Public consultation on the revision of the nonfinancial reporting directive

A Eurelectric response paper

June 2020

Eurelectric represents the interests of the electricity industry in Europe. Our work covers all major issues affecting our sector. Our members represent the electricity industry in over 30 European countries.

We cover the entire industry from electricity generation and markets to distribution networks and customer issues. We also have affiliates active on several other continents and business associates from a wide variety of sectors with a direct interest in the electricity industry.

We stand for

The vision of the European power sector is to enable and sustain:
- A vibrant competitive European economy, reliably powered by clean, carbon-neutral energy
- A smart, energy efficient and truly sustainable society for all citizens of Europe

We are committed to lead a cost-effective energy transition by:

investing in clean power generation and transition-enabling solutions, to reduce emissions and actively pursue efforts to become carbon-neutral well before mid-century, taking into account different starting points and commercial availability of key transition technologies;

transforming the energy system to make it more responsive, resilient and efficient. This includes increased use of renewable energy, digitalisation, demand side response and reinforcement of grids so they can function as platforms and enablers for customers, cities and communities;

accelerating the energy transition in other economic sectors by offering competitive electricity as a transformation tool for transport, heating and industry;

embedding sustainability in all parts of our value chain and take measures to support the transformation of existing assets towards a zero carbon society;

innovating to discover the cutting-edge business models and develop the breakthrough technologies that are indispensable to allow our industry to lead this transition.

Dépôt légal: D/2020/12.105/34

WG Financial Regulation & Market Integrity

Contact:

Stella Benfatto, Advisor - Wholesale Markets - sbenfatto@eurelectric.org

Contribution ID: 1c1f85ed-6985-48e7-8c20-8afd47297caa
Date: 11/06/2020 17:21:24

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. 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.

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

- ◯ Academic/research institution
- ◉ Business association
- ◯ Company/business organisation
- ◯ Consumer organisation
- ◯ EU citizen
- ◯ Environmental organisation
- ◯ Non-EU citizen
- ◯ Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ◯ Public authority
- ◯ Trade union
- ◯ Other

* First name

Stella

* Surname

Benfatto

* Email (this won't be published)

sbenfatto@eurelectric.org

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Eurelectric aisbl

* 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.

4271427696-87

* Country of origin

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

○ Afghanistan	○ Djibouti	○ Libya	○ Saint Martin
○ Åland Islands	○ Dominica	○ Liechtenstein	○ Saint Pierre and Miquelon
○ Albania	○ Dominican Republic	○ Lithuania	○ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
○ Algeria	○ Ecuador	○ Luxembourg	○ Samoa
○ American Samoa	○ Egypt	○ Macau	○ San Marino
○ Andorra	○ El Salvador	○ Madagascar	○ São Tomé and Príncipe

- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium (selected)
- 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

Northern Mariana Islands

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

* 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
- [x] Other
- [ ] Not applicable

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

Electricity

* 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.	○	○	●	○	○	○
The limited reliability of non-financial information reported by companies pursuant to the NFRD is a significant problem.	○	○	●	○	○	○
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?

	Please specify which other non-financial matters (no more than 3):
Other non-financial matter #1	Climate change (see the Non-binding Guidelines on Climate Reporting by the EC and the TCFD metrics), with the possibility for companies to not disclose sensitive business information as long as the disclosure still reflects non-financial risks relevant to the market/investors.
Other non-financial matter #2	Value chain, in particular supply chain, with the possibility for companies to not disclose sensitive business information as long as the disclosure still reflects non-financial risks relevant to the market/investors.
Other non-financial matter #3	Innovation, research & development (contributing to sustainable development), with the possibility for companies to not disclose sensitive business information as long as the disclosure still reflects non-financial risks relevant to the market/investors.

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?

	Please specify which additional categories of non-financial information (no more than 3):
Additional category of non-financial information #1	Company's contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), supported by SDGD Recommendations
Additional category of non-financial information #2	Scenario analysis in qualitative terms (see TCFD recommendations)
Additional category of non-financial information #3	Available non-financial objectives, if they are essential for the assessment of the management of non-financial matters.

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[1]. 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).

---

[1] 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
- [x] 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.

- Since 2008, stakeholders contemplated improvements in the coherence of the non-financial reporting framework. Considering the diversity of companies, it is sometime difficult to ensure comparability through non-financial reporting. Nevertheless, there is room for improvement in terms of the approach to report ESG issues, which eventually will result in comparable and reliable non-financial reporting information.

