

# Public consultation on the revision of the non-financial reporting directive

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

This consultation is now available in 23 European Union official languages.

Please use the language selector at the top of this page to choose your language for this consultation.

## Background information on the Non-Financial Reporting Directive

The [Non-Financial Reporting Directive – NFRD – \(Directive 2014/95/EU\)](#) is an amendment to the [Accounting Directive \(Directive 2013/34/EU\)](#). It requires certain large companies to include a non-financial statement as part of their annual public reporting obligations. Companies under the scope of the NFRD had to report according its provisions for the first time in 2018 (for financial year 2017).

The NFRD applies to large Public Interest Entities with more than 500 employees. In practice it includes large listed companies, and large banks and insurance companies (whether listed or not) – all providing they have more than 500 employees.

The NFRD identifies four sustainability issues (environment, social and employee issues, human rights, and bribery and corruption) and with respect to those issues it requires companies to disclose information about their business model, policies (including implemented due diligence processes), outcomes, risks and risk management, and KPIs relevant to the business. It does not introduce or require the use of a non-financial reporting standard or framework, nor does it impose detailed disclosure requirements such as lists of indicators per sector.

The NFRD requires companies to disclose information “to the extent necessary for an understanding of the development, performance, position and impact of [the company’s] activities.” This means companies should disclose not only how sustainability issues may affect the company, but also how the company affects society and the environment. This is the so-called double materiality perspective.

In 2017, as required by the Directive, the Commission published [non-binding guidelines for companies on how to report non-financial information](#). In June 2019, as part of the [Sustainable Finance Action Plan](#), the Commission published additional [guidelines on reporting climate-related information](#), which integrate the recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures.

## Current context

The non-financial information needs of users, in particular the investment community, are increasing very substantially and very quickly. The demand for better information from investee companies is driven partly by investors needing to better understand financial risks resulting from the sustainability crises we face, and partly by the growth in financial products that actively seek to address environmental and social problems. In addition, some forthcoming EU legislation, including the [regulation on sustainability disclosures in the financial services sector \(Regulation \(EU\) 2019/2088\)](#), and the [regulation on a classification system \(taxonomy\) of sustainable economic activities](#), can only fully meet their objectives if more and better non-financial information is available from investee companies. The taxonomy regulation will require companies under the scope of the NFRD to disclose certain indicators of the proportion of their activities that are classified as sustainable according to the taxonomy.

The feedback received in the online [public consultation on corporate reporting carried out in 2018](#) in the context of a fitness check that is currently being finalised by the Commission services, confirms that the non-financial information currently disclosed by companies does not adequately meet the needs of the intended users. The following problems have been identified:

1. There is inadequate publicly available information about how non-financial issues, and sustainability issues in particular, impact companies, and about how companies themselves impact society and the environment. In particular:
  - a. Reported non-financial information is not sufficiently comparable or reliable.
  - b. Companies do not report all non-financial information that users think is necessary, and many companies report information that users do not think is relevant.
  - c. Some companies from which investors and other users want non-financial information do not report such information.
  - d. It is hard for investors and other users to find non-financial information even when it is reported.
2. Companies incur unnecessary and avoidable costs related to reporting non-financial information. Companies face uncertainty and complexity when deciding what non-financial information to report, and how and where to report such information. In the case of some financial sector companies, this complexity may also arise from different disclosure requirements contained in different pieces of EU legislation. Companies are under pressure to respond to additional demands for non-financial information from sustainability rating agencies, data providers and civil society, irrespective of the information that they publish as a result of the NFRD.

In its [resolution on sustainable finance in May 2018](#), the European Parliament called for the further development of reporting requirements in the framework of the NFRD. In December 2019, in [its conclusions on the Capital Markets Union](#), the Council stressed the importance of reliable, comparable and relevant information on sustainability risks, opportunities and impacts, and called on the Commission to consider the development of a European non-financial reporting standard. In addition, [ESMA recently published a report on undue short-term pressure on corporations](#) where it recommends the Commission to amend the NFRD provisions.

In its [Communication on the European Green Deal](#), the Commission committed to review the Non-Financial Reporting Directive in 2020 as part of the strategy to strengthen the foundations for sustainable investment. Meeting the objectives of the European Green Deal will require additional investments across all sectors of the economy, the bulk of which will need to come from the private sector. In this sense review of the NFRD is part of the effort to scale up sustainable finance by improving transparency.

The European Green Deal also stressed that sustainability should be more broadly embedded into the corporate governance framework, as many companies still focus too much on short-term financial performance compared to their long-term development and sustainability aspects. As part of the [Sustainable Finance Action Plan](#), work is being undertaken to prepare a possible action in this area.

In addition, to ensure appropriate management of environmental risks and mitigation opportunities, and reduce related transaction costs, the Commission will also support businesses and other stakeholders in developing standardised natural capital accounting practices within the EU and internationally.

The services of the European Commission have published an [inception impact assessment on the Review of the Non-Financial Reporting Directive](#). It summarises the problem definition, possible policy options and likely impacts of this initiative.

## Objectives of this public consultation and links with other consultation activities

This public consultation aims to collect the views of stakeholders with regard to possible revisions to the provisions of the NFRD. The principal focus of this consultation is on the possible options for such revisions.

This public consultation builds on a number of recent consultation activities, including:

- An [online public consultation on corporate reporting in 2018](#), in the context of the fitness check on the EU framework for public reporting by companies. That consultation enabled the Commission to gather data and views on the problems that need to be addressed with regard to non-financial reporting. Problem analysis is therefore not a principal focus of the current consultation strategy.
- A [online targeted consultation on climate-related reporting in 2019](#), as part of the development of the new guidelines for companies on how to report climate-related information. In addition, the Technical Expert Group on Sustainable Finance organised a [call for feedback on its recommendations with regard to reporting climate-related information](#). The results of these consultation activities, although specific to the issue of climate, are also useful when considering non-financial reporting more generally.

This consultation is one element of a [broader consultation strategy in the context of the review of the NFRD](#). In addition to this open consultation, there will also be targeted surveys addressed to SMEs, and to companies currently under the scope of the NFRD. The targeted surveys will collect more detailed opinions and data from companies on certain issues, including costs related to non-financial reporting.

In addition, the services of the Commission will soon launch an open public consultation on a Renewed Sustainable Finance Strategy, seeking for stakeholders' views in other Sustainable Finance related issues, including questions related to sustainable corporate governance.

