

This paper has been prepared by the EFRAG Secretariat for discussion at a public meeting of EFRAG SRB. The paper forms part of an early stage of the development of a potential EFRAG position. Consequently, the paper does not represent the official views of EFRAG or any individual member of the EFRAG SRB or EFRAG SR TEG. The paper is made available to enable the public to follow the discussions in the meeting. Tentative decisions are made in public and reported in the EFRAG Update. EFRAG positions, as approved by the EFRAG SRB, are published as comment letters, discussion or position papers, or in any other form considered appropriate in the circumstances.

## Revised LSME

### Cover Note

#### Objective

- 1 The objective of this session is to update the SRB members on the status of the project and changes made so far to ESRS LSME ED (from now on Revised LSME) to respond to the comments received in the public consultation (including field test) and the feedback received from SR TEG members on the documents of [18 July SR TEG meeting](#) where the EFRAG Secretariat proposed changes were presented.
- 2 The SR TEG discussed has discussed in editorial sessions on 12 and 19 of September as well as on 7 and 10 of October the changes to be made in the Revised LSME Sections.
- 3 The summary of those changes per section is portrayed in the table of Appendix A.

#### Background of the discussions and state of play

- 4 EFRAG is currently working on the Revised LSME following the feedback received during the public consultation for a more simplified standard and according to the tentative decision taken by EFRAG SRB on [4 July 2024](#).
- 5 While the instruction is to streamline the standard as much as possible within limits set by the CSRD, EFRAG would like to avoid any undue loss of information for users and investors.
- 6 The architecture of the standard will stay unchanged, with the exception of moving content from AR to an IG document (see below). Whenever possible, the EFRAG Secretariat is using directly text of VSME to replace the content of the LSME ED in the Revised LSME, however in many cases this is not technically possible, as the text of LSME needs to support the qualitative characteristics of quality and auditability of the information. Whenever LSME ED is used as a basis for the content, the EFRAG Secretariat anyway streamlining it, based on the outcome of the consultation and field test.

#### Revised LSME IG and approach to may datapoints - non authoritative implementation guidance issued jointly with the draft standard

- 7 A streamlined standard would respond to the feedback of the consultation, however LSMEs are less resourced than entities in scope of Set 1 and need guidance to reduce their

dependency on consultancy guidance. The reduction of number of pages do not necessarily correspond to an advantage from this point of view. The EFRAG Secretariat proposes to move some ARs to a non-authoritative IG document. Those that contain essential elements of mandatory provisions (e.g. AR to the Entity Specific concept), that are needed to support comparability and auditability and to deliver the characteristics of quality will stay in the Delegated Act while other parts of the AR will be moved to the IG.

- 8 For all the voluntary datapoints (“may disclose”) in Revised LSME, the tentative approach is to include a reference to Set 1 for guidance and specific ARs. This reduces the number of pages and contributes to streamlining the standard. At the same time the “may” datapoints are standardised as the relevant guidance of Set 1 applies. To make the Standard more readable, the content of Set 1 related to those references is included as an Appendix of the “non-binding guidance” to be issued together with LSME. This approach doesn't apply to social disclosures in Sections 2 and 3 because all the disclosures that were in the main text of ESRS S2, S3 and S4 are related to PAT and SBM-3 in Sections 2 and 3 of the LSME standard - deleting them would result in not having S2, S3 and S4 in the draft Standard. Furthermore, some other Application requirements are still in the draft and complement MDR – deleting them from the standard would hinder LSMEs’ from a simplified version of those compared to a more complexified Set 1.

#### **Key requirements in ESRS 1 and value chain**

- 9 The key requirements in ESRS 1 (materiality, value chain, entity-specific) will stay unchanged, due their role in securing the qualitative characteristics of information and auditability.
- 10 Some new paragraphs on value chain reporting have been drafted that incorporate into the standard key clarifications to the general requirements from the content of IG 2 value chain (to support an understanding of the hot spot approach i.e. do not need to collect data from every counterparty and VC coverage is limited to selected disclosures).
- 11 LSME is the legal cap for the content of VC datapoints: the ESRS for large undertakings cannot result in preparers having to collect information from their counterparties in the value chain that go beyond the content of LSME. In SR TEG discussions, members asked whether sector ESRS may add VC datapoints that do not have a corresponding datapoint in LSME. This is because, in the context of Revised LSME, pending the finalisation of sector ESRS, it is not feasible to anticipate whether and which VC datapoints could be needed in sector ESRS. OG and MQC ED do not add new VC datapoints, but this is due to the fact that their business model is typically vertically integrated.
- 12 For this reason, the current value chain provisions of Revised LSME (Section 1) have been amended to explain the link between the entity specific disclosure of LSME (i.e. the requirement to include in the sustainability statements additional disclosure on an entity-specific basis when they are material but not covered by LSME) and the sector specific disclosure (i.e. when appropriate entity specific shall cover sector disclosure not covered by LSME).
- 13 Some EFRAG SR TEG members would welcome, in addition to the suggested enhancement to this text, legal certainty as to whether sector ESRS may add VC datapoints that do not have a corresponding datapoint in LSME and whether there will be future delegated acts on LSME sector ESRS.

## Outreaches on Revised LSME

- 14 Considering the detailed feedback obtained in the consultation and field test, EFRAG Secretariat considers that a re-exposure would not bring significantly new evidence on Revised LSME. However, in order to confirm with stakeholders the direction of travel on the specific changes (and proposed reductions of datapoints), the EFRAG Secretariat has organised a series of workshops to which it invited those that participated in the consultation and field tests as well as the broader public:
- (a) On the 26 of September (3 pm to 5 pm) for users/investors of LSME sustainability statement (incl. members of BAP, IAP, CMAP and other banking/investor representatives) to discuss if the Revised LSME, in spite of the new simplifications, still meets the needs of investors, which is an overarching objective of this standard in the provision of the CSRD. This workshop followed an open call for participants. On the 4 of October continuation of the workshop to discuss changes made in topical sections 4 (Environment), 5 (Social) and 6 (Business conduct).
  - (b) On the 27 of September (9.30 am to 11.30 am) dedicated workshop for preparers (listed SMEs/SNCIs/proxy preparers).
  - (c) On the 27 of September (3 pm to 5 pm) dedicated workshop for all other stakeholders interested in the Revised LSME (i.e., NGOs, civil society, national standard setters, associations and organisations, academics, consultants/auditors, etc.).
- 15 Appendix B of this cover note also illustrates the main feedback received from those three workshops.
- 16 EFRAG Secretariat will also participate in a workshop (closed meeting) with ESMA and NCA on 14 October to present and discuss the Revised LSME to NCAs.

### Next steps

- 17 The EFRAG Secretariat will incorporate comments made during this session.
- 18 EFRAG Secretariat tentatively aims to proceed with the approval of [draft] ESRS LSME (including Basis for Conclusions) in the following dates:
- (a) 4 November 2024 with SR TEG (tentative)
  - (b) 13 November with SR Board (tentative), 27 November (possible continuation)
  - (c) 20 December Revised LSME package released to the EC (including CBA)
- 19 CBA will be reviewed considering the changes included in the [draft] Standard (i.e. clarification of key principles, decrease of the number of datapoints, streamlining of the content, etc). The results presented in the revised CBA will be discussed with SR TEG and SRB.