- Non-financial reporting requirements should be complemented with a sense of proportion and in relation to (company) relevant non-financial information. It could also include more guidance in order to specify what concrete sustainability information should be disclosed in terms of reporting the risks in different ESG areas.

- It is important to respond to the growing demand for data and information from investors and other stakeholders. When judging whether non-financial reporting practices meet certain objectives, it should be on the basis of justified needs of stakeholders rather than expectations that can create additional reporting burdens for companies without real added value.

- Environmental matters should be defined according to international standards, e.g. GHG Protocol, ISO 14001 or GRI-Standards.

- Streamlining the various obligations should lead to simplification and clarification. All in all, a streamlining and clarification of the reporting requirements is therefore helpful.

- Avoidance of inappropriate reporting effort in comparison to company size.

- Using the six environmental objectives helps to structure items and reporting, but it should not create inconsistencies with other matters covered in the NFRD However, this is not the final solution to comparability. Comparability depends on the specific ratios, variables, etc that are required to be published, and on the underlying methodologies to calculate them.

- We would support the obligation to adopt an internationally reporting standard, giving companies room to choose. Along time, the standards will converge, with no doubt. Also, the specific matters that a company reports on should remain based on its assessment of what is material to their business and stakeholders.

- On the long term, when the same items are covered in the Taxonomy Regulation and the NFRD, coherence should be sought to avoid any additional administrative burden, especially in terms of reporting.

- The revision of the NFRD should not lead to a disproportionate additional burden on the reporting companies compared to the full employment equivalent or financial expenditure involved. In this context, the new disclosure requirements in Article 4 delta of the political agreement on the Taxonomy Regulation and the resulting significant additional burden on reportable companies must also be taken into account.

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.
Global Reporting Initiative	○	○	●	○	○
Sustainability Accounting Standards Board	○	○	○	○	●
International Integrated Reporting Framework	○	○	○	○	●

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?

- (selected) 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

	Name of other standard or framework (no more than 3):	Please rate from 1 to 4 as explained above (please use digits only)
Other standard or framework #1	GHG Protocol	3
Other standard or framework #2	Task Force on Climate-related Disclosures (TCFD)	3
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.
Global Reporting Initiative	○	○	○	●	○
Sustainability Accounting Standards Board	○	●	○	○	○
International Integrated Reporting Framework	○	●	○	○	○
Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)	○	○	●	○	○
UN Guiding Principles Reporting Framework (human rights)	○	○	○	○	●
CDP	○	●	○	○	○
Climate Disclosure Standards Board (CDSB)	○	○	○	○	●
Organisation Environmental Footprint (OEF)	○	○	○	○	●
Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS)	●	○	○	○	○

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?

- (x) 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

	Name of other existing standard or framework (no more than 3):	Please rate from 1 to 4 as explained above (please use digits only)
Other existing standard or framework #1	GHG Protocol	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):

	Name of standard or framework (no more than 3):	Estimated cost of application per year, excluding any one-off start-up costs
Standard or framework #1		
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?

- (x) 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
- (x) 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?

- (x) 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
- (x) 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 / accountants.

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	○	○	○	●	○
Preparers	○	○	○	●	○
Auditors/accountants	○	●	○	○	○

Question 18. In addition to the stakeholders referred to in the previous question, to what extent to 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	○	●	○	○	○
Academics	○	●	○	○	○

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

	Name of other stakeholder (no more than 3):	Please rate from 1 to 4 as explained above (please use digits only)
Other stakeholder #1	Banks	4
Other stakeholder #2	Insurance companies	4
Other stakeholder #3	Providers of EDG ratings	4

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)			X		
European Banking Authority (EBA)			X		
European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA)			X		
European Central Bank (ECB)			X		
European Environment Agency (EEA)			X		
Platform on Sustainable Finance				X	

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?

- (selected) 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

	Name of other European public body or authority (no more than 3):	Please rate from 1 to 4 as explained above (please use digits only)
Other European public body or authority #1	Member States Experts Group	3
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 to 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	○	○	○	○	●
Environmental authorities	○	●	○	○	○

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?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

20.2 Please specify which other type of national authorities or bodies 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

	Name of other national authority or body (no more than 3):	Please rate from 1 to 4 as explained above (please use digits only)
Other national authority or body #1	Ministry of Economic Affairs	3
Other national authority or body #2		
Other national authority or body #3		

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.