---

**Please note:** In order to ensure a fair and transparent consultation process **only responses received through our online questionnaire will be taken into account** and included in the report summarising the responses. Should you have a problem completing this questionnaire or if you require particular assistance, please contact [fisma-non-financial-reporting@ec.europa.eu](mailto:fisma-non-financial-reporting@ec.europa.eu).

More information:

- [on this consultation](#)
- [on the consultation document](#)
- [on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation](#)

## About you

---

\* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

\* I am giving my contribution as

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Academic/research institution   | <input type="radio"/> EU citizen                          | <input type="radio"/> Public authority |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Business association | <input type="radio"/> Environmental organisation          | <input type="radio"/> Trade union      |
| <input type="radio"/> Company/business organisation   | <input type="radio"/> Non-EU citizen                      | <input type="radio"/> Other            |
| <input type="radio"/> Consumer organisation           | <input type="radio"/> Non-governmental organisation (NGO) |  |

\* First name

Jana

\* Surname

Bour

\* Email (this won't be published)

j.bour@epra.com

\* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

EPRA - European Public Real Estate Association

\* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

\* Are you (or do you represent companies that are) SMEs?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Transparency register number

*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

09307393718-06

\* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- |                                      |  |                                     |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan    | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti           | <input type="radio"/> Libya         | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands  | <input type="radio"/> Dominica           | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon        |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania        | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria        | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador            | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg    | <input type="radio"/> Samoa                            |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt              | <input type="radio"/> Macau         | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra        | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador        | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar    | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe            |

- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga

- |  |                                   |   |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Cambodia                         | <input type="radio"/> Hungary     | <input type="radio"/> Northern Mariana Islands                    | <input type="radio"/> Trinidad and Tobago                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Cameroon                         | <input type="radio"/> Iceland     | <input type="radio"/> North Korea                                 | <input type="radio"/> Tunisia                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Canada                           | <input type="radio"/> India       | <input type="radio"/> North Macedonia                             | <input type="radio"/> Turkey                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Cape Verde                       | <input type="radio"/> Indonesia   | <input type="radio"/> Norway                                      | <input type="radio"/> Turkmenistan                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Cayman Islands                   | <input type="radio"/> Iran        | <input type="radio"/> Oman  | <input type="radio"/> Turks and Caicos Islands             |
| <input type="radio"/> Central African Republic         | <input type="radio"/> Iraq        | <input type="radio"/> Pakistan                                    | <input type="radio"/> Tuvalu                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Chad                             | <input type="radio"/> Ireland     | <input type="radio"/> Palau                                       | <input type="radio"/> Uganda                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Chile                            | <input type="radio"/> Isle of Man | <input type="radio"/> Palestine                                   | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine                              |
| <input type="radio"/> China                            | <input type="radio"/> Israel      | <input type="radio"/> Panama                                      | <input type="radio"/> United Arab Emirates                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island                 | <input type="radio"/> Italy       | <input type="radio"/> Papua New Guinea                            | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton                       | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica     | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay                                    | <input type="radio"/> United States                        |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands          | <input type="radio"/> Japan       | <input type="radio"/> Peru  | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia                         | <input type="radio"/> Jersey      | <input type="radio"/> Philippines                                 | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros                          | <input type="radio"/> Jordan      | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands                            | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo                            | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan  | <input type="radio"/> Poland                                      | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan                           |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands                     | <input type="radio"/> Kenya       | <input type="radio"/> Portugal                                    | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica                       | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati    | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico                                 | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City                         |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire                    | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo      | <input type="radio"/> Qatar                                       | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela                            |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia                          | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait      | <input type="radio"/> Réunion                                     | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba                             | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan  | <input type="radio"/> Romania                                     | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao                          | <input type="radio"/> Laos        | <input type="radio"/> Russia                                      | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus                           | <input type="radio"/> Latvia      | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda                                      | <input type="radio"/> Yemen                                |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia                          | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy                            | <input type="radio"/> Zambia                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe                             |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark                          | <input type="radio"/> Liberia     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis                       |  |
|  |                                   | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia                                 |  |

\* Field of activity or sector (if applicable):

*at least 1 choice(s)*

- Audit, assurance and accounting

- Banking
- Insurance
- Investment
- Pension provision
- Investment management (e.g. hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, money market funds, securities)
- Credit rating agencies
- Providers of ESG data and ratings
- Market infrastructure operation (e.g. CCPs, CSDs, Stock exchanges)
- Social entrepreneurship
- Production, manufacturing or services not covered by any of the above categories
- Other
- Not applicable

\* Please specify your activity field(s) or sector(s):

Providers of the EPRA Sustainability Best Practices Recommendations (sBPR) - the sole real estate industry standard for public ESG disclosure in Europe - and a public database built for investors, benchmark providers and researchers that want to analyse the ESG performance of companies operating in the listed real estate sector.

\* Please choose one of the following options:

- My organisation is a preparer of non-financial information (or represents such organisations).
- My organisation is a user of non-financial information (or represents such organisations).
- My organisation is both a preparer and a user of non-financial information (or represents such organisations).
- My organisation is neither a preparer nor a user of non-financial information (nor does it represent organisations that are preparers or users of such information).
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

\* Are you (or do you represent companies that are) currently under the scope of the provisions of the NFRD?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

\* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.





## Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

## Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

## 1. Quality and scope of non-financial information to be disclosed

---

The feedback received from the [online public consultation on corporate reporting carried out in 2018](#) suggests that there are some significant problems regarding the non-financial information currently disclosed by companies pursuant to [Directive 2014/95/EU](#) (“the Non-Financial Reporting Directive” or NFRD) Likewise, [ESMA’s 2018 Activity Report](#) gathers evidence that shows there is significant room for improvement in the disclosure practices under the NFRD.

### Question 1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about possible problems with regard to non-financial reporting?

Please rate as follows:

1= totally disagree, 2= mostly disagree, 3= partially disagree and partially agree, 4= mostly agree, 5= totally agree

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
The lack of comparability of non-financial information reported by companies pursuant to the NFRD is a significant problem.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The limited reliability of non-financial information reported by companies pursuant to the NFRD is a significant problem.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Companies reporting pursuant to the NFRD do not disclose all relevant						

non-financial information  
needed by different user  
groups.



Article 19a of the Accounting Directive (which was introduced into the Accounting Directive by the NFRD) currently requires companies to disclose information about four non-financial matters, if deemed material by the particular company:

- i. environment,
- ii. social and employee issues,
- iii. human rights,
- iv. bribery and corruption.