**Appendix A: Changes to the draft Standard - Revised LSME**

The changes portrayed below form the main changes applied and are based on the latest SR TEG discussions and feedback received.

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
Section 1  Sector ESRS connection with LSME	Not applicable	Not applicable	SR TEG discussed on 19 September the value chain cap implications when developing future sector-specific ESRS Standards.  As an attempt to address the concerns, SR TEG Chair proposed the following paragraph to be inserted in Section 1:  <i>“When Sector specific ESRS will be effective, in the preparation of sector disclosures to be covered by the undertaking as entity specific disclosure, the undertaking shall refer to the relevant sector ESRS, in particular for disclosure that would require the undertaking to collect information from value chain counterparties.”</i>
Section 1  3.7 Level of disaggregation	NA	NA	Some SR TEG members would avoid having this as a voluntary (“may disclose”) as it was suggested by the Secretariat as a simplification. The reason is that oftentimes, the level of disaggregation is the only way the information can be indeed useful.  Secretariat reinserted this as a ‘shall’.

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
Section 1 Chapter 4.1 Reporting undertaking and value chain	NA	NA	<b>After SR TEG 10 October:</b> After SR TEG feedback on the list of the identified areas with value chain implications, it was decided to move it to LSME IG.
Section 1 Chapter 6.6 Classified and sensitive information	NA	NA	<b>After SR TEG 10 October:</b> After SR TEG debate and EC feedback, it was decided to align this chapter with ESRS Set 1.
Section 1 Phase-ins	Some respondents (preparers) indicated difficulty in navigating through all the different phase-in period times.	Some respondents (preparers) indicated difficulty in navigating through all the different phase-in period times.	<b>After SR TEG 10 October:</b> Decision taken to keep the same phase-in periods as in Set 1.
Section 2 to 6 SFDR datapoints	NA	<u>NA</u>	The approach that was proposed from Secretariat was the following:  <u>Table 1:</u> Always mandatory (“shall disclose”)  <u>Table 2 and 3:</u> turned to voluntary (“may disclose”) except for where, if the DR is the only one pertaining to a topic, the datapoint is then kept mandatory (as “shall disclose”).  Moved the EU Law Table of Section 2 (SBM-3) and Section 3 (PAT incl. Processes to engage and Processes to remediate) in the main body. The content was streamlined according to the

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
			<p>new approach described above (Table 1 shall and Table 2 and 3 shall/may depending on the occasion) with references to the content of ESRS Set 1.</p> <p><b>After SR TEG 10 October:</b> Taking into account investors' workshops feedback (possible loss of information) and ESRS 1 par. 35, Secretariat needs to further explore if the tentative decision of the SR TEG to turn all Table 2 and Table 3 SFDR into "shall disclose" but keeping the ones related to PAT of Table 2 and Table 3 as "if applicable" ones (i.e., undertakings report these only in case they have related policies in place) truly forms a simplification for LSME.</p>
<p>Section 2 to 6</p> <p>Architectural change of DR and datapoint structure</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Accepted by SR TEG: Streamlined the structure of the paragraphs, where possible, making the DR and information requests more direct (datapoint request only stated once + objective to assess the materiality of information).</p>
<p>Section 2</p> <p>BP-2 Disclosures in relation to specific circumstances</p>	<p>Preparers expressed concern in relation to VC boundaries and on the availability of VC information</p>	<p>Preparers: Need of clarification on the meaning of the terms "reasonable effort"</p> <p>Most of users agreed</p> <p>One NSS suggested to delete par. 9b, 10 and 12b, c for proportionality</p>	<p>Simplified requirements on outcome uncertainty and merged with sources of estimation.</p> <p><u>Use of phase-ins:</u> if the undertaking decides to use them but either/or E4, S1, S2, S3 and S4 is/are material, the undertaking then has to disclose that these topics were indeed assessed as material and disclose policies and actions if it has them in place</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
<p>Section 2</p> <p>GOV-1 The role of the administrative, management and supervisory bodies</p>	<p>identified by most preparers as either feasible or possible to prepare</p> <p>Two other respondents suggested that some information (i.e. ex/non ex) is already available in relation to the general composition of the admin/management bodies</p>	<p>Majority of preparers agreed with DR-3. Listed SMEs and industry associations argued that EFRAG has gone beyond Article 19a by mandating disclosures that should be optional</p> <p>Most users supported this DR</p> <p>One NSS suggested to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reduce the granularity of par. 19 as granular disclosures of governance bodies of LSMEs without any relation to sustainability matters are not highly relevant due to their small size</li> <li>- delete par 20c. because information on the body / person in charge of sustainability matters is enough</li> </ul>	<p>Simplified language</p>
<p>Section 2</p> <p>GOV-2 Due diligence</p>	<p>Most of preparers underlined the difficulties in implementing a due diligence process and the need to for more guidance</p> <p>Other respondents: need for more guidance</p>	<p>Only some preparers agreed with this DR. A SNCI, an undertaking association, and five industry associations argued for voluntary due diligence disclosures</p>	<p>Asking whether the undertaking has a due diligence process or not (SFDR indicator) and if so, it may briefly describe how and where it is reflected in its sustainability statement and if the process informed the materiality assessment.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
		<p>All users supported DR-4 on due diligence</p> <p>Others: majority agreed</p> <p>- one NSS suggested to delete this DR in line with the proportionality principle, as CS3D/due diligence target large undertakings only</p>	<p><b>After SR TEG 10 October:</b> After SR TEG pushback, Secretariat will reintroduce this ‘may’ datapoint on brief explanation of the process as a ‘shall disclose’.</p>
<p>Section 2 SBM-1 Strategy, business model and value chain</p>	<p>Preparers: majority find it highly challenging and costly and expressed the need for additional explanation on VC boundaries and concern on the identification of the list of significant ESRS sectors (par. 28b)</p> <p>Users: Most stated that all datapoints are needed with the exception of the list of significant ESRS sectors</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed with SBM-1.</p> <p>Users: majority supported SBM-1. Need for clarification in relation to the scope of revenues from sectors such as fossil fuels and tobacco</p> <p>Others: Most agreed</p> <p>One NSS suggested to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- delete par. 28 a iv, no need to disclose service/products banned; too granular.</li> <li>- modify par. 28b eliminating reference to materiality assessment. “list of the significant ESRS sectors where the company or its subsidiaries</li> </ul>	<p>Added in AR the possibility to list NACE codes in replacement of ESRS sectors (“..the undertaking may use NACE codes or the ESRS sector classification..”)</p> <p>Deleted the sustainability related goals of the strategy in terms of significant groups of products and services, customer categories, geographical areas and relationships with stakeholders.</p> <p><b>After SR TEG 19 September:</b> Secretariat reinserted in SBM-1 after an SR TEG member’s suggestion the employee headcount and revenues as they are perceived as crucial datapoints that help users in understanding the undertaking’s business, characteristics and activities.</p>



Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
		<p>operate or can potentially have a material impact”</p> <p>- delete par. 28d as this information is covered by the disclosure requirement SBM-3 on material impacts and risks and their interaction with strategy and business model(s) as well as disclosures on sustainability policies, actions, resources and targets</p>	<p><b>After SR TEG 10 October</b>, it was agreed to keep these two reinsertions on revenues and sectors but not refer to ESRS sectors but instead, as a compromise, users can leverage on IFRS 8 segment reporting that LSMEs should already have in their reporting obligations spectrum.</p>
<p>Section 2</p> <p>SBM-2 Interests and views of stakeholders</p>	<p>Preparers: Most considered this possible to prepare with some effort or highly challenging and costly.</p> <p>Some preparers mentioned high costs and effort to implement a stakeholders engagement and required more guidance to better understand the implications in the MA process</p> <p>Users: Most stated that all datapoints are needed.</p> <p>In particular, if the undertaking confirms that they have a process</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed / Additional clarification is needed on whether the dialogue itself is required or not. Suggestion also to change this DR in a voluntary one</p> <p>Users: all supported this DR</p> <p>Others: majority agreed</p> <p>- one public authority suggested to add guidance to help LSMEs to better identify whether they have to report through describing the type of engagements covered</p> <p>- One public authority wants this disclosure to be mandatory also</p>	<p>Aligned with VSME ED and it is a report if you have (“shall disclose”) asking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The categories of stakeholders considered</li> <li>• A brief description of engagement activities</li> <li>• The outcome of those activities</li> </ul> <p>How the interests and views of stakeholders are taken into account by the strategy and business model</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>or sporadic engagement, the expectation should be to report only (i) type of stakeholders that it engaged via a drop-down menu, (ii) result of the engagement as these are the most important outputs</p>	<p>when a company does not do stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>- One NGO/user of sustainability statements feels that too much information has been eliminated from this DR and asks for reinstatement of several items from set 1.</p>	
<p>Section 2 SBM-3 Material impacts and risks and their interaction with strategy and business model</p>	<p>Preparers: Most found it possible to prepare with some effort or highly challenging and costly. Respondents required more guidance and underlined the difficulties to estimate the financial implications of Irs</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed. Some argued that the current requirements are too granular</p> <p>Users: majority supported DR. Suggestion to have a pre-set list of biodiversity sensitive areas and to only require information about incidents of forced labour if the country of operation is associated with any risks, ii. suggestion to only require sectoral and geographic distribution, while other aspects would be entity specific, iii. Additional guidance on the definitions of climate-related physical risk/transition risk, iv. Suggestion to exempt undertaking from conducting</p>	<p>Deleted the requirement on changes compared to the previous period (already included in BP-2).</p> <p>Deleted the requirement on specification of IRs that are covered by DRs included in LSME as opposed to those covered by entity-specific disclosure (for simplification)</p>
<p>Section 2 SBM-3 Material impacts and risks and their interaction with strategy and business model related to Environment</p>	<p>Users: most stated that all datapoints are needed. Some respondents indicated that the requirement to report current financial effects and anticipated financial effects might be too detailed to ask from the LSMEs Therefore, a starting question could be that if the reporting</p>	<p>only require information about incidents of forced labour if the country of operation is associated with any risks, ii. suggestion to only require sectoral and geographic distribution, while other aspects would be entity specific, iii. Additional guidance on the definitions of climate-related physical risk/transition risk, iv. Suggestion to exempt undertaking from conducting</p>	<p><b>Anticipated financial effects:</b> as an attempt to simplify the standard and to respond to public consultation concern from preparers that anticipated financial effects are too burdensome for LSMEs, Secretariat had proposed to turn anticipated financial effects into a qualitative datapoint.</p> <p><b>After SR TEG 19 September:</b> SR TEG members suggested and agreed to switch back to a quantitative datapoint request as anticipated financial effects provide investors with crucial information about the value of the company.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>entity foresees any immediate financial impact.</p> <p>Some users also expressed issues in understanding the ARs where are located EU datapoints and guidance</p>	<p>the value chain assessment if workers in the value chain are located exclusively in the EU.</p> <p>- one investment fund suggested in relation to “Own workforce” to reduce the number of mandatory reporting items in AR 18, 19 and 20. For instance requiring only types of own workers, sectoral, and geographic distribution.</p>	<p><b>After SR TEG 10 October:</b> it was agreed to keep this quantitative approach (as in Set 1) but include another provision which grants the LSME to disclose qualitative information, when it is not possible with reasonable effort to disclose quantifications of anticipated financial effects.</p> <p>On Environment: Deleted the explanation of whether each identified climate related risk is considered as physical or transition risk. Specifying physical and transition risk is already being asked in Section 4, E(6).</p> <p>Also deleted the resilience to align with the decision that SBM-3 in main body in LSME does not include resilience analysis.</p>
<p>Section 2</p> <p>SBM-3 Material impacts and risks and their interaction with strategy and business model related to Social</p>			<p>Deleted largely redundant disclosures related to how companies develop understanding of how certain groups of people may be at risk of harm, and disclosure about how risks arise from impacts and dependencies (for all four stakeholder groups).</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
			<p>Made disclosure about risks that arise from impacts and dependencies on a specific sub-group in a broadly defined stakeholder group voluntary (all four stakeholders).</p>
<p>Section 2 IR-1 Processes to identify and assess material impacts and risks</p>	<p>Most of preparers considered this DR possible to prepare with some effort. need for more guidance to standardize the process with practical example</p>	<p>Majority agreed with this DR. Called for additional guidance, including examples of risks and impacts in different sectors.</p>	<p>Deleted the requirement to disclose if the process has changed compared to the prior reporting period (for simplification)</p> <p><b>After SR TEG 19 September:</b> as describing processes to identify and assess IROs is not an explicit wording of the CSRD for LSMEs, it had been suggested by a member that IR-1 is kept voluntary. However, as double materiality forms a very important element in sustainability reporting and it is identified as one of the areas with value chain implications, it was agreed to keep it mandatory ('shall disclose') but to explore simplifications. Another member suggested possible streamlining activities in this DR, namely deleting content that was already voluntary in the main body of the Exposure Draft (or putting it in AR or LSME IG).</p> <p><b>After SR TEG 10 October:</b> some members would prefer having the voluntary datapoints in the main body of the draft standard while others would like to explore simplifications.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
Section 2 IR-2 Disclosure Requirements in ESRS LSME covered by the undertaking’s sustainability statement	Preparers: Most considered this DR possible to prepare with some effort.  Users: Most of the users stated that all datapoints are needed.	NA	discussed with SR TEG if language simplification is enough on the request of an explanation of how the undertaking has determined the material information in relation to IROs, including the use of thresholds and how it has implemented the criteria of Section 1 chapter 3.2 material matters and materiality of information
Section 3 EU Law table	Preparers in the field test workshop indicated that the EU Law table should be made clearer (i.e., move back to main body from AR where it was in the ED)	NA	Moved the table to the main body of IR-3 and IR-4.
Section 3 PAT on E, S, and G	Preparers and users suggested that Section 3 AR is long and that it should be streamlined Centralised approach is complex and difficult	a majority agreed, but some disagreed, indicating some reservations about the complexity and applicability of these requirements for certain entities.  The main reasons for disagreement included concerns about the extensive number of Application Requirements (AR) on plans, actions, and targets (PAT), which were seen as overly complex and burdensome.	Turned Policies on Environment (except the ones related to climate change) to voluntary disclosures (“may disclose”)
Section 3 Policies on Environment except for Transition plan			