- Standardisation is meaningful in a sense of easing reporting and understanding reports. Today, the current "standards":
- provide a broad framework for different companies to report on non-financial information;
- prescribes the topics for companies to report on, allowing for reporting on more specific topics based on materiality;
- prescribes the aspects that companies need to report on (risks, impacts, policies etc) and where they should report, whilst leaving necessary flexibility to adapt to different sectors, business models, stakeholders etc.

- Standardisation should include sector specific parts. If a common standard would be introduced it should not be too restrictive. It is important that the reported non-financial information responds to the demands of the investors, but it is as important to notice that flexibility and sector specific approach is needed since the same information does not necessarily fit to all sectors;

- The EU should not develop a new standard but specify the use of existing standards – i.e.the several ESG standards (GRI; SASB), frameworks (IIRC; TCFD; CDSB; CDP; etc) and financial standards (IFRS). In this regard a common standard should highlight relevant existing frameworks and standards in a way to create consistency and coherence to guide companies. The standard should not create additional burden and be useful for companies.

- Expertise on all level is welcomed but it should not lead to national differentiation.

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.

Eurelectric would like to raise three main points:

1. We support the double materiality perspective - However, it is important to differentiate between generic information and information particularly related to how the individual company is doing its business. Hence, applying the principle must focus on the importance of materiality to ensure relevant and value-creating reporting in a transparent and comparable way. Please also see further description in the answer to question 24.

2. The materiality definition- This cannot be based on an assessment purely of financial risks related to the company, as it is complex and sometimes impossible to put a financial value on sustainability themes, meaning sustainability reporting would potentially miss important, material issues. In particular, it is important to address the issue of material is fundamental because:
a. The concept of materiality is of fundamental importance for determining the content of non-financial reports.
b. There isn't yet a common definition, however, materiality is a common principle across all frameworks

and standards;
c. The concept of materiality it is not consistently used by the companies in order to address article 19a) of Directive 2014/95, namely the double materiality perspective: financial relevance for the company and relevance in terms of impacts. That trend (the developments of materiality definition) should consider if it is possible the alignment with the financial concept information. The organisations from traditional domain (IASB and FASB) are exploring the non-financial field, and this entail a change in the current approach, moving more towards comparability, robustness and standardisation.

Therefore, the materiality definition should:

a. Allow for companies to define what is material to them by being transparent in their assessment methodology and results, and thus also report on these issues, however not based on particular and mandatory elements
b. Should recognise the difference between generic information relevant for investors across industries and business models and particular industry/company specific information.
c. In addition to a risk-based approach, include the opportunity perspective needed to use the NFRD to engage companies in developing more sustainable business models.
d. To a reasonable extent integrate the society impact perspective as well, both negative and positive, to ensure the definition supports both the company perspective and the society perspective of the double materiality perspective

3. The role of existing reporting frameworks - There is currently no reporting standard which provides a workable definition of materiality. Until this happens, companies should – except for generic information – be allowed to select relevant data as long as they are transparent about how they have defined material issues, their results and which frameworks they follow for reporting of these data. It is important to allow companies to assess whether or not a topic is material, i.e. relevant to their business overall, and then to tailor their reporting to this. What is considered a material topic will be different from one company to another, even within a sector. However, more guidance or highlighting of good practices on the methodologies and processes to assess materiality would be useful for companies.

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.

Ad 1. We support the idea of the double materiality perspective. Yet, we believe that applying the two-fold perception of society’s impact on your business and material impacts on society emphasizes the importance of materiality to ensure relevant and value-creating reporting for companies and stakeholders alike

Ad 2a. The materiality definition cannot be based solely on an assessment of financial risks. It is complex to

put a financial value on sustainability themes. Without clear methods for defining the financial value of sustainability risks, financial risk assessment is insufficient to properly assess sustainability materiality; it risks missing issues with high materiality to specific businesses or industries. Also, a definition focused only on financial risk is inadequate to meet more multi-faceted interests and stakeholder engagement. Hence, we endorse a definition that is both inspired by the logic of accounting and allows for multi-faceted business models, industries and interests and expectations (See white-paper launched by WEF in March 2020 on how ESG issues become financially material over time and impact of stakeholder activism)
Since materiality depends on the company's unique circumstances which will be subject to change, the NFRD should also allow for companies to define that which is material to them by being transparent in their assessment methodology and results. It should not be based on particular and mandatory elements. Certain data may not make sense for all companies

