Reply form

on the Joint Consultation Paper on the review of SFDR Delegated Regulation regarding PAI and financial product disclosures
Responding to this paper

The ESAs invite comments on all matters in the Joint Consultation Paper and in particular on the specific questions in this reply form. Comments are most helpful if they:

- respond to the question stated;
- indicate the specific question to which the comment relates;
- contain a clear rationale; and
- describe any alternatives the ESAs should consider.

ESMA will consider all comments received by 4 July 2023.

Instructions

In order to facilitate analysis of responses to the Joint Consultation Paper, respondents are requested to follow the below steps when preparing and submitting their response:

- Insert your responses to the questions in the Joint Consultation Paper in this reply form.
- Please do not remove tags of the type <ESMA_QUESTION_SFDR_1>. Your response to each question has to be framed by the two tags corresponding to the question.
- If you do not wish to respond to a given question, please do not delete it but simply leave the text “TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE” between the tags.
- When you have drafted your responses, save the reply form according to the following convention: ESMA_CP SFDR Review_nameofrespondent.

For example, for a respondent named ABCD, the reply form would be saved with the following name: ESMA_CP SFDR Review_ABCD.

- Upload the Word reply form containing your responses to ESMA’s website (pdf documents will not be considered except for annexes). All contributions should be submitted online at www.esma.europa.eu under the heading ‘Your input - Consultations’.
Publication of responses

All contributions received will be published following the close of the consultation, unless you request otherwise. Please clearly and prominently indicate in your submission any part you do not wish to be publicly disclosed. A standard confidentiality statement in an email message will not be treated as a request for non-disclosure. A confidential response may be requested from us in accordance with ESAs’ rules on access to documents. We may consult you if we receive such a request. Any decision we make not to disclose the response is reviewable by ESMA’s Board of Appeal and the European Ombudsman.

Data protection

The protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the ESAs is based on Regulation (EU) 2018/1725. Further information on data protection can be found under the Legal notice section of the EBA website and under the Legal notice section of the EIOPA website and under the Legal notice section of the ESMA website.

General information about respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the company / organisation</th>
<th>EUROPEANISSUERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Non-financial counterparty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you representing an association?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/Region</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions

Q1: Do you agree with the newly proposed mandatory social indicators in Annex I, Table I (amount of accumulated earnings in non-cooperative tax jurisdictions for undertakings whose turnover exceeds € 750 million, exposure to companies involved in the cultivation and production of tobacco, interference with the formation of trade unions or election worker representatives, share of employees earning less than the adequate wage)?

<ESMA_QUESTION_SFDR_1>

EuropeanIssuers does not support the extension of the principal adverse impact (PAI) indicators to social indicators. Our members consider that the priority is to ensure an effective implementation of the sustainability reporting requirements of the Taxonomy Regulation and the CSRD, at constant perimeter, in order to allow companies to report on their impacts and policies and to provide investors with the data they need to finance sustainable activities and the transition and comply with their own reporting requirements. It is premature to amend the delegated act to extend the list for the following reasons, in particular:

- The implementation of the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) will provide investors with social indicators and EuropeanIssuers members don’t see the need for anticipating these disclosures.

- As pointed out by the ESAs in the joint consultation paper there are more significant and urgent issues in the sustainable finance regulatory framework to address, for instance consistency of the DNSH criteria and definition of sustainable investments between the SFDR and the Taxonomy Regulation. In its recent communication on the sustainable finance package (“A sustainable finance framework that works on the ground”), the Commission indicates that a public consultation will be launched in the fall 2023 to pave the way for a comprehensive assessment of the SFDR. EuropeanIssuers members consider that assessing the implementation of the SFDR and if necessary amending level 1 is a more appropriate measure.

- Any change to add disclosure requirements will only further complexify the current sustainable finance framework and impair its usability for both preparers and users. There is for instance no...
harmonised definition of ‘adequate wage’ and indicators based on such notion will not be comparable.

