS 1, ESRS 5 and ESRS P1 working papers

(1) Merger of previous ESRS 2, ESRS 3, ESRS 4 and part of ESRS 1 working papers

- *Reminder: the CSRD foresees a second set of standards covering sector-specific standards and requirements for SMEs.*

### **Q3A: To what extent do you consider the proposed coverage of set 1 adequately addresses CRSD sustainability topics?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q3B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q3C: Other comments, if applicable**

*A sectoral description of the undertaking's activities is a key element to understand the undertaking's impacts, risks and opportunities arising from its business model(s). It is also the basis for the implementation of the set 2 sector-specific standards. As a consequence, a standardised sector classification has been developed based on the **NACE classification system**, together with reference to additional economic activities as described in the EU Taxonomy.*

***ESRS SEC 1 provides a detailed table** including how 40 sectors are aggregated into 14 sector groups: the different sectors within a sector group may determine different impacts, risks and opportunities.*

### **Q4A: To what extent do you support the proposed sector classification?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q4B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q4C: Other comments, if applicable**

*For clarity, standardised sustainability reporting shall be easily identifiable within the management report (MR). Therefore, when preparing its sustainability reporting, the undertaking shall choose one of the following three presentation options:*

- *a single separately identifiable section of the MR;*
- *four separately identifiable parts of the MR: (i) General information; (ii) Environment; (iii) Social; (iv) 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.*

## **Q5A: To what extent do you support the three options proposed approach?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

## **Q5B: if Other, please explain**

## **Q5C: other comments, if applicable**



### 3. IMPLEMENTATION OF CSRD PRINCIPLES

---

*ESRS 1 paragraphs [xx to xx]*

*When preparing its sustainability reporting following ESRS and in particular when developing its entity-specific disclosures the undertaking shall apply the fundamental principles of information quality (relevance and faithful representation) as well the enhancing qualities of information (comparability, verifiability, and understandability).*

**Q6A: To what extent do you do you support the proposed approach to implement the characteristics of information quality?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q6B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q6C: Other comments, if applicable**



*ESRS 1 paragraphs [xx to xx]*

***Double materiality assessment** supports the determination of whether information on a sustainability matter has to be included in the undertaking's sustainability report. 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.*

*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 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.*

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

**Q7A: To what extent do you do you support the proposed approach to implement the double materiality principle?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q7B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q7C: Other comments, if applicable**

*ESRS 1 paragraphs [xx to xx]*

*All mandatory DRs in ESRS (sector agnostic and sector-specific) shall be presumed to be material and justify a full disclosure. To consider the undertaking's facts and circumstances and outcome of its materiality assessment, as well as not to overburden the sustainability reporting with unnecessary disclosures, this presumption is rebuttable.*

*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: (a) all of the mandatory disclosures of an entire ESRS or (b) a group of DR related to a specific aspect covered by an ESRS, on the basis of reasonable and supportable evidence, in which case it is deemed to be complied with through a statement that: (a) the ESRS or (b) the group of DR is “not material for the undertaking”.*

**Q8A: To what extent do you support the rebuttable presumption of mandatory disclosures?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q8B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q8C: Other comments, if applicable**

*ESRS 1 paragraphs [xx to xx]*

*The reporting boundary is the one retained for financial statements complemented by information about its upstream and downstream value chain. Associates and JVs accounted for under the equity method are considered as part of the value chain. Entities accounted for under proportional consolidation are considered as part of the boundary for the consolidated proportion.*

*The undertaking's reporting boundary includes information about the value chain when this is necessary in order to: (a) allow users to understand the undertaking's material impacts and how material sustainability-related risks and opportunities affect the undertaking's development, performance and position, and (b) produce a set of complete information that meets the qualitative characteristics.*

*The financial and/or impact materiality of a sustainability matter is not constrained to matters that are within the control of the undertaking.*

*When a topical or sector specific ESRS requires that a disclosure requirement is prepared using a specific reporting boundary, this requirement shall prevail.*

*In some circumstances, 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.*

*In these cases, the undertakings should **seek to approximate** the missing information, by using all reasonable and supportable information, including internal and external information, such as peer groups or sector data. It shall also disclose: (a) its basis for preparation for the relevant disclosure and indicators, including the scope for which an approximation has been used, and (b) the planned actions in order to reduce in the future missing data.*

*The undertaking shall reassess on a regular basis the definition of its reporting boundaries. When a change has occurred, the definition shall be adjusted accordingly. The undertaking shall **restate the comparative information**, unless the undertaking assesses that this is impracticable, after making every reasonable effort.*

