

CONSULTATION SURVEY

---

# DRAFT EUROPEAN SUSTAINABILITY REPORTING STANDARDS

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

April 2022



Open for comments until 8 August 2022

**PTF-ESRS**

Project Task Force on European sustainability reporting standards

 **EFRAG**

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

### ***Characteristics of information quality***

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

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

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

## ***Double materiality***

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

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

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

**Impact materiality:**

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

**Financial materiality:**

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

## **(Materiality) Rebuttable presumption**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (a) all of the mandatory disclosures of an entire ESRS or
- (b) a group of DR related to a specific aspect covered by an ESRS,

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

- (a) the ESRS or
- (b) the group of DR is “not material for the undertaking”.

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

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

**Q27: how would you suggest it can be improved?**



### ***Reporting boundary and value chain***

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

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

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

### ***Time horizon***

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

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

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

1/ Yes 2/ No 3/ I do not know

Please explain why

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

1/ Yes 2/ No 3/ I do not know

Please explain why

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

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

1/ Not at all 2/ To a limited extent with strong reservations, 3/ To a large extent with some reservations 4/ Fully 5/ No opinion

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

### ***Bases for preparation***

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

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

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

1/ Yes 2/No 3/ I do not know

**If yes, please indicate which one(s).**

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



EFRAG is co-funded by the European Union and EEA and EFTA countries. The contents of the documents are however the sole responsibility of the EFRAG PTF- ESRS and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Directorate-General for Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union (DG FISMA). Neither the European Union nor DG FISMA can be held responsible for them.