These correspond to the “sustainability factors” defined in Article 2(24) of Regulation (UE) 2019/2088 on sustainability-related disclosures in the financial services sector.

**Question 2. Do you consider that companies reporting pursuant to the NFRD should be required to disclose information about other non-financial matters in addition to those currently set-out in Article 19a?**

	<p align="center"><b>Please specify which other non-financial matters (no more than 3):</b></p>
Other non-financial matter #1	<p>It should be made explicit that (i) environment contain both 1) impacts of businesses on climate and other environmental issues and 2) impacts of climate and other environmental issues on businesses.</p>
Other non-financial matter #2	
Other non-financial matter #3	

For each of the four non-financial matters identified in Article 19a of the Accounting Directive, and subject to the company's own materiality assessment, companies are required to disclose information about their business model, policies (including implemented due diligence processes), outcomes, risks and risk management (including risks linked to their business relationships), and key performance indicators (KPIs) relevant to the business.

**Question 3. Are there additional categories of non-financial information related to a company’s governance and management procedures, including related metrics where relevant, (for example, scenario analyses, targets, more forward-looking information, or how the company aims to contribute to society through its business activities) that companies should disclose in order to enable users of their reports to understand the development, performance, position and impacts of the company?**

	<b>Please specify which additional categories of non-financial information (no more than 3):</b>
Additional category of non-financial information #1	
Additional category of non-financial information #2	
Additional category of non-financial information #3	

[Investment in intangible assets currently represents the majority of investment carried out by the private sector in advanced economies](#). There is a long-standing debate about the need for better reporting of intangible investments in company reports, including in relation to sustainability<sup>1</sup>. Irrespective of the potential future changes to accounting standards, it is likely to remain the case that a significant proportion of intangible assets will fail to meet the definition of an asset or the criteria for recognition as an intangible asset in the financial statements. The Accounting Directive currently makes no explicit reference to intangible assets in the Articles concerning the management report, other than the requirement to report about activities in the field of research and development in Article 19(2)(b).

---

<sup>1</sup> The European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG) is currently carrying out a [research project on this topic](#). The United Kingdom's Financial Reporting Council issued a [consultation document about business reporting of intangibles in 2019](#).

**Question 4. In light of the importance of intangibles in the economy, do you consider that companies should be required to disclose additional non-financial information regarding intangible assets or related factors (e.g. intellectual property, software, customer retention, human capital, etc.)?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

In addition to the provisions of the NFRD, several other EU legislative acts require disclosures of sustainability-related information for financial sector entities:

- The [Regulation on prudential requirements for credit institutions](#) requires certain banks to disclose ESG risks as of 28 June 2022.
- The [Regulation on sustainability related disclosures in the financial services sector](#) requires financial market participants to disclose their policies on the integration of sustainability risks in their investment decision-making process and the adverse impacts of investment decisions on sustainability factors, as of 10 March 2021.
- The [Regulation establishing a framework to facilitate sustainable investment \(the Sustainable Finance Taxonomy\)](#) creates new reporting obligations including for companies subject to the NFRD, starting in December 2021.

**Question 5. To what extent do you think that the current disclosure requirements of the NFRD ensure that investee companies report the information that financial sector companies will need to meet their new disclosure requirements?**

- Not at all
- To some extent but not much
- To a reasonable extent
- To a very great extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

In order to ensure that the financial service sector can comply with the new disclosure requirements there might be scope for better aligning the information required to investees and the one financial sector entities need to report themselves, e.g. as regards sustainability impacts.

## Question 6. How do you find the interaction between different pieces of legislation?

You can provide as many answers as you want.

- It works well
- There is an overlap
- There are gaps
- There is a need to streamline
- It does not work at all
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## Question 7. In order to ensure better alignment of reporting obligations of investees and investors, should the legal provisions related to non-financial reporting define environmental matters on the basis of the six objectives set-out in the taxonomy regulation: (1) climate change mitigation; (2) climate change adaptation; (3) sustainable use and protection of water and marine resources; (4) transition to a circular economy (5) pollution prevention and control; (6) protection and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystems?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

## Please provide any comments or explanations to justify your answers to questions 1 to 7:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Q1) Introduction of industry standards can improve the lack of comparability addressed by many investors as a limit to perform analysis across investees operating in the same sector. However, investors should also invest in their own understanding of ESG data as they already do so for financial data.

Limited reliability of ESG dataset can be addressed by third party assurance.

Lack of information needed by different user groups cannot be addressed easily, but industry standard can also contribute to it. A further solution to this could be to define 'primary users' of data (i.e. investors) and then make financially material information available to them. This might be reflected in the revision of the materiality definition within the NFRD.

Q4) Intellectual property & software represent elements of competitive advantages and companies should not be forced to report on them. Human capital and customer relation could be disclosed on voluntary basis.

Q6) We appreciate the change of EU Taxonomy Regulation to reflect the EU NFRD's scope and portfolio level disclosure.

Q7) We welcome the alignment between the EU Taxonomy and the NFRD. At the same time, we would like to stress that companies identify their impacts according to the materiality assessment and they should be able to continue doing so. The outcomes of such materiality assessment might go beyond the EU Taxonomy categories and/or confirm that some categories are not material. Therefore, a 'comply or explain' principle

should be introduced which would enable companies to report only on material impacts.

In short, the EU Taxonomy categories can be used as overarching themes and then companies could be asked to report on the material ones, based on 'comply or explain' principle.

## 2. Standardisation

---

*Note: in this section, the word "standard" is used for simplicity. This should not be read as a suggestion that all relevant reporting requirements must be specified in a single normative document. Rather, "standard" is merely used as a shorthand that could encompass a consistent and comprehensive set of standards. Reporting standards define what information companies should report and how such information should be prepared and presented.*

A requirement that all companies falling within the scope of the NFRD report in accordance with a common non-financial reporting standard may help to address some of the problems identified in section 1 (comparability, reliability and relevance).

**Question 8. In your opinion, to what extent would a requirement on companies to apply a common standard for non-financial information resolve the problems identified?**

- Not at all
- To some extent but not much
- To a reasonable extent
- To a very great extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 9. In your opinion, is it necessary that a standard applied by a company under the scope of the Non-Financial Reporting Directive should include sector-specific elements?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

A number of non-financial reporting frameworks and standards already exist. Some, including the standards of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), the framework of the International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC), and the standards of the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), aim to cover most or all relevant non-financial issues.