Ad 2b. While we favor an approach that accounts for a company's unique circumstances, it is possible to foresee integrating some generic data in the definition of materiality. These should be based on issues that are relevant across sectors. Such criteria should be based on existing frameworks, accounting for the wealth of standards that already exist. It should be noted, however, that some data reporting simply cannot be mandatory due to the specific situation of different industries. E.g: an good standard for generic data is the GHG Protocol (Protocol's scope 1 and scope 2). As for the scope 3 emissions mentioned in the GHG Protocol, we believe it is premature to consider these implemented as a mandatory requirement

Ad 2c. The definition of materiality set-out in Article 2 of the Accounting Directive would focus on risks only. It would miss the opportunity perspective which is needed to:1) use the NFRD to engage companies in developing more sustainable business models 2) for stakeholders to adequately assess the relevance and long-term value of the company
NFRD should require reporting on both material risks and opportunities. This is in line with the SDG agenda. SDGs could be used as a framework to assess both opportunities and risks. It is crucial that the NFRD also leaves room for companies to define their own material themes to report on. Thus, while we support a broader perception of what can be deemed 'material', we advise against pre-defining what topics and indicators companies should report on when it comes to non-generic information(Question 23)

Ad 2d. The Accounting Directive's materiality definition mainly supports the company perspective of the double materiality perspective. It is important to integrate the society impact perspective as well (negative & positive). The SDG can be used as a guidance for this 'direction of the definition', as it is relevant to have the 'forward-looking perspective' considered when companies identify, prioritise and report on their impacts /contributions to society. Also, impact reporting will be supported by improved frameworks for quantification of impacts

Ad 3. We acknowledge that it remains difficult to quantify and standardise key ESG indicators and thus also to compare non-financial performance across companies, business models, sectors and geographies. There is currently no one reporting standard which can provide the full guidance on how to define, report and manage all material sustainability issues. Nevertheless, international standards provide good guidance on how to report on specific sustainability issues. Thus, companies should align their reporting with international standards where possible. This is particularly evident in areas as regards reporting on climate impacts throughout the value chain as it is e.g. in the GHG Protocol. Thus, the GHG Protocol offers some of the transparency and standardisation that is otherwise lacking in sustainability reporting on a topic relevant to all businesses. We recommend integrating the Protocol in the revision of the Directive

We believe it is important the legislation stresses that companies should be 'transparent' about the methodology they use to identify material issues, report on the results of their materiality assessment, and that their reporting follow issue-specific guidelines. This will also allow the field of materiality assessments to mature after the implementation of the NFRD

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
- (x) 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
- (x) 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 30.1 If you answered yes in reply to the previous question, please explain whether there is an existing assurance standard that could be used for this purpose or whether a new standard would need to be developed:

5000 character(s) maximum

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

> Concerning question 28, please note that we answered “Yes” but (but a transition period should be included in the revision for companies to adapt to the new requirements).
>
> Existing standard: International Standard on Assurance Engagements ISAE 3000 (Revised)

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?

- (selected) 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.

As this is dependent on size, geographical sites and spread of the company, no general indication is possible.

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.

The range of assurance service range from limited to reasonable assurance depending on where the NFE is located and according to which standard it is audited.

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.

Non-financial information should not be treated in the same way as financial information, in particular regarding the need for assurance/auditing except from reasonable generic ESG data as explained in the answer to questions23 and 24. Depending on the importance of non-financial information and, consequently, its place of reporting, different assessments arise as to whether the audit requirements for companies are appropriate and justifiable.

As the audit requirements are currently limited and primarily delegated to internal governance bodies, a reassessment of the audit requirements should be carried out to provide greater legal certainty for all.

With regard to the depth of the audit, "limited assurance" should be provided as a minimum requirement in order to ensure reliability and ultimately also better comparability.

A review of materiality analysis and risks should be standard, but take into account that there is less experience with non-financial information. Although, mandatory auditing should not lead to disproportionate costs.

It follows from this that a uniform (new) auditing standard could clarify many currently open questions.

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.	○	○	○	○	○	●
The tagging of non-financial information would only be possible if reporting is done against standards.	○	○	●	○	○	○
All reports containing non-financial information should be available through a single access point.	○	○	○	○	○	●

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.

It depends on investors’ ability to use such upgrade.

It is preferable to use existing and global standards.

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.

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).	○	○	●	○	○
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.	○	○	●	○	○

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.	( )	( )	(•)	( )	( )	( )
Legislation should be amended to require companies to file the separate report with Officially Appointed Mechanisms (OAMs).	( )	(•)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Legislation should be amended to ensure the same publication date for management report and the separate report.	( )	( )	(•)	( )	( )	( )

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.