Pending the review of the SFDR and full implementation of the Taxonomy Regulation and the CSRD, EuropeanIssuers advocates for not adding any requirement that would complexify the current framework. EuropeanIssuers reminds that the Commission’s mandate to the ESAs invites the authorities to “consider” an extension of the list of PAI indicators. In this regard EuropeanIssuers suggests that the ESAs should limit the review of the regulatory technical standards to streamlining the framework and addressing technical issues identified.

**Q2 : Would you recommend any other mandatory social indicator or adjust any of the ones proposed?**

Please refer to our answer to question 1.

**Q3 : Do you agree with the newly proposed opt-in social indicators in Annex I, Table III (excessive use of non-guaranteed-hour employees in investee companies, excessive use of temporary contract employees in investee companies, excessive use of non-employee workers in investee companies, insufficient employment of persons with disabilities in the workforce, lack of grievance/complaints handling mechanism for stakeholders materially affected by the operations of investee companies, lack of grievance/complaints handling mechanism for consumers/ end-users of the investee companies)?**

Please refer to our answer to question 1.

**Q4 : Would you recommend any other social indicator or adjust any of the ones proposed?**

Please refer to our answer to question 1.
Q5: Do you agree with the changes proposed to the existing mandatory and opt-in social indicators in Annex I, Table I and III (i.e. replacing the UN Global Compact Principles with the UN Guiding Principles and ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work)? Do you have any additional suggestions for changes to other indicators not considered by the ESAs?

EuropeanIssuers supports changes aimed at ensuring consistency between the different pieces of legislation in force, namely between the SFDR, the Taxonomy Regulation and the Climate Benchmarks Regulation. However, as mentioned in the answer to question 1, EuropeanIssuers does not support adding new disclosure and extending the list of PAI indicators even though revenues associated to production of tabacco will be disclosed under the ESRS.

Q6: For real estate assets, do you consider relevant to apply any PAI indicator related to social matters to the entity in charge of the management of the real estate assets the FMP invested in?

Q7: For real estate assets, do you see any merit in adjusting the definition of PAI indicator 22 of Table 1 in order to align it with the EU Taxonomy criteria applicable to the DNSH of the climate change mitigation objective under the climate change adaptation objective?

Q8: Do you see any challenges in the interaction between the definition ‘enterprise value’ and ‘current value of investment’ for the calculation of the PAI indicators?
Q9 : Do you have any comments or proposed adjustments to the new formulae suggested in Annex I?

Q10 : Do you have any comments on the further clarifications or technical changes to the current list of indicators? Did you encounter any issues in the calculation of the adverse impact for any of the other existing indicators in Annex I?

SFDR Delegated Regulation defines enterprise value as the sum, at fiscal year-end, of the market capitalisation (including ordinary and preferred shares) and the book value of total debt and non-controlling interests, without deduction of cash or cash equivalents (Annex I). EuropeanIssuers considers that to determine the enterprise value, it would be more relevant to calculate the market capitalisation based on an average price covering a longer period (average on the last 3 months for instance) to avoid variations of carbon emissions and footprint due only to market conditions (e.g. market capitalisations of many companies have plummeted in a few weeks due to the Covid-19 outbreak). Variations of market capitalisation both up and down should, therefore, be neutralised.

Q11 : Do you agree with the proposal to require the disclosure of the share of information for the PAI indicators for which the financial market participant relies on information directly from investee companies?
Q12: What is your view on the approach taken in this consultation paper to define ‘all investments’? What are the advantages and drawbacks you identify? Would a change in the approach adopted for the treatment of ‘all investments’ be necessary in your view?

Q13: Do you agree with the ESAs’ proposal to only require the inclusion of information on investee companies’ value chains in the PAI calculations where the investee company reports them? If not, what would you propose as an alternative?

Q14: Do you agree with the proposed treatment of derivatives in the PAI indicators or would you suggest any other method?