**Question 10. To what extent would the application of one of the following standards or frameworks, applied on its own, resolve the problems identified while also enabling companies to *comprehensively* meet the current disclosure requirements of the Non-Financial Reporting Directive, taking into account the double-materiality perspective (see section 3)?**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	1 (not at all)	2 (to some extent but not much)	3 (to a very reasonable extent)	4 (to a very great extent)	N.A.
<a href="#">Global Reporting Initiative</a>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">Sustainability Accounting Standards Board</a>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">International Integrated Reporting Framework</a>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**10.1 Do you consider that other standard(s) or framework(s), applied on their own, would resolve the problems identified while also enabling companies to *comprehensively* meet the current disclosure requirements of the NFRD?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**10.2 Please specify which other standard(s) or framework(s) you consider, applied on their own, would resolve the problems identified while also enabling companies to *comprehensively* meet the current disclosure requirements of the NFRD, and to what extent:**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	<b>Name of other standard or framework (no more than 3):</b>	<b>Please rate from 1 to 4 as explained above (please use digits only)</b>
Other standard or framework #1	Industry specific standards where available – for example for listed real estate / real estate in general: EPRA sustainability Best Practices recommendations (largely based on GRI KPIs but adapted to the European real estate sector)	4
Other standard or framework #2		
Other standard or framework #3		

On 5 December 2019, the Economic and Financial Affairs Council adopted conclusions on deepening the Capital Markets Union, in which it invited the Commission to “consider the development of a European non-financial reporting standard **taking into account international initiatives**”.

Most existing frameworks and standards focus on individual or a limited set of non-financial issues. Examples include the recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), the UN Guiding Principles Reporting Framework (human rights), the questionnaires of the CDP (formerly the Carbon Disclosure Project), and the standards of the Climate Disclosure Standards Board (CDSB). Several approaches have also been developed at EU level in the environmental area, including the Organisation Environmental Footprint and reporting under the Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS).

**Question 11. If there were to be a common European non-financial reporting standard applied by companies under the scope of the NFRD, to what extent do you think it would be important that such a standard should incorporate the principles and content of the following existing standards and frameworks?**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	1 (not at all)	2 (to some extent but not much)	3 (to a very reasonable extent)	4 (to a very great extent)	N.A.
<a href="#">Global Reporting Initiative</a>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">Sustainability Accounting Standards Board</a>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">International Integrated Reporting Framework</a>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)</a>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">UN Guiding Principles Reporting Framework (human rights)</a>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">CDP</a>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">Climate Disclosure Standards Board (CDSB)</a>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">Organisation Environmental Footprint (OEF)</a>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<a href="#">Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS)</a>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**11.1 Do you consider that the principles and content of other existing standard(s) or framework(s) should be incorporated in a potential common European non-financial reporting standard?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**11.2 Please specify the existing standard(s) or framework(s), whose principles and content should be incorporated in a potential common European non-financial reporting standard, and to what extent:**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	<b>Name of other existing standard or framework (no more than 3):</b>	<b>Please rate from 1 to 4 as explained above (please use digits only)</b>
Other existing standard or framework #1	Industry specific standards where available	4
Other existing standard or framework #2		
Other existing standard or framework #3		

**Question 12. If your organisation *fully* applies any non-financial reporting standard or framework when reporting under the provisions of the NFRD, please indicate the recurring annual cost of applying that standard or framework (including costs of retrieving, analysing and reporting the information):**

	<b>Name of standard or framework (no more than 3):</b>	<b>Estimated cost of application per year, excluding any one-off start-up costs</b>
Standard or framework #1	The combination of GRI and EPRA sBPR	Human resources 100k€ in HR dedicated to reporting Consulting services to prepare CSR report 200k€ dedicated to reporting Auditing 35k€ dedicated to reporting
Standard or framework #2		
Standard or framework #3		



Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) often do not have the technical expertise nor resources necessary to prepare reports in accordance with state-of-the-art, sophisticated standards. This may imply that requiring SMEs to apply the same standards as large companies may be a disproportionate burden for SMEs.

At the same time, many SMEs are under increasing pressure to provide certain non-financial information to other businesses, in particular if they are suppliers of large companies. In addition, financial institutions are increasingly likely to request certain non-financial information from companies to whom they provide capital, including SMEs. In this respect, SMEs that do not provide non-financial information may experience a negative impact on their commercial opportunities as suppliers of larger companies or on their access to capital, and may not be able to benefit from new sustainable investment opportunities.

**Question 13. In your opinion, would it be useful for there to be a simplified standard and/or reporting format for SMEs?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 14. To what extent do you think that a simplified standard for SMEs would be an effective means of limiting the burden on SMEs arising from information demands they may receive from other companies, including financial institutions?**

- Not at all
- To some extent but not much
- To a reasonable extent
- To a very great extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 15. If the EU were to develop a simplified standard for SMEs, do you think that the use of such a simplified standard by SMEs should be mandatory or voluntary?**

- Mandatory
- Voluntary
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

In the responses to the [Commission's public consultation on public corporate reporting carried out in 2018](#), just over half of the respondents believed that integrated reporting could contribute to a more efficient allocation of capital and agreed that the EU should encourage integrated reporting.

**Question 16. In light of these responses, to what extent do you agree that the body responsible for developing a European non-financial reporting standard should also have expertise in the field of financial reporting in order to ensure "connectivity" or integration between financial and non-financial information?**

- Not at all
- To some extent but not much
- To a reasonable extent

- To a very great extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 17. The key stakeholder groups with an interest in and contributing to the elaboration of financial reporting standards have historically been investors, preparers of financial reports (companies) and auditors / a c c o u n t a n t s .**

**To what extent to do you think that these groups should also be involved in the process of developing a European non-financial reporting standard?**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	1 (not at all)	2 (to some extent but not much)	3 (to a very reasonable extent)	4 (to a very great extent)	N.A.
Investors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Preparers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Auditors/accountants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Question 18. In addition to the stakeholders referred to in the previous question, to what extent do you consider that the following stakeholders should be involved in the process of developing a European non-financial reporting standard?**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	1 (not at all)	2 (to some extent but not much)	3 (to a very reasonable extent)	4 (to a very great extent)	N.A.
Civil society representatives/NGOs	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academics	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**18.1 Do you consider that other stakeholder(s) should be involved in the process of developing a European non-financial reporting standard?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**18.2 Please specify which other stakeholder(s) you consider should be involved in the process of developing a European non-financial reporting standard and to what extent:**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	<b>Name of other stakeholder (no more than 3):</b>	<b>Please rate from 1 to 4 as explained above (please use digits only)</b>
Other stakeholder #1	Industry bodies	4
Other stakeholder #2	Standard setters	4
Other stakeholder #3		