**Q9A: To what extent do you do you support the proposed approach to implement the reporting boundary concept?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q9B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q9C: Other comments, if applicable**

*ESRS 1 paragraphs [xx to xx]*

*Disaggregation by country shall be applied when material impacts, risks and opportunities are linked to laws, regulations or prevailing business practices in a given country. Disaggregation in relation to a site or an asset shall also be considered by the undertaking when relevant for a proper understanding of its impacts, risks and opportunities.*

*Where data from different levels, or multiple locations within a level, is aggregated, the undertaking shall ensure that this is done in a way that avoids obscuring the specificity and context necessary to interpret the information and that avoids aggregating material items with different natures.*

*When a topical or sector-specific ESRS requires that a specific level of disaggregation is adopted in preparing a specific item of information, this requirement shall prevail.*

**Q10A: To what extent do you support the proposed approach to implement the disaggregation principle?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q10B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q10C: Other comments, if applicable**

*ESRS 1 paragraphs [xx to xx]*

*The undertaking shall adopt the following time intervals: (a) one year for short-term, (b) two to five years for medium-term, and (c) more than five years for long-term.*

***In its processes of identification and management of material impacts risks and opportunities, the undertaking shall adopt time horizons that reflect the expected impacts on people or the environment or the expected financial effects. When defining its action plans and setting targets, the undertaking shall adopt time horizons that reflect its strategic planning horizons and resources allocation plans.***

*When preparing its sustainability report, the entity shall: (a) present its material impacts, risks and opportunities classifying them in the relevant time interval, and (b) present its action plans and targets classifying them in the relevant time interval.*

**Q11A: To what extent do you do you support the proposed approach to time horizons?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q11B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q11C: Other comments, if applicable**

*ESRS 1 paragraphs [xx to xx]*

*The undertaking shall adopt presentation practices that promote **cohesiveness between its sustainability report** 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.*

*When the sustainability report includes monetary amounts or other quantitative data points that are directly presented in FS, the undertaking shall include a **reference to the relevant paragraph** of its FS.*

*When sustainability reporting includes monetary amounts or other quantitative data points that are either an aggregation or a part of amounts or data presented in the undertaking's FS, the undertaking shall include a **reconciliation with the most relevant amount(s)** presented in the FS and a reference to the relevant paragraph.*

*When a link cannot be made either directly or through reconciliation, the undertaking shall demonstrate where needed **the consistency of data, assumptions used, and qualitative information** with the corresponding data, assumptions and qualitative information included in the FS. When the data, assumptions and qualitative information are not consistent, the undertaking shall state that fact and explain the reason.*



*Examples of items for which the statement of consistency above is required are: (a) when the same KPI is presented as of the reporting date in financial statements and in projection in future periods in the sustainability report, and (b) when macroeconomic or business projections are used to develop key indicators in the sustainability report and they are also relevant in estimating the recoverable amount of assets, the amount of liabilities or provisions in financial statements.*

**Q12A: To what extent do you support the proposed approach to cohesiveness and connectivity?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q12B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q12C: Other comments, if applicable**

*ESRS 1 paragraphs [xx to xx]*

*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 (i) when the undertaking is required to describe policies, targets, actions and action plans, and resources in relation to sustainability matters and (ii) when the undertaking decides to describe policies, targets, actions and action plans, and resources in relation to entity-specific sustainability matters.*

*DP 1 – On policies adopted to manage material sustainability matters*

*DP 2 – On targets, progress and tracking effectiveness*

*DP 3 – Actions, action plans and resources in relation to policies and targets*

## **Q13A: To what extent do you do you support DP1?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

## **Q13B: To what extent do you do you support DP2?**

## **Q13C: To what extent do you support DP3?**

**Q13D: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable**

**Q13E: Other comments, if applicable**

*ESRS 1 paragraphs [xx to xx] provide bases for preparation which include the following principles:*

*1. Presenting comparative information, 2. Estimating under conditions of uncertainty, 3. Updating disclosures about events at the end of the reporting period, 4. Changes in preparing or presenting sustainability information, 5. Errors, 6. Adverse impacts and financial risks, 7. Optional disclosures, 8. Consolidated reporting and subsidiary exemption, 9. Stating relationship and compatibility with other sustainability reporting frameworks.*

**Q14A: To what extent do you do you support the comparative comparative principle?**

**Q14B to Q14K: repeat the question for each of the other 8 principles.**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q14J: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable (please specify to which principle you refer)**