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
<p>Section 3 Climate transition plan</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed with report if you have approach Users: majority agreed Other: Majority agreed</p>	<p>After an in depth analysis, Secretariat reformulated in the EU Law table of Section 3:</p> <p><i>‘If Climate change is material, the undertaking shall disclose its transition plan for climate change mitigation, if there is one in place.</i></p> <p><i>If the undertaking has adopted a transition plan for climate change mitigation, it shall provide information about it, including an explanation of how its GHG emission reduction targets are compatible with the limiting of global warming to 1.5°C.</i></p> <p><i>If the undertaking has significant CapEx amounts invested during the reporting period related to coal, oil and gas-related economic activities, it shall disclose the amounts of those investments.’</i></p> <p><i>AR 16. In case the undertaking operates in high climate impact sectors and does not have a transition plan for climate change mitigation in place, it may indicate whether and, if so, when it will adopt such a transition plan.</i></p> <p>Additionally, Secretariat gave definition of HCIS and added an AR on what is expected to be disclosed when the undertaking is reporting on transition plans.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
			<p><b>After SR TEG 10 October:</b> on AR 16 above, it was agreed after an SR TEG member’s suggestion to extend this datapoint to all undertakings.</p>
<p>Section 3 S1, S2, S3, S4 related to IR-3 (Policies and actions in relation to sustainability matters)</p>			<p>Made extensive editorial changes by merging text and eliminating redundancies as well as numerous improvements of individual paragraphs. In many cases, the ARs that apply to PAT disclosures are entirely or largely identical for all four social stakeholder groups. Where that was the case we merged them into one as much as possible. In some cases, such as the guidance for disclosures about engagement processes, this has required creating a section for ‘general guidance’ and sections with stakeholder-specific guidance.</p>
<p>Section 3 S1, S2, S3, S4 related to IR-4 (Targets in relation to sustainability matters)</p>			<p>Merged the four separate sub-sections in the application requirements to IR-4 into one.</p>
<p>Section 4 E1to E5 – Contextual information</p>	NA	NA	<p>Contextual information related to metrics now harmonized across E topics in new AR.</p>
<p>Section 4</p>	<p>Preparers: DR was never calculated before and may not be relevant for certain sectors such</p>	<p>Preparers:</p>	<p>Deletion of disaggregation including non-renewable sources and nuclear sources. Disclosure remains on total energy</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
<p>E1-1– Energy consumption and mix</p>	<p>as R&amp;D. Challenging and costly due to data availability issues.</p> <p>Users: Majority agree datapoints needed. Add estimation models tailored to sectors and geographies. Suggestion to simplify by keeping only SFDR and the ones related to energy consumption.</p> <p>Other: Feasible/ possible to prepare. Further guidance needed.</p>	<p>1. Limit requirement to renewable sources (challenge to disclose consumption from both nuclear sources and renewable sources).</p> <p>2. Simplify and harmonize across environmental topics (45 out of 83 ARs refer to climate).</p> <p>Users: clarify - It will be necessary to identify possible steps for decarbonization.</p> <p>Other: Limit the number of additional datapoints in the ARs (45 out of 83 ARs refer to climate). Supported by National or European authority/Standard Setter Comment Letter</p>	<p>consumption in MWh related to own operations and share of % from renewable sources.</p> <p>Deletion of disclosure on energy production, both non-renewable and renewable.</p> <p><b>After SR TEG 7 October:</b> As this is SFDR Table 2, Secretariat reassessed and reinserted as a ‘may disclose’ the breakdown of energy consumption by type of non-renewable sources of energy (such as from fossil sources). Keeping this as voluntary or mandatory still remains to be discussed and decided at SR TEG.</p>
<p>Section 4 E1-2– Gross Scopes 1, 2, 3 and Total GHG emissions</p>	<p>Preparers: challenging to calculate as there is lack of (high quality) information, especially on value chain.</p> <p>Users: keep but suggest aligning with SFDR for Scopes 1/2/3, along with a phase-in. One</p>	<p>Preparers: 1. clarifications needed on EU ETS and regulated sectors, consolidating emissions (operational vs. financial control), reporting emissions from leased assets, joint arrangements and associates that are not in the value chain and Scope 3</p>	<p>Simplification of datapoints through deletion of market-based method for total emissions.</p> <p>To disclose location-based scope 2 emissions, and if applicable the market-based scope 2 emissions.</p> <p>Reference to possible use of calculators and tools in AR.</p>



Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>suggested only keeping Scope 1 &amp; 2.</p> <p>Other: Highly challenging and costly. Further guidance needed.</p>	<p>Proposal: Scope 3 emissions on voluntary basis (difficulty in acquiring data from partners); too high expectations for Scope 1 and 3.</p> <p>methodological issue in meeting GHG Protocol requirements if an LSME is at the same time a parent of a small or medium-sized group (so having subsidiaries). This issue should be considered when mandating on listed SMEs the obligation to meet the GHG Protocol requirements.</p> <p>Industry Association supports stronger requirements to ensure SFDR/Benchmarks Regulation/Pillar 3 data points and data points on key climate metrics such as GHG emission scopes 1, 2 and 3 are effectively disclosed by companies.</p> <p>Users: majority agreed</p> <p>Users noted importance of GHG emissions information for business partners and decarbonization reasons.</p>	<p><b><u>After SR TEG 7 October and workshop feedback from investors:</u></b> Secretariat is extending the disclosure on Scope 3 emissions to all undertakings in Scope (previous suggestion was to limit to HCIS).</p>

Revised LSME session – Cover Note

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
		<p>PHASE-IN: extend Scope 3 emissions transition period to 5 years (particularly complex for value chain related total emissions).</p> <p>Other: majority agreed but left detailed comments per paragraph (Scope 3 flexibilities for LSMEs / more guidance / voluntary to use market based methods)</p>	