**Question 19. To what extent should the following European public bodies or authorities be involved in the process of developing a European non-financial reporting standard?**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	1 (not at all)	2 (to some extent but not much)	3 (to a very reasonable extent)	4 (to a very great extent)	N.A.
European Securities Markets Authority (ESMA)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
European Banking Authority (EBA)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
European Central Bank (ECB)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
European Environment Agency (EEA)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Platform on Sustainable Finance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**19.1 Do you consider that other European public body/ies or authority/ies should be involved in the process of developing a European non-financial reporting standard?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant



**19.2 Please specify which other European public body/ies or authority/ies you consider should be involved in the process of developing a European non-financial reporting standard and to what extent:**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	<b>Name of other European public body or authority (no more than 3):</b>	<b>Please rate from 1 to 4 as explained above (please use digits only)</b>
Other European public body or authority #1	EFRAG - European Financial Reporting Advisory Group	4
Other European public body or authority #2		
Other European public body or authority #3		

National accounting standards-setters of several EU Member States are represented in the European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG), which acts as the EU's voice and technical advisor in relation to financial reporting.

**Question 20. To what extent do you consider that the following national authorities or bodies should be involved in the process of developing European non-financial reporting standards?**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	1 (not at all)	2 (to some extent but not much)	3 (to a very reasonable extent)	4 (to a very great extent)	N.A.
National accounting standards-setters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Environmental authorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## 20.1 Do you consider that other type of national authorities or bodies should be involved in the process of developing a European non-financial reporting standard?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

### Please provide any comments or explanations to justify your answers to questions 8 to 20:

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

It is EPRA's experience that when companies have a tool (i.e. a common standard) which is accessible, tailored to a specific industry (i.e. offering a materiality pre-screening) and well recognised by the investment community, then the whole process of making ESG information public is made simpler, cheaper, more comparable and even possible to smaller companies. While at EPRA sBPR's launch in 2011 only 9 companies within the EPRA membership were reporting in line with sBPR standard, over the years the number of reporters has drastically increased up to 70 for FY 2018 corresponding to EUR 282 billion of market capitalisation. The increase of sBPR reporting companies over the year is explained by the demand of investors to access harmonized, comparable and consistent ESG data across investees.

Regarding Q10, we stress that neither GRI nor SASB, if applied on their own, would resolve the problem NFRD's 2020 review is intended to address. SASB is not used in Europe and its introduction would force companies with already a well-established reporting structure and historical dataset, mainly based on GRI, to rethink completely their reporting. GRI's strength is that it is widely known and used in Europe, however, it lacks industry focus. For instance, EPRA sBPR built on GRI but in a tailored way for the commercial real estate sector (i.e. recurring rental income producing commercial real estate) with the introduction of sector specific definitions such as Like-for-Like.

Until we reach a certain stage of non-financial reporting, we would not recommend to go higher towards the integrated reports, hence IIRF is considered as 1 for the purpose of 2020 NFRD Review. However, they should be enabled and encouraged for those prepares who are ready for a more integrated approach. In the meantime, we suggest to begin with TCFD's integration to the companies' annual reports.

As mentioned above, industry standard helps minimise the cost for the companies to apply the NFRD even when on voluntary basis. For an example, it minimises the need to use external consultants. In addition, the upcoming EU Taxonomy might serve as an excellent motivation for SMEs to provide non-financial information where they are seeking more sustainable capital for which investors will need those information to determine whether the activities companies pursue are sufficiently sustainable. We argue that maintaining a voluntary nature of such disclosure will naturally reveal those companies who are actually pursuing such objectives and therefore this would contribute to avoiding greenwashing. The logic is, if you conduct your business sustainably, you want to communicate it. And therefore, you want to publicly disclose your information. If you want, and aren't large enough to afford a full scale of ESG reporting, then having access to a tailored standard would help you significantly in producing a report and then start building your own experience.

For question 13, it is yes, and therefore there should be an industry standard which we consider sufficiently proportionate for SMEs. Even before considering the current Covid-19 outbreak and its aftermath, we believed that SMEs should continue to pursue ESG disclosure on a voluntary basis. Now, it is even more urgent.

On Q 17 & 18, the most consulted stakeholders should be preparers and/or the organisations which represent them and have the relevant knowledge and experience (e.g. listed property companies and EPRA's experience of setting a standard for its industry). Investors' involvement is equally important as the annual reports are ultimately addressed to them and hence continuous dialogue between preparers and investors should be reasonably encouraged. That is also our experience at EPRA in the Sustainability Committee where the ESG standard is regularly discussed. We should also bear in mind that there is a limited number of ESG specialised investors with a great knowledge on the topic. Most of the generalist investors are in a significant need of being educated on ESG. For that purpose, offering a training session via interactive online webinars (or otherwise) prove helpful. Standard setters are the ones which should be also consulted. Auditors should be consulted within a reasonable extent bearing in mind a potential conflict of interest (i.e. simplicity/costs). Other bodies or NGOs should be consulted to the extent they have knowledge and experience on ESG disclosure.

On Q 19, we would add that there should be a distinction made between financial and non-financial companies. Representing listed property companies, as non-financial companies, we do not think there is a need to involve any of the listed bodies. However, we believe that they should be involved to a reasonable extent when it comes to those companies which they supervise.

### 3. Application of the principle of materiality

---

The NFRD requires companies to disclose information “to the extent necessary for an understanding of the development, performance, position and impact of [the company’s] activities.” This materiality principle implies that companies reporting pursuant to the NFRD must disclose (i) how sustainability issues may affect the development, performance and position of the company; and (ii) how the company impacts society and the environment. This is the double-materiality perspective ([see also the Commission’s non-binding guidelines on reporting climate-related information, section 2.2, page 4](#)). The two “directions” of materiality are distinct although there can be feedbacks from one to the other. For example, a company that with severe impacts on the environment or society may incur reputational or legal risks that undermine its financial performance.

‘Material’ information is defined in Article 2(16) of the Accounting Directive as “the status of information where its omission or misstatement could reasonably be expected to influence decisions that users make on the basis of the financial statements of the undertaking. The materiality of individual items shall be assessed in the context of other similar items.” This definition is geared towards financial reporting, which is principally intended to serve the needs of investors and other creditors. By contrast, non-financial information serves the needs of a broader set of stakeholders, as it relates not only to the increasing impact of non-financial matters on the financial performance of the company, but also to its impacts on society and the environment. This may imply the need to provide an alternative definition of materiality for application in the context of non-financial reporting, or at least additional guidance on this issue.