**Q14K: Other comments, if applicable**



## 4. GENERAL QUESTIONS PER EACH ESRS

---

- **Objective: receive feedback on the general adequacy of each standard in relation to the sustainability matters it covers.**
- For each standard,
  - an introductory paragraph would remind its stated objective, and
  - Same sub-questions would be asked (but for ESRS E1 where an additional question would be asked on compatibility with international initiatives)
- The goal of each sub-question (ie what relevance means, ...) will be explained as an introduction to this section
- This section would not apply to ESRS 1 (covered by the previous section), but to all other Exposure drafts prescribing DRs.
- ESRS 2 would be subdivided in 3 sections covering strategy, governance and material impacts, risks and opportunities

# General questions per each ESRS (2/3)

## Q1: ESRS XX (including its application guidance):

	Agree	Agree with some reservations	Partially agree with significant reservations	Disagree	No opinion
Meets its stated objective					
Supports the production of relevant (decision useful) information about the sustainability matter covered					
Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from an impact perspective					
Covers information necessary for a faithful representation from a financial perspective					
Provides sufficient guidance to foster consistent application and comparability					
Can be produced at acceptable costs					

# General questions per each ESRS (3/3)

---

**Q2: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable (comments per each DR are covered in a separate section, so here please provide general comments on the ESRS, if any)**

**Q3: Other comments, if applicable**



## 5. APPLICATION PROVISIONS & PRIORITISATION

---



*Set 1 proposes the target content of a set of standards aimed at achieving the objectives of the CSRD proposal, with the exception of the standards to be included in Set 2. As such it sets a comprehensive package of principles and requirements. **Set 1 application provisions** included in ESRS 1 already include two provisions to facilitate the first-time application:*

*AP1 - comparatives not required for the first reporting, and*

*AP2 – transitional measures for entity-specific disclosures (“grand-fathering” for 2 years)*

**Q1: To what extent do you support AP1?**

**Q2: To what extent do you support AP2?**

1/ Agree, 2/ Agree with some reservations, 3/ Partially agree with significant reservations, 4/ Disagree 5/ No opinion

**Q3: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable (please specify to which principle you refer)**

**Q4: Other comments, if applicable**

# Prioritisation / phasing in options (1/2)

*EFRAG SRB might want to consider a possible phasing-in for the implementation of some of the Exposure Drafts and/or DRs included in the Exposure Drafts. The following questions explore potential prioritisation levers.*


**Q6: How would you rank Exposure Drafts by relative level of priority (1.highest/ 2.medium / 3.lowest)?**

	High	Medium	Low	No opinion
ESRS 2 SBM				
ESRS 2 GOV				
ESRS 2 IRO				
ESRS E1				
ESRS E2				
...				

**Q7: How would you rank the following types of DRs in terms of implementation difficulty or sensitivity (high / medium / low)?**

- 1) Narrative retrospective information
- 2) Narrative forward-looking information (e.g. strategic orientations, policies, action / transition plans, ...)
- 3) Quantitative retrospective information
- 4) Quantitative forward-looking information (e.g. targets, scenarios, resources / opex / capex,...)
- 5) Information based on data outside the financial control
- 6) Commercially or legally sensitive information
- 7) Others?

**To be discussed and potentially completed with more granularity**



## 6. QUESTIONS PER EACH DR

---

# Questions per each DR (1/2)

- *Same questions to be asked for all DR.*
- *It is anticipated that respondents will choose the DRs they want to comment but will probably not cover all of them.*

## Q1A: ESRS XX – DR YY – AG ZZ

	Agree	Agree with some reservations	Partially agree with significant reservations	Disagree	No opinion
Provides relevant (decision useful) information about the sustainability matter covered					
Covers information fostering comparability across sectors					
Provides sufficient guidance to foster consistent application and comparability					
Can be produced at acceptable costs					

## Questions per each DR (2/2)

---

**Q1B: Please explain your reservations together with your suggestions for improvement, if applicable (specifying the paragraph of the main body of the standard and/or of the application guidance they relate to)**


**Q1C: How would you rank the DR by relative level of priority (1.highest/ 2.medium / 3.lowest)?**

**Q1D: Other comments, if applicable**

***TO BE REPEATED FOR ALL DRs***



EFRAG receives financial support of the European Union - DG Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union. The contents of this presentation is the sole responsibility of EFRAG and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union.



EFRAG  
Aisbl - ivzw  
35 Square de Meeüs  
B-1000 Brussel  
Tel. +32 (0)2 207 93 00  
[www.efrag.org](http://www.efrag.org)