It is important to note that question 37 refers to "all NECESSARY non-financial information". Therefore, the question was interpreted as it does only consider the essential information and excludes the possibility to extend the reports to ALL (also the non-necessary) non-financial information.
Disclosing all (also the non-necessary) non-financial information would lead an excessive burden for companies in the drafting process of the management report.

The interpretation of question 37 also applies to question 38, despite the absence of the wording "all NECESSARY non-financial information".

In other words, companies should be required to disclose only the essential non-financial information in the management report and NOT all the non-financial information.

If legislation provides the option to publish a separate report, for any company choosing this option, the requirement to publish both the management report and a separate report on the same date could be an unnecessary constraints.

The possibility to provide the non-financial statement separately to the management report is an important flexibility for companies. The need and relevancy of publishing the statement may vary depending on the company's general internal processes and reporting systems, as well as on the users of the statement. It would be difficult to meet the needs of all the stakeholders with a single method for reporting non-financial information. Publishing the non-financial statement separately does not make it less relevant. If the visibility of the statement is found problematic, it can be enhanced with other methods. Linking the non-financial statement and the financial management report should not be mandatory but the choice of each company.

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.

Specifically, the current segregation of non-financial information in separate non-financial and corporate

governance statements within the management report:
- provide to some extend but not much effective communication for generic data;
- provide to a reasonable extent effective communication for specific and comprehensive data.

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

			3			Don't know /

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	(partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	no opinion / not relevant
Expand scope to include all EU companies with securities listed in regulated markets, regardless of their size.			X			
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).			X			
Expand scope to include all public interest entities, regardless of their size.			X			

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.			X			
Remove the exemption for companies that are subsidiaries of a parent company that reports non-financial information at	X					

group level in accordance with the NFRD.						
Expand the scope to include large companies established in the EU but listed outside the EU.	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Expand the scope to include large companies not established in the EU that are listed in EU regulated markets.	○	○	◉	○	○	○
Expand scope to include all limited liability companies regardless of their size.	○	◉	○	○	○	○

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

Question 42.1 If you consider that there should be a specific competent authority in charge of supervising non-listed companies' compliance with the obligation of disclosing non-financial information, please specify who in your opinion should carry out this task (National Competent Authorities, European Supervisory Authorities, other...) and how:

5000 character(s) maximum
including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

> Concerning question 41: it would be acceptable to have more companies subject to the requirements, pending on the appropriateness of the level of information. If the requirements in terms of the level of information become an excessive burden for companies, it is not acceptable to have more companies submitted to the NFRD framework.
>
> As the subject of this document is the development of an European standard for non-financial reporting, it should be the relevant European Supervisory Authority who carries this task.

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

	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 threshold criteria for determining which banks have to comply with the NFRD provisions should be different from those used by Non-Financial Corporates.	○	○	○	○	○	●
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.	○	○	○	○	○	●

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.

If small companies, with less than 250 would also report this non-financial information, it should be done under a simplified scheme, which should be developed.

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.

Between 0.75 – 3 FTEs; deviation stems from annual variations when engaging in different projects.

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.

Between 80 000 – 300 000 euros; deviation in costs stems from annual variations when engaging in different projects.

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

	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
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.	○	○	●	○	○	○
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.	○	○	○	○	●	○

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.	○	○	○	○	○	◉

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.

It's likely easy for companies to know what to report and when, but gaining all information takes work and accrues costs. It is also a good point to note that companies retaining credit raters for a rating must provide information to these as well, so there are a lot of overlapping disclosure obligations.
For smaller companies this is not likely so difficult, since smaller companies don't apply for credit ratings from raters. We don't think that there are particular difficulties in gaining information from partners, since different disclosure obligations are very common.

The level of technology readiness may facilitate the disclosure of information.

More support and guidance could be given to companies to assess what is material and to develop reporting methodologies.

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)

More on this consultation (https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-non-financial-reportin
directive_en)

Specific privacy statement (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)

More on non-financial reporting (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

Eurelectric pursues in all its activities the application of the following sustainable development values:

Economic Development

- Growth, added-value, efficiency

Environmental Leadership

- Commitment, innovation, pro-activeness

Social Responsibility

- Transparency, ethics, accountability

Union of the Electricity Industry - Eurelectric aisbl
Boulevard de l’Impératrice, 66 – bte 2 - 1000 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: + 32 2 515 10 00 - VAT: BE 0462 679 112 • www.eurelectric.org
EU Transparency Register number: 4271427696-87