**Question 21. Do you think that the definition of materiality set-out in Article 2 (16) of the Accounting Directive is relevant for the purposes of determining which information is necessary to understand a company’s development, performance and position?**

- Not at all
- To some extent but not much

- To a reasonable extent
- To a very great extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 22. Do you think that the definition of materiality set-out in Article 2 (16) of the Accounting Directive is relevant for the purposes of determining which information is necessary to understand a company's impacts on society and the environment?**

- Not at all
- To some extent but not much
- To a reasonable extent
- To a very great extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 23. Is there is a need to clarify the concept of 'material' non-financial information?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 23.1 If you do think there is a need to clarify the concept of 'material' non-financial information, how would you suggest to do so?**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The EU should adjust the materiality definition keeping in mind the potential 'tension' between what a reporting companies consider important and material for its business and what information users (investors) would expect from them.

**Question 24. Should companies reporting under the NFRD be required to disclose their materiality assessment process?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Please provide any comments or explanations to justify your answers to questions 21 to 24:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Regarding question 24, materiality disclosure would help data users to better understand companies ESG dataset and information while increasing transparency.

## 4. Assurance

---

The NFRD requires that the statutory auditor or audit firm checks whether the non-financial statement has been provided if a firm falls within the scope of the Directive.

Article 34 of the Accounting Directive requires that the financial statements are audited, and that the statutory auditor or audit firm express an opinion whether the management report (i) is consistent with the financial statements for the same financial year; and (ii) has been prepared in accordance with the applicable legal requirements. Article 34 of the Accounting Directive also requires the statutory auditor or audit firm to state whether it has identified material misstatements in the management report and to give an indication of the nature of such material misstatements. However, the non-financial statement published pursuant to the NFRD – whether contained in the management report or a separate report – is explicitly excluded from the scope of Article 34 of the Accounting Directive. Consequently, the NFRD does not require any assurance of the content of the non-financial statement.

**Question 25. Given that non-financial information is increasingly important to investors and other users, are the current differences in the assurance requirements between financial and non-financial information justifiable and appropriate?**

- Not at all
- To some extent but not much
- To a reasonable extent
- To a very great extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 26. Should EU law impose stronger assurance requirements for non-financial information reported by companies falling within the scope of the NFRD?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

There are two types of assurance engagement a practitioner can perform:

- Reasonable assurance reduces the risk of the engagement to an acceptably low level in the given circumstances. The conclusion is usually provided in a positive form of expression and states an opinion on the measurement of the subject matter against previously defined criteria.
- Limited assurance engagements provide a lower level of assurance than the reasonable assurance engagements. The conclusion is usually provided in a negative form of expression by stating that no matter has been identified by the practitioner to conclude that the subject matter is materially misstated.

**Question 27. If EU law were to require assurance of non-financial information published pursuant to the NFRD, do you think that it should require a reasonable or limited assurance engagement on the non-financial information published?**

- Reasonable
- Limited
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 28. If EU law were to require assurance of non-financial information published pursuant to the NFRD, should the assurance provider assess the reporting company's materiality assessment process?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 29. If assurance of non-financial information was required by EU law, should the assurance provider be required to identify and publish the key engagement risks, their response to these risks and any related key observations (if applicable)?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 30. If assurance of non-financial information was required by EU law, do you think that assurance engagements should be performed based on a common assurance standard?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 31. Do you think that an assurance requirement for non-financial information is dependent on companies reporting against a specific non-financial reporting standard?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 32. Do you publish non-financial information that is assured?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 32.1 If you do publish non-financial information and that information is assured, please indicate the annual costs of such assurance:**



*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

50k euros

**Question 32.2 If you provided an answer to the previous question, please describe the scope of the assurance services provided (issues covered, reasonable/limited, etc.):**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Limited.

**Please provide any comments or explanations to justify your answers to questions 25 to 32:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Q26) At the moment, the Directive also allows Member States to define whether or not reports must be verified by an independent assurance service provider (only France and Italy opted for the assurance option). In this regard, EPRA's recommendation would be firstly to replace this Member State option with a harmonised requirement of assurance across all EU members states.

Q30) No, it should be based on recognised assurance standards.

## 5. Digitisation

---

The EU has introduced a structured data standard, the European Single Electronic Format (ESEF) under the Transparency Directive. With effect from 1 January 2020 listed companies in the EU shall report their annual financial reports in XHTML (audited financial statements, management report and issuer's responsibility statements). Additionally, if the consolidated financial statements are prepared in IFRS, the XHTML document should also be tagged using iXBRL elements specified in the ESEF taxonomy. This allows the information to be machine-readable. This is expected to produce a number of benefits, including cost saving for users of annual financial reports, greater speed, reliability and accuracy of data handling, improved analysis, and better quality of information and decision-making.

Additionally, the Commission is exploring opportunities to establish a single access point for public corporate information. In this respect, the Commission expects the High-level Forum on CMU to examine this topic and formulate recommendations from the Capital Markets angle in the coming months.

### Question 33. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding digitalisation of non-financial information?

Please rate as follows:

1= totally disagree, 2= mostly disagree, 3= partially disagree and partially agree, 4= mostly agree, 5= totally agree

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
It would be useful to require the tagging of reports containing non-financial information to make them machine-readable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The tagging of non-financial information would only be possible if reporting is done against standards.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
All reports containing non-financial information should be available through a single access point.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Question 34. Do you think that the costs of introducing tagging of non-financial information would be proportionate to the benefits this would produce?**

- Not at all
- To some extent but not much
- To a reasonable extent
- To a very great extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 35. Please provide any other comments you may have regarding the digitalisation of sustainability information:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

EPRA would encourage the introduction of a portal/ database where all non-financial information can be made available to stakeholders. In case of listed real estate sector, since September 2019 we have been collecting the data of listed property companies, which are EPRA members, and making available in an open and centralised database accessible to investors, analysts and all relevant stakeholders.\* The database captures all ESG metrics which are recommended in the EPRA sBPR standard for public disclosure.

\*<https://www.epra.com/sustainability/sbpr-database>

**Please provide any comments or explanations to justify your answers to questions 33 to 35:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Q33) Tagging itself is not useful if it is not done on the base of industry standards. Indeed the same KPI, for example energy intensity (Energy-Int), refers to a different meaning across industries (manufacturing vs real estate). On the contrary, if used for companies operating in the same industry, tagging allows comparability and provides further clarity to data users.