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
<p>Section 4</p> <p>GHG Intensity based on net revenue</p>	<p>Preparers: challenging to calculate as there is lack of (high quality) information, especially on value chain</p> <p>Users: majority agreed. keep but suggest aligning with SFDR for Scopes 1/2/3, along with a phase-in. Or only keeping Scope 1 &amp; 2. Further guidance needed.</p> <p>Other: Highly challenging and costly. Further guidance needed.</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- either as voluntary or not applicable to LSMEs.</li> <li>- reduce granularity (e.g., considering that green certificates from the energy providers may not have been received until the report publication).</li> <li>- allow SNCI the possibility to define a denominator (sales is not suitable).</li> <li>- give a 3 year phase in</li> </ul> <p>Users: all agreed</p> <p>Suggestions: - give a phase in as this metric will not be available until Scope 3 emissions are included in total GHG emissions.</p> <p>clearer guidance on how the calculation/reconciliation will be performed, with examples.</p> <p>Other: Most agreed</p> <p>Suggestions:</p>	<p><u>Moved to AR</u>: Previous paragraphs on reconciliations to the relevant line item or notes in the financial statements of the net revenue amounts and flexibility of SNCIs to use other (more appropriate in cases) denominators.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
		<p>allow SNCI the possibility to define own denominator (Net-Turnover is not suitable) until an industry standard is been issued.</p> <p>delete §21, to be calculated directly by FMPs as the denominator and nominator will be available. Reasons: technical reasons of KPI; delete AR 17 to AR 18.</p> <p>delete or defer §22 (reconciliations with financial statements).</p>	
<p>Section 4 E1-3 – GHG removals and GHG mitigation projects financed</p>	<p>Preparers: challenging to calculate as there is lack of (high quality) information, especially on value chain.</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed. Suggestion: Further simplifications should be considered. Users: most agreed</p>	<p><u>After SR TEG 7 October:</u> After discussions of feasibility of adjustments, it was agreed to keep removals (value chain implications) but to delete carbon credits (relates to own operations only).</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
through carbon credits	<p>Users: The design of carbon offsetting projects should be validated with a DR that mentions the use of several standards and mechanisms. This DR should always be separate to GHG totals.</p> <p>Other: Give software/tool to calculate. Lack of information on the value chain.</p>	<p>Suggestions: removals and carbon credits should always be reported separately from the total GHG amounts.</p> <p>Other: most agreed</p> <p>Suggestions: simplify and turn to voluntary</p>	
<p>Section 4</p> <p>E1-4 – Anticipated financial effects from material physical and transition risks and potential climate related opportunities</p>	<p>Preparers: more guidance and software/tool to calculate, especially on scenario development.</p> <p>Users: Should only be voluntary and if the LSME identifies negative financial effects due to physical and transition risks.</p> <p>Other: Highly challenging and costly. Further guidance needed.</p>	<p>Preparers: Some agreed</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Align with financial disclosures</li> <li>- The company should report only if it can be done with reasonable effort</li> <li>- More guidance should be provided</li> <li>- Remove “before considering climate actions”</li> </ul> <p>Users: all agreed</p> <p>Suggestions:</p>	<p>Merged with E2, E3, E4 and E5 DRs on the topic in new DR E6, including brief description of risk.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Voluntary and only if the LSME confirms the existence of negative effects from physical and transition risks</li> <li>- Alternative: keep reporting on financial effects of physical risks mandatory (required by EBA Pillar 3 Template 5); and require financial effects of transitional risks only if the undertaking discloses that it has a transition plan (avoids LSMEs the spending of additional resources to perform climate scenarios).</li> </ul> <p>Other: most agreed</p> <p>Suggestions: the DR needs to be simplified</p>	
<p>Section 4</p> <p>E2-1– Pollution of air, water and soil</p>	<p>Preparers: data availability issues for this DR.</p> <p>Users: Suggestion to use sector and geography-tailored estimation models that require minimum input information.</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed</p> <p>Suggestions: clarifications and adjustments to inferior methodology needed</p> <p>Users: all agreed</p>	<p>Previous sections E2-1 (pollution of air, water and soil) and E2-2 (substances of concern and substances of very high concern, i.e. 'SoC' and SVHC) are now merged.</p> <p>Objective and bolded paragraph now streamlined.</p> <p>E-PRTR &amp; IED references updated.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>Other: Include more guidance, including precise reporting definitions, thresholds and examples.</p>	<p>Suggestions: guidance on best practice (where not mandated in the undertaking's jurisdiction) for measuring and disclosing each pollutant emitted to air, water and soil.</p> <p>Other: majority agreed</p> <p>Suggestion: Clarifications in AR needed for better guidance</p>	<p>For Soc and SVHC, removed split by main hazard class, keeping 2 datapoints (volumes in terms of what is generated or used as input and what is output as emissions, products or services).</p> <p>Contextual information related to metrics now harmonized across E topics in new AR.</p> <p>AR section now aligned with VSME.</p> <p>Included guidance on pollutants and substances in separate guidance document.</p> <p>Created guidance on microplastics in separate guidance document.</p> <p><b>After SR TEG 7 October:</b> As microplastics are not clearly defined in Set 1, SR TEG members suggested and agreed on the need for more clarification in LSME. This is particularly important for AR 20 of Set 1 which described microplastics however, the current wording 'generation' is ambiguous. Secretariat should develop further clarifications for this AR.</p>
<p>E3-1 – Water consumption</p>	<p>Preparers: highly challenging</p> <p>Users: Keep this DR only for water-intensive specific sectors where there is water consumption, not only water</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed</p> <p>Suggestions: water intensity per revenue may not suit to all industries / clarification needed on definitions of water consumption and turnover /</p>	<p>Changed from 'shall' to 'may' and moved to AR metrics on: water recycled and reused, water stored and changes in storage and water intensity.</p> <p>Made water consumption 'shall, if applicable', with explanation of what triggers the applicability.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>usage and give more guidance for water-intensive sectors.</p> <p>Other: Include more guidance, including precise reporting definitions, thresholds and examples.</p>	<p>guidance and examples for water intense areas needed / allow different denominators</p> <p>Users: Most agreed</p> <p>Suggestions: the DR should apply in water intensive sectors and give guidance for those</p> <p>Other: Most agreed</p> <p>Suggestions: water intensity per revenue may not suit to all industries / clarification needed on definitions of water consumption and turnover / guidance and examples for water intense areas needed / allow different denominators</p>	<p>Added water withdrawal as ‘may’.</p> <p>Clarified concepts and added examples and references in separate guidance. Added specific material on water withdrawal for shared facilities. Added EEA WEI+ map/dataset as alternative reference to WRI Aqueduct for areas at high water stress (still though under discussion with EEA).</p>
<p>E4-1 – Impact Metrics related to Biodiversity and Ecosystems Change</p>	<p>Preparers: Highly challenging. External consultants needed. Include more guidance including calculation support and templates.</p>	<p>Preparers: some agreed</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>-GUIDANCE on calculation data, measurement of biodiversity</p>	<p>EMAS-aligned land-use change metrics moved from AR to DR as voluntary / main text, aligning with VSME. Paragraph with reference to additional set 1 metrics on land-use/freshwater-use/sea-use change now streamlined. A table that can be used for information on land-use added to the ARs.</p>



Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>Users: Include in guidance definition and list of global sensitive biodiversity areas.</p> <p>Other: The value chain coverage should be better clarified (own operations vs operational control).</p>	<p>footprint (currently no established metrics).</p> <p>-value chain scope is too complex; consider further overall simplification.</p> <p>Users: majority agreed / suggestion to add definition or provision of a global list of biodiversity-sensitive areas.</p> <p>Other: majority agreed</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- definition of "sites managed" and measurement of area (e.g. outdoor areas).</li> <li>- harmonize methodological requirements across environmental matters (AR 5).</li> <li>- delete LCA approach (§52), only keep what is under SMEs' direct control.</li> </ul>	<p><b>After SR TEG 7 October:</b> after SR TEG suggestion, added in Objective of this DR this additional sentence: <i>'..an understanding of how the undertaking's business model is in line with the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 (to end biodiversity loss by 2030).'</i></p> <p>Also included institutional Frameworks and Directives references for Biodiversity strategy used in Set 1.</p>

Revised LSME session – Cover Note

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ensure same granularity on biodiversity impact metrics as ESRS E4-5.</li> <li>- include a metric on the type of ecosystem where a site is located (and potentially HCV status).</li> <li>- add request for details on volumes and type of commodity procured from ecosystems, and commodity source to production unit level (if feasible, otherwise subnational area).</li> </ul> <p>add information on type of monitoring system used; include deforestation.</p>	
			<p>Paragraphs on Life Cycle Assessment in main text and AR deleted and moved to separate guidance document, reference to IG2 added there.</p>
			<p>Paragraph on Invasive Alien Species deleted and moved to separate guidance document.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
			Paragraphs on Methodology and Contextual Information deleted and moved to separate guidance document. (A consolidated AR on contextual information in relation to metrics added covering all E standards.)
			The definition of managed sites deleted and moved to separate guidance document.
			Paragraph on frameworks to identify protected areas added to separate guidance document (aligned with VSME).
E5-1 Resource inflows	<p>Users: Use sector and geography-tailored estimation models that require minimum input information.</p> <p>Other: More guidance is needed including definitions, calculation support and templates.</p>	<p>Preparers: some agreed</p> <p>Suggestions: Add definitions (e.g., value chain) and calculation rules and simplify to avoid companies opting out.</p> <p>Users: All agreed</p> <p>Other: Most agreed</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reinforce by adding requirement on volumes or weights (may be estimated through proxies) of materials used that generate material impacts.</li> </ul>	<p>DRs simplified by moving of the explanations on percentage-based disclosures on material expenditures, sustainability-certified biological materials, as well as detailed expenditure and certification schemes information to the LSME Guidance.</p> <p><b>After SR TEG 7 October:</b> Public consultation indicated difficulty in disclosing secondary and biological materials, thus the Secretariat simplified this DR by only asking for annual mass-flows to certain sectors. SR TEG members however suggested to include all undertakings in this datapoint. Secretariat will do so in the next version of the draft. After SR TEG feedback, Secretariat also reinserted secondary materials, as it was previously deleted from the draft Standard and move to the LSME IG as simplification</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- refer to upstream value chain.</li> <li>- Define biological</li> </ul> Simplify AR	
E5-2 Resource outflows	Users: only keep total waste generated and add the type of waste and the way it is managed.  Other: More guidance needed including definitions, calculation support and templates.	Preparers: some agreed  Suggestions: Add definitions (e.g., value chain) and calculation rules and simplify to avoid companies opting out.  Users: All agreed  Other: Most agreed  Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- move §62-63 (products and materials) to ARs on an optional basis (requirements closer to opportunities than to negative impacts).</li> <li>- delete §67 (always true for metrics) or move to ARs and harmonize across environmental metrics (no need to repeat in all DRs).</li> </ul>	Waste disclosure simplified to focus on total annual waste generation, broken down by type (non-hazardous and hazardous), as well as the total annual waste diverted to recycling or reuse, to align with VSME.  Removed AR on products and materials, and added additional ARs on waste (on non-hazardous and hazardous (including radioactive waste)). Additional guiding examples added to separate guidance document.  <b>After SR TEG 7 October:</b> After having aligned with VSME and deleting products an material, SR TEG suggested to include a narrative datapoint on products and materials, which is already reflected in the current draft.

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
		<p>Include definitions (e.g., value chain) and calculation rules.</p>	
<p>E6 – Anticipated financial effects from material environmental-related matters other than climate</p>	<p>Preparers: data collection challenge: Materiality is challenging for topics not related to climate.</p> <p>Users: Suggested that the information can indeed be useful but practically burdensome for LSMEs.</p> <p>Other: More guidance including definitions, calculation support and templates is needed.</p> <p>This DR comes with data availability issues which poses challenges to SNCIs.</p>	<p>Preparers: some agreed</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need for information to be completed by reference to financial disclosures to avoid discrepancies.</li> <li>2. Need for further simplifications to avoid companies opting out.</li> </ol> <p>Users: all agreed</p> <p>Other: Majority agreed</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- add positive financial impact on society and from society to company finances.</li> <li>- only apply to climate (more mature topic), delete for other environmental topics</li> </ul> <p>clarify or provide examples from the SNCI viewpoint on possible anticipated financial effects</p>	<p>Now merged with E1-4; content across all environmental topics deleted or streamlined.</p> <p>Objective and bolded paragraphs are now streamlined.</p> <p>Creation of guidance on physical and transition risks for all environmental topics in separate guidance document.</p> <p><b>After SR TEG 7 October:</b> After having aligned with VSME, SR TEG suggested to explore more alignment with Set 1. Secretariat added a merged request of a brief description of how the material risks of SBM-3 have (or could reasonably be expected to have) a material influence on the undertaking’s financial position, financial performance and cash flows over the short-, medium- and long-term for all E topics.</p> <p>For climate change, Secretariat strictly kept it to EU Law datapoints.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
<p>S2 Value Chain Workers</p> <p>S3 Affected Communities</p> <p>S4 Consumers and End-Users</p>			<p>Inserted new paragraph into ‘Objectives’ chapter of Sections 3 and 5 to increase the visibility of the three social stakeholders for which there is no separate section in LSME Revised: value chain workers, affected communities and consumers. This follows concerns that were raised in public feedback.</p> <p>Deleted all materials and references related to value chain workers, affected communities and consumers from ‘Objectives’ chapter of Section 5 and corresponding ARs because Section 5 does not require any disclosures about these three stakeholder groups.</p>
<p>S1 Own Workforce</p>			<p>Made numerous editorial improvements and deleted the first paragraph from every Disclosure Requirement because it is redundant.</p>
<p>S1-1 – Characteristics of the undertaking’s employees</p>	<p>Preparers: most considered this DR “possible to prepare with some efforts”</p> <p>Preparers suggested that specific metrics like S1-1 are identified as potentially more challenging to verify due to their qualitative nature.</p>	<p>Preparers: Most agreed</p> <p>Two preparers want more clarity on ‘temporary employees’. They believe that ‘temporary’ and ‘non-guaranteed hours employees’ are different kinds of precarious employment and should be merged into one datapoint. Two others simply ask for clarification about</p>	<p>Deleted paragraph 12: voluntary disclosure of the numbers of full-time/part-time employees, disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>Deleted AR 15 (option to disclose additional break-downs of information concerning the company’s employees).</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>Preparers agreed that clear guidance is needed on this DR.</p> <p>Users: Majority agreed</p> <p>One user suggested that ‘non-guaranteed hours’ employees are not needed, as it might be interpreted the same way as temporary employees.</p> <p>Other: majority found this DR “feasible with available means or already prepared”</p> <p>Some respondents said that a clearer definition of 'employees' and 'own workforce' were needed.</p>	<p>'temporary work'. (The table in AR 13 would have to be adjusted if the two categories were to be merged.)</p> <p>Para 11(a): One preparer took issue with the requirement to disclose the total number of employees and breakdowns by gender and country for countries where at least 10% of the company’s employees are located. It was suggested to limit the breakdown only to countries in which the company has 50 or more employees and which represent at least 10% of its total number of employees.</p> <p>Users: most agreed</p> <p>One user argued that 'temporary' and 'non-guaranteed hours employees' (para 11(b)) are different kinds of precarious employment and requested deletion of non-guaranteed hours item (also suggested by One national authority)</p> <p>Other: most agreed</p>	

