**Reply form**

**on the Joint Consultation Paper on the review of SFDR Delegated Regulation regarding PAI and financial product disclosures**

12 April 2023ESMA34-45-1218

**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](http://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[[1]](#footnote-1). Further information on data protection can be found under the [Legal notice](http://www.eba.europa.eu/legal-notice) section of the EBA website and under the [Legal notice](https://eiopa.europa.eu/Pages/Links/Legal-notice.aspx) section of the EIOPA website and under the [Legal notice](https://www.esma.europa.eu/legal-notice) section of the ESMA website.

**General information about respondent**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | AMAFI |
| Activity | Investment Services |
| Are you representing an association? |  |
| Country/Region | France |

**Questions**

1. : 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>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_1>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_2>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_2>

1. : 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)?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_3>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_3>

1. : Would you recommend any other social indicator or adjust any of the ones proposed?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_4>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_4>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_5>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_5>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_6>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_6>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_7>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_7>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_8>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_8>

1. : Do you have any comments or proposed adjustments to the new formulae suggested in Annex I?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_9>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_9>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_10>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_10>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_11>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_11>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_12>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_12>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_13>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_13>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_14>

First of all, AMAFI would like to make the following general comments before answering questions 14 and 15:

AMAFI welcomes the opportunity to answer the ESAs’ joint consultation paper on the review of SFDR Delegated Regulation regarding principle adverse impacts (PAI) and financial product disclosures.

The association has been working for several months on the role derivatives can play in sustainable finance. In [AMAFI/21-47](http://www.amafi.fr/download/pages/VygdyKGuBdSkKlWVnoYMBq8lK7y68ZmbnnxmOrrJ.pdf), we have tried to show that derivatives play an important role in the economy. Far from being remote from the real world or being vain trading instruments, they are an essential tool for economic agents to hedge their risks and facilitate their financing, contributing to the development of companies, including with regards to sustainability transformation.

We also had the opportunity to provide comments on this matter to the European Union Platform on Sustainable Finance (PSF) in