Q34) We do believe that the costs of introducing tagging of non-financial information would be proportionate to the benefits this would produce but only if it is done against industry standards. We have experienced the benefits of including guidance on tagging within the sBPR framework, also in light of the recent development of the database. This enables data collation and display of comparable information.

An example is listed here below:

- Elec-Abs; Total electricity consumption
- Elec-LfL; Like-for-like total electricity consumption
- DH&C-Abs; Total district heating & cooling consumption
- DH&C-LfL; Like-for-like total district heating & cooling consumption

## **6. Structure and location of non-financial information**

---

The default requirement of the NFRD is that companies under scope shall include their non-financial statement in their annual management report. However, the NFRD also allows Member States to allow companies to disclose the required non-financial information in a separate report under certain conditions, and most Member States took up that option when transposing the Directive. Companies can be allowed by national legislation to publish such a report up to six months after the balance sheet date.

The publication of non-financial information in a separate report has a number of consequences, including:

- separate reports that include non-financial information are out of the legal mandate of the national competent authorities, whose mandate over periodic reports is limited to the annual and semi-annual financial reports (which include the management report).
- separate reports that include non-financial information are not required to be filed in the Officially Appointed Mechanisms (OAMs) designated by Member States pursuant to Article 21(2) of the Transparency Directive.

**Question 36. Other consequences may arise from the publication of the non-financial statement as part of a separate report. To what extent do you agree with the following statements:**

Please rate as follows:

1= not at all, 2= to some extent but not much, 3= to a reasonable extent, 4= to a very great extent

	1 (not at all)	2 (to some extent but not much)	3 (to a very reasonable extent)	4 (to a very great extent)	N. A.
The option to publish the non-financial statement as part of a separate report creates a significant problem because the non-financial information reported by companies is hard to find (e.g. it may increase search costs for investors, analysts, ratings agencies and data aggregators).	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The publication of financial and non-financial information in different reports creates the perception that the information reported in the separate report is of secondary importance and does not necessarily have implications in the performance of the company.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Question 37. Do you believe that companies should be required to disclose all necessary non-financial information in the management report?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 38. If companies are allowed to publish the required non-financial information in a report that is separate from the management report, to what extent do you agree with the following approaches?**

Please rate as follows:

1= totally disagree, 2= mostly disagree, 3= partially disagree and partially agree, 4= mostly agree, 5= totally agree

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Legislation should be amended to ensure proper supervision of information published in separate reports.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Legislation should be amended to require companies to file the separate report with Officially Appointed Mechanisms (OAMs).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Legislation should be amended to ensure the same publication date for management report and the separate report.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Question 38.1 Please provide any comments regarding the location of reported non-financial information:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The management report, including the non-financial statement, aims to provide a company's stakeholders with the information necessary to understand the company's development, performance, position and impact. Some non-financial information is also reported in the corporate governance statement, which is also part of the management report.

**Question 39. Do you consider that the current segregation of non-financial information in separate non-financial and corporate governance statements within the management report provides for effective communication with users of company reports?**

- Not at all
- To some extent but not much
- To a reasonable extent
- To a very great extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Please provide any comments or explanations to justify your answers to questions 36 to 39:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Q36) We would be concerned about the capability of companies to integrate ESG into financial performance. It's more a business integration which we would be concerned of rather than a reporting integration.

From a pure reporting perspective, we would recommend that key (most material) non-financial information could be included in the same main report. Additional metrics may be published in a separate report, clearly referenced in the main report.

Q37) It could be made on voluntary basis especially considering that (if the NFRD scope is revised towards the inclusion of SMEs) not all SMEs are, at this stage, experienced with ESG disclosure. Hence, we should not mandate integration of financial and ESG information as this would require having a solid experience in producing a sustainability report. However, on voluntary basis, we would recommend that key (most material) non-financial information could be included in the same main report. Additional metrics may be published in a separate report, clearly referenced in the main report.

## 7. Personal scope (which companies should disclose)

---



The NFRD currently applies to large Public-Interest Entities (PIEs) with more than 500 employees. In practice this means large companies with securities listed in EU regulated markets, large banks (whether listed or not) and large insurance companies (whether listed or not) – all provided that they have more than 500 employees.

The Accounting Directive defines large undertakings as those that exceed at least two of the three following criteria:

- a. balance sheet total: EUR 20 000 000;
- b. net turnover: EUR 40 000 000;
- c. average number of employees during the financial year: 250.

Some Member States have extended the personal scope of the NFRD by lowering the threshold to 250 employees, in effect capturing all large PIEs.

Companies that are a subsidiary of another company are exempt from the reporting requirements of the NFRD if their parent company publishes the necessary non-financial information at consolidated level in accordance with the NFRD.

There are a number of potential arguments to support the extension of the personal scope of the NFRD:

- Changes in the legislative framework: following the adoption of the Regulation on sustainability-related disclosure in the financial services sector and of the Taxonomy Regulation, investors may require non-financial information from a broader range of investees in order to comply with their own sustainability-related reporting requirements.
- Large unlisted companies can have significant impacts on society and the environment. There may therefore be no a priori reason to differentiate between listed and non-listed companies in this respect. In addition, the difference in treatment between listed and non-listed companies in this regard may serve as a disincentive for companies to become listed, and therefore undermine the attractiveness of capital markets.
- Exempting PIEs that are subsidiaries limits the information about impacts on society and the environment, thus undermining the ability of stakeholders of such exempted subsidiaries to hold them accountable for their impacts on society and the environment, especially at local and national level.

**Question 40. If the scope of the NFRD were to be broadened to other categories of PIEs, to what extent would you agree with the following approaches?**

Please rate as follows:

1= totally disagree, 2= mostly disagree, 3= partially disagree and partially agree, 4= mostly agree, 5= totally agree

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Expand scope to include all EU companies with securities listed in regulated markets, regardless of their size.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Expand scope to include all large public interest entities (aligning the size criteria with the definition of large undertakings set out in the Accounting Directive: 250 instead of 500 employee threshold).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expand scope to include all public interest entities, regardless of their size.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Question 41. If the scope of the NFRD were to be broadened to non-PIEs, to what extent would you agree with the following approaches?**

Please rate as follows:

1= totally disagree, 2= mostly disagree, 3= partially disagree and partially agree, 4= mostly agree, 5= totally agree

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Expand the scope to include large non-listed companies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Remove the exemption for companies that are subsidiaries of a parent company that reports non-financial information at group level in accordance with the NFRD.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expand the scope to include large companies established in the EU but listed outside the EU.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expand the scope to include large companies						

not established in the EU that are listed in EU regulated markets.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expand scope to include all limited liability companies regardless of their size.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Question 42. If *non-listed* companies were required to disclose non-financial information, do you consider that there should be a specific competent authority in charge of supervising their compliance with that obligation?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Due to the nature of their activities, credit institutions and insurance undertakings have larger balance sheets than non-financial corporations. Hence, the vast majority of such institutions will exceed the balance sheet threshold in the definition of large undertakings set-out in the Accounting Directive. Moreover, the application of some public disclosure requirement of EU prudential regulation for credit institutions and insurance undertakings is defined based on various size thresholds.