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
<p>S1-2 – Characteristics of non-employees in the undertaking’s own workforce</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed</p> <p>Some said that collecting data on ‘non-employees’ was very challenging for LSMEs &amp; Proxies.</p> <p>Users: majority agreed</p> <p>Some claimed that SMEs usually struggle to collect comprehensive data on non-employees, including contractors, suppliers, and temporary workers, especially if they lack direct oversight or control over these individuals.</p> <p>Other: Most agreed</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed</p> <p>Several respondents from the preparer and 'others' side have asked for more clarity about the terms 'self-employed' and 'non-employees' and to differentiate them more clearly from, or include them in, value chain workers.</p> <p>Some industry associations noted that there could be challenging in data collection. One respondent proposed to have it as voluntary.</p> <p>Users: all agreed</p> <p>Other: majority agreed</p> <p>Out of disagreement, one national authority/standard setter suggests a different approach for this DR. It should only apply to companies with 'a significant number of non-employee workers' because this 'is a matter of business model rather than a metric'.</p>	<p>Following public feedback that the distinction between value chain workers and non-employees in the company’s own workforce should be clearer, we split AR 19 into two separate paragraphs and added some wording from the definition of ‘value chain workers’ in the ESRS glossary.</p>



Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
S1-3 – Collective bargaining coverage	<p>Preparers: Most found the DR feasible</p> <p>A preparer mentioned that ‘collective bargaining and social dialogue’ are also very challenging as there are no established processes.</p> <p>Preparers agreed that clear guidance is needed on this DR.</p> <p>Users: majority agreed</p> <p>Other: majority found it feasible</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed</p> <p>Users: Most found this DR essential</p> <p>Other: Majority agreed.</p> <p>Four respondents from the financial industry are against the deletion of the social dialogue part from this disclosure (ESRS S1-8, on which this DR is based, included datapoints like ‘percentage of employees covered by workers’ representatives’.) They argue that there are only two datapoints that are not too complex for SMEs.</p>	Deleted AR 25 (mandatory tabular reporting format for coverage rates) and replaced it with simple instruction to report in quintiles (as in VSME).
S1-5 – Social protection	<p>Preparers: majority found this DR “possible to prepare with some efforts”.</p> <p>Users: Majority agreed that all social datapoints in the ED are needed.</p> <p>Other: all found it feasible. A comment pointed out that the national legal requirements for</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed</p> <p>Users: majority agreed</p> <p>Other (suggestions):</p> <p>The duty to disclose absence of social protection (para 30) should only be required for ‘major countries’ and should only apply to material situations, i.e. when a significant number of individuals are concerned.</p>	Deleted completely.

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	social protection are highly challenging.	<p>One respondent argued that para 31, which says that companies may also make disclosures about social protection about non-employees in its workforce, should be deleted because information about non-employee workers may be difficult to collect and legally sensitive. Alternatively, it should be moved to AR.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that para 29 should be amended to clarify whether employees need to be covered by social protection for all listed major life events (our understanding) or "any" (wording in par 29) one of them.</p>	
S1-7 – Health and safety metrics	Preparers: most found it feasible Additional comments highlighted the restricted data collection on illness and sick day due to Data Protection laws.	Preparers: majority agreed with DR Users: all agreed Other: most agreed. Some considered that some datapoints	Moved para 38 (optional disclosure concerning non-employees) to application requirements.  Deleted AR 31 (voluntary break-down of fatality data by injuries and ill health).

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>Users: Most agreed with necessity of DR</p> <p>A Rating Agency user pointed out the lack of specialized health and safety personnel or expertise to effectively monitor and report on health and safety metrics.</p> <p>Other: Split views. Comments made visible the challenges due to data protection laws that restrict the collection of detailed information on employee illnesses and sick days.</p>	<p>from set 1(i.e., information about the extent to which own workforce is covered by the health and safety management system ) were missing and valuable and another with some fine tuning of the scope (non-employees as voluntary) and aligning the definition with GRI.</p>	
<p>S1-8 – Remuneration metrics</p>	<p>Preparers: majority found it feasible (guidance is needed)</p> <p>A preparer raised concerns about contexts for gender pay gap in not considering specific roles and responsibilities may leading to misconceptions.</p> <p>Users: majority found it necessary</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed</p> <p>One SNCI sees conceptual problems with the gender pay gap. They argue that the unadjusted pay gap is not relevant because it disregards differences in tasks and job categories.</p> <p>One preparer was concerned that the annual total remuneration ratio disclosure could lead to the public identification of individuals and/or</p>	<p>Added new sub-paragraph in paragraph 41 that exempts companies with fewer than 50 employees from disclosing the gender pay gap and the total remuneration ratio.</p> <p>Copied the useful and more detailed guidance in VSME for calculating average gross hourly pay into ARs.</p> <p>Made requirement to report gender pay gap data from the past two reporting periods voluntary (AR 46).</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>A Rating Agency user pointed out the lack of SME access to industry benchmarking/ standards for comparing remuneration metrics, making it difficult to assess the competitiveness of their compensation practices.</p> <p>Other: split views. Comments called attention to the challenges on gender pay gap, annual remuneration and data evaluation internally and highlighted the issues for comparability of jobs &amp; salaries e.g. lowest wage in a bank</p>	<p>their salaries and felt that this should be voluntary.</p> <p>Users: most found it essential</p> <p>Other: majority agreed</p> <p>Three industry associations see conceptual problems with the gender pay gap. They argue that the unadjusted pay gap is not relevant because it disregards differences in tasks and job categories.</p> <p>Five industry associations had concerns about data protection with regard to the annual total remuneration ratio disclosure. Some fear that this could lead to the public identification of individuals and/or their salaries.</p>	
S1-10 – Diversity metrics	<p>Preparers: majority found it possible to prepare with efforts</p> <p>Users: Majority indicated that this is essential</p> <p>A Rating Agency user pointed out the risk of inadequate data</p>	<p>Preparers: all agreed with feasibility</p> <p>Users: all agreed its essential</p> <p>Other: majority agreed its feasible</p> <p>The disagreements related to i) the deletion of the age breakdown from set 1 (a standard-setter), ii) merging</p>	<p>Deleted requirement to disclose gender balance at top management level in <i>absolute numbers</i>. (Paragraph 50(a); percentage disclosure remains.)</p> <p>Made AR 52 (requirement to provide contextual information related to percentage of persons with disabilities) voluntary.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	<p>disclosure due to culturally conservative environments around e.g. diversity &amp; inclusion.</p> <p>Other: majority found it feasible</p>	<p>two of the set 1 disclosures (ESRS S1-9 and S1-12) rather than being separate and iii) it is considered limited in terms of vulnerable groups included.</p> <p>In addition, a standard-setter suggested to adapt the definition of top management for LSMEs but did not say how.</p>	
<p>Voluntary Disclosure S1-11 – Work-life balance metrics</p>	<p>Preparers: Majority found it feasible or possible to prepare with some efforts</p> <p>Users: majority agreed that the DR is needed</p> <p>A Rating Agency user highlighted the lack of formalized policies or practices to support work-life balance for employees, leading to a lack of data.</p> <p>Other: most indicated the DR is feasible</p> <p>One respondent called attention to the fact that it seems assumed that the company has knowledge</p>	<p>Preparers: majority agreed with content</p> <p>Users: most agreed with DR</p> <p>Other: majority agreed</p> <p>four respondents (banking associations and standard-setters) suggest adding other aspects of work-time balance concerning remote working options, working time accounts or the number of departures in the reporting period alongside qualitative information to give a fuller work-life balance picture.</p>	<p>Deleted completely.</p>