Q15: What are your views with regard to the treatment of derivatives in general (Taxonomy-alignment, share of sustainable investments and PAI calculations)? Should the netting provision of Article 17(1)(g) be applied to sustainable investment calculations?
Q16: Do you see the need to extend the scope of the provisions of point g of paragraph 1 of Article 17 of the SFDR Delegated Regulation to asset classes other than equity and sovereign exposures?

Q17: Do you agree with the ESAs' assessment of the DNSH framework under SFDR?

Q18: With regard to the DNSH disclosures in the SFDR Delegated Regulation, do you consider it relevant to make disclosures about the quantitative thresholds FMPs use to take into account the PAI indicators for DNSH purposes mandatory? Please explain your reasoning.

Q19: Do you support the introduction of an optional “safe harbour” for environmental DNSH for taxonomy-aligned activities? Please explain your reasoning.

No, EuropeanIssuers does not support the introduction of an optional “safe harbour”. We agree with the ESAs that a single taxonomy-based system for DNSH would be the best solution but pending the review of the SFDR, the best way forward would be the status quo. Requiring more specific disclosures from investors on the criteria used to assess sustainable investments (thresholds) or introducing an optional safe-harbour would add complexity and would not solve the issue of comparability between financial products. As regards particularly the optional safe-harbour, EuropeanIssuers furthermore disagrees with the ESAs’ statement that it could boost use of proceeds instruments focused on
environmental economic activities. The only way to boost investments is to improve the Taxonomy and in particular the technical screening criteria in order to increase the number of eligible economic activities and ensure the financing of transition. This said, the Commission in its last FAQ published on 13 June 2023 in the Sustainable Finance Package has addressed the issue by stating that investments in Taxonomy-aligned activities “can be automatically qualified as ‘sustainable investments’ in the context of the product level disclosure requirements under the SFDR.” To ensure legal certainty, this statement should be included in both regulations at level 1.

<ESMA_QUESTION_SFDR_19>

Q20 : Do you agree with the longer term view of the ESAs that if two parallel concepts of sustainability are retained that the Taxonomy TSCs should form the basis of DNSH assessments? Please explain your reasoning.

<ESMA_QUESTION_SFDR_20>

If two parallel concepts of sustainability are retained, EuropeanIssuers agrees that DNSH assessments should be based on the Taxonomy technical screening criteria. However we consider that the best way forward would be to harmonize the definition of the DNSH principle and of sustainable investments between the SFDR and the Taxonomy Regulation.

<ESMA_QUESTION_SFDR_20>

Q21 : Are there other options for the SFDR Delegated Regulation DNSH disclosures to reduce the risk of greenwashing and increase comparability?

<ESMA_QUESTION_SFDR_21>

EuropeanIssuers considers that addressing greenwashing via specific legislation is not a priority. The priority should be to finalize the regulatory framework regarding sustainable finance and sustainability reporting to ensure that it is fit for purpose. As long as the regulatory framework is not finalized and stabilized and the new requirements not fully understood by both entities subject to these requirements and regulators in charge of their enforcement, risks of non-compliance can arise from diverging interpretations and practices which could be seen as greenwashing by certain stakeholders. Only a robust, clear, comprehensible and stabilized framework can eventually prevent diverging interpretations or practices. Such a framework is also necessary to ensure that companies are not discouraged from setting sustainability-related targets and reporting on sustainability-related actions or products for fear of being accused of greenwashing.

<ESMA_QUESTION_SFDR_21>
Q22: Do you agree that the proposed disclosures strike the right balance between the need for clear, reliable, decision-useful information for investors and the need to keep requirements feasible and proportional for FMPs? Please explain your answers.

Q23: Do you agree with the proposed approach of providing a hyperlink to the benchmark disclosures for products having GHG emissions reduction as their investment objective under Article 9(3) SFDR or would you prefer specific disclosures for such financial products? Do you believe the introduction of GHG emissions reduction target disclosures could lead to confusion between Article 9(3) and other Article 9 and 8 financial products? Please explain your answer.