For example:

- the [Regulation on prudential requirements for credit institutions and investment firms](#) includes in its definition of large credit institutions those with a total value of assets equal to or greater than EUR 30 billion;
- the same Regulation defines small and non-complex institutions as those that have EUR 5 billion or less total assets;
- the [consultation paper published by EIOPA in October 2019 proposes to revise article 4 thresholds of Solvency II](#) (below which entities are excluded from the scope of Solvency II), doubling the thresholds related to the technical provisions (from EUR 25M provisions to EUR 50M) and allowing Member States to set the threshold referring to premium income between the current EUR 5M and until a maximum of EUR 25M.

**Question 43. To what extent do you agree with the following statements relating to possible changes of the personal scope of the NFRD for financial institutions?**

Please rate as follows:

1= totally disagree, 2= mostly disagree, 3= partially disagree and partially agree, 4= mostly agree, 5= totally agree

	<b>1</b> (totally disagree)	<b>2</b> (mostly disagree)	<b>3</b> (partially disagree and partially agree)	<b>4</b> (mostly agree)	<b>5</b> (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
--	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	----------------------------	-----------------------------	--

The threshold criteria for determining which banks have to comply with the NFRD provisions should be different from those used by Non-Financial Corporates.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
The threshold criteria for determining which insurance undertakings have to comply with the NFRD provisions should be different from those used by Non-Financial Corporates.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**Please provide any comments or explanations to justify your answers to questions 40 to 43:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

## 8. Simplification and reduction of administrative burdens for companies

---

**Question 44. Does your company publish non-financial information pursuant to the NFRD?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

**Question 41.1 If your company publishes non-financial information pursuant to the NFRD, please state how much time the employees of your company spend per year carrying out this task, including time of retrieving, analysing and reporting the information?**

**Please provide your answer in terms of full-time-equivalents (FTEs, 1 FTE**

**= 1 employee working 40h a week during 250 working days per year). Please provide your answer for reports published in 2019, covering financial year 2018.**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

What we want to highlight is that the non-financial reporting process is and should be integrated into many, if not all, departments of the company; it should be integrated in its DNA, with assessment on both the impacts of the business on society and the impact of the ESG efforts of the company on its own business. It is a whole process, a journey and some companies, with many years of experience are further on its way of achieving such integration than others. It is not a single department's task, although where there is one, it enormously facilitates the process.

Resources availability vary across companies, and it mainly depends on companies size. On average, our members invest in 1.5 FTE to carry out the reporting activities.

**Question 44.2 Please state the total cost per year of any external services, excluding the cost of any assurance or audit services, that you contracted to assist your company to comply with the requirements of the Non-Financial Reporting Directive. Please provide your answer for reports published in 2019, covering financial year 2018.**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

On average, our members invest in 200k euros to carry out assurance activities.

The majority of Member States have transposed the NFRD requirements into national legislation making very few changes to the wording of the legal provisions. Therefore, in the majority of the national legal frameworks, companies are required to comply with national legislation that is quite high level, not very prescriptive and do not require the use of any particular reporting standard.

**Question 45. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?**

Please rate as follows:

1= totally disagree, 2= mostly disagree, 3= partially disagree and partially agree, 4= mostly agree, 5= totally agree

	<b>1</b> (totally disagree)	<b>2</b> (mostly disagree)	<b>3</b> (partially disagree)	<b>4</b> (mostly agree)	<b>5</b> (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion /
--	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

			and partially agree)			not relevant
Companies reporting pursuant to the NFRD face uncertainty and complexity when deciding what non-financial information to report, and how and where to report such information.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Companies are under pressure to respond to individual demands for non-financial information from sustainability rating agencies, data providers and civil society, irrespective of the information that they publish as a result of the NFRD.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Companies reporting pursuant to the NFRD have difficulty in getting the information they need from business partners, including suppliers, in order to meet their disclosure requirements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Please provide any comments or explanations to justify your answers to questions 44 to 45:**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Q45) It is very common that companies face significant pressure from investors, sustainability rating agencies, data providers and civil society, to respond to their individual demands for non-financial information irrespective of the information that they publish. It results to such overburden, that there is no surprise many of the smaller companies (SMEs) feel that there is no point in having a single ESG report if that is not going to meet the needs of the investors, or rating agencies anyway. Therefore, a harmonised standard would tremendously help to address this problem.

A continuous dialogue between preparers and investors also aids to resolve such pressure. What's very important is to keep a focus on certain industry as outside of such context any discussion on materiality will lose its practicality and remain a theoretical exercise. This is the reason why having in place industry specific

standards is crucial to address this and many other matters, covered in the previous sections.

Besides that, companies reporting pursuant to the NFRD do face difficulty in getting the information they need from business partners, including tenants or suppliers, in order to meet their disclosure requirements. This is something which needs to be reflected on during the NFRD Review. As for listed real estate companies, we would like to refer to the work planned as part of the 'renovation wave'- and the announced platform (under the Green Deal), during which DG Energy will be looking again at the obstacles in accessing tenants data which are needed to understand the operational use of the buildings owned and invested in by the owners.

## Additional information

---

Should you wish to provide additional information (e.g. a position paper, report) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your additional document(s) here:

The maximum file size is 1 MB.

You can upload several files.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

### Useful links

[More on the Transparency register \(http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en\)](http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en)

[More on this consultation \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-non-financial-reporting-directive\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-non-financial-reporting-directive_en)

[Specific privacy statement \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement_en)

[Consultation document \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-non-financial-reporting-directive-consultation-document\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-non-financial-reporting-directive-consultation-document_en)

[More on non-financial reporting \(https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/company-reporting-and-auditir/company-reporting/non-financial-reporting\\_en\)](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/company-reporting-and-auditir/company-reporting/non-financial-reporting_en)

### Contact

fisma-non-financial-reporting@ec.europa.eu