Topic / DR	Field test feedback	Public consultation feedback	Summary of change in Revised LSME
	of the family related circumstances when there could be data restrictions in gathering that information.		
Section 6 on Business conduct			No major issues compared to the rest of the sections but due to certain feedback, the Secretariat re-considered the disclosures in this section and moved those not related to metrics to section 3 to improve consistency across the topics.

### Agenda Papers

20 In addition to this cover note, agenda papers for this session are:

- (a) Agenda paper 06-02 – draft Revised LSME Section 1 General requirements (track changes compared to ESRS LSME ED) – EFRAG SRB 24-10-16;
- (b) Agenda paper 06-03 – draft Revised LSME Section 2 General disclosures (track changes compared to ESRS LSME ED) – EFRAG SRB 24-10-16;
- (c) Agenda paper 06-04 – draft Revised LSME Section 3 Policies, Actions and Targets (track changes compared to ESRS LSME ED) – EFRAG SRB 24-10-16;
- (d) Agenda paper 06-05 – draft Revised LSME Section 4 Environment (track changes compared to ESRS LSME ED) – EFRAG SRB 24-10-16;
- (e) Agenda paper 06-06 – draft Revised LSME Section 5 Social (track changes compared to ESRS LSME ED) – EFRAG SRB 24-10-16; and
- (f) Agenda paper 06-07 – draft Revised LSME Section 6 Business conduct (track changes compared to ESRS LSME ED) – EFRAG SRB 24-10-16.

**Appendix B: Revised LSME Workshops summary**

*Investor workshop*

**30 participants in investors workshop of which:**

Type	number
Bank	8
Investor (asset management)	7
Other	5
Investors association	3
Stock exchange	2
Other association	2
Insurance	2
Banking association	1

*Main feedback received from investor workshop on the changes to the draft Revised LSME*

DR / Topic	Main concerns	EFRAG Secretariat action
SFDR datapoints	Some respondents indicated major loss of information due to the changes while some others some loss	To be discussed at SR TEG: Secretariat to bring back GHG reduction targets and Biodiversity as a shall, as these two were mostly of high concern for investors.
E1-2– GHG emissions	Most respondents indicated major loss of information due to the changes	After SR TEG 7 October, Secretariat readjusted the DR: Scope 3 now is asked to all sectors, not only to High Climate Impact Sectors

DR / Topic	Main concerns	EFRAG Secretariat action
		(also considering that it is SFDR Table 1 indicator)
E1-3 – GHG removals	Some respondents indicated major loss of information due to the changes while some others no loss	After SR TEG 7 October, Secretariat readjusted by removing carbon credits and keeping removals
E5-1 Resource inflows	Some respondents indicated some loss of information due to the changes	After SR TEG 7 October, Secretariat readjusted the DR: annual mass-flow to be asked in all sectors, not only the ones operating in manufacturing, construction and/or packaging processes
E5-2 Resource outflows	Some respondents indicated some loss of information due to the changes	After SR TEG 7 October, Secretariat readjusted the DR by including a qualitative datapoint on products and materials (circular economy principle)
E6 – Anticipated financial effects from material environmental-related matters other than climate	Majority indicated some or considerable loss of information	After SR TEG 7 October, Secretariat will better align with Set 1 but explore as many simplifications as possible
S1-5 – Social protection	Some respondents indicated some loss of information due to the changes	Secretariat considers that this DR can be removed because the datapoints are highly depended on national regulations in which the undertaking has no control of. Additionally, as this DR does not affect the cap and it is not a major loss of information for investors, Secretariat kept this as deleted.



Preparer workshop

**29 participants in preparers workshop of which:**

Stakeholder group	number
proxy preparer for one (or more) of the above categories (e.g., consultant working for listed SMEs)	21
small or medium undertaking with securities listed in EU regulated markets	6
SNCI	1
European Commission representative	1

*Main feedback received from preparer workshop on the changes to the draft Revised LSME*

DR / Topic	Main concerns
SFDR datapoints	Majority indicated that the change moderately reduces reporting costs.
Section 2 General disclosures	Majority indicated that the change moderately reduces reporting costs. Some indicated significant reduction in reporting costs.
Section 3 Policies, Actions and Targets	Majority indicated that the change moderately reduces reporting costs. Some indicated significant reduction in reporting costs while the rest either limited or no change in reporting costs.

DR / Topic	Main concerns
Section 4 Environment	Majority indicated that the change moderately reduces reporting costs while some indicated significant reduction in reporting costs.
Section 5 Social	Majority indicated that the change moderately reduces reporting costs while some indicated limited reduction in reporting costs.
Section 6 Business conduct	Majority indicated that the change limitedly reduces reporting costs.

*Other stakeholder groups workshop*

**20 participants in other stakeholder groups workshop of which:**

Stakeholder group	number
Other associations and organisations	7
Academics	4
Auditors/Consultants	3
NGO	2
Bank	2
French financial markets regulator	1
Civil society organisations	1

*Revised LSME session – Cover Note*

*Main feedback received from other stakeholder groups workshop on the changes to the draft Revised LSME*

<b>DR / Topic</b>	<b>Main concerns</b>
SFDR datapoints	Majority indicated some loss of information due to the changes while some others major loss.
Section 2 General disclosures	Majority indicated no loss of information due to the changes while some others either some or considerable loss.
Section 3 Policies, Actions and Targets	Majority indicated some loss of information due to the changes.
Section 4 Environment	Majority indicated some loss of information due to the changes.
Section 5 Social	Majority indicated some loss of information due to the changes.
Section 6 Business conduct	Majority indicated no loss of information due to the changes.