Q24: The ESAs have introduced a distinction between a product-level commitment to achieve a reduction in financed emissions (through a strategy that possibly relies only on divestments and reallocations) and a commitment to achieve a reduction in investees’ emissions (through investment in companies that has adopted and duly executes a convincing transition plan or through active ownership). Do you find this distinction useful for investors and actionable for FMPs? Please explain your answer.

Q25: Do you find it useful to have a disclosure on the degree of Paris-Alignment of the Article 9 product’s target(s)? Do you think that existing methodologies can provide sufficiently robust assessments of that aspect? If yes, please specify which methodology (or methodologies) would be relevant
for that purpose and what are their most critical features? Please explain your answer.

Q26: Do you agree with the proposed approach to require that the target is calculated for all investments of the financial product? Please explain your answer.

Q27: Do you agree with the proposed approach to require that, at product level, Financed GHG emissions reduction targets be set and disclosed based on the GHG accounting and reporting standard to be referenced in the forthcoming Delegated Act (DA) of the CSRD? Should the Global GHG Accounting and Reporting Standard for the Financial Industry developed by PCAF be required as the only standard to be used for the disclosures, or should any other standard be considered? Please justify your answer and provide the name of alternative standards you would suggest, if any.

Q28: Do you agree with the approach taken to removals and the use of carbon credits and the alignment the ESAs have sought to achieve with the EFRAG Draft ESRs E1? Please explain your answer.
Q29: Do you find it useful to ask for disclosures regarding the consistency between the product targets and the financial market participants entity-level targets and transition plan for climate change mitigation? What could be the benefits of and challenges to making such disclosures available? Please explain you answer.

Q30: What are your views on the inclusion of a dashboard at the top of Annexes II-V of the SFDR Delegated Regulation as summary of the key information to complement the more detailed information in the pre-contractual and periodic disclosures? Does it serve the purpose of helping consumers and less experienced retail investors understand the essential information in a simpler and more visual way?

Q31: Do you agree that the current version of the templates capture all the information needed for retail investors to understand the characteristics of the products? Do you have views on how to further simplify the language in the dashboard, or other sections of the templates, to make it more understandable to retail investors?

Q32: Do you have any suggestion on how to further simplify or enhance the legibility of the current templates?
Q33: Is the investment tree in the asset allocation section necessary if the dashboard shows the proportion of sustainable and taxonomy-aligned investments?

Q34: Do you agree with this approach of ensuring consistency in the use of colours in Annex II to V in the templates?

Q35: Do you agree with the approach to allow to display the pre-contractual and periodic disclosures in an extendable manner electronically?

Q36: Do you have any feedback with regard to the potential criteria for estimates?
Q37: Do you perceive the need for a more specific definition of the concept of “key environmental metrics” to prevent greenwashing? If so, how could those metrics be defined?

Q38: Do you see the need to set out specific rules on the calculation of the proportion of sustainable investments of financial products? Please elaborate.

Q39: Do you agree that cross-referencing in periodic disclosures of financial products with investment options would be beneficial to address information overload?

Q40: Do you agree with the proposed website disclosures for financial products with investment options?

Q41: What are your views on the proposal to require that any investment option with sustainability-related features that qualifies the financial product with investment options as a financial product that promotes environmental and/or social characteristics or as a financial product that has sustainable
investment as its objective, should disclose the financial product templates, with the exception of those investment options that are financial instruments according to Annex I of Directive 2014/65/EU and are not units in collective investment undertakings? Should those investment options be covered in some other way?

Q42: What are the criteria the ESAs should consider when defining which information should be disclosed in a machine-readable format? Do you have any views at this stage as to which machine-readable format should be used? What challenges do you anticipate preparing and/or consuming such information in a machine-readable format?

At this stage, the ESAs should focus on quantitative indicators. Tagging narrative information (text blocks) is of course feasible but has proven little usefulness based, on the experience of public companies publishing their consolidated financial accounts in accordance with the ESEF. As regards the format, the ESAs should consider using the ESEF.

Q43: Do you have any views on the preliminary impact assessments? Can you provide estimates of costs associated with each of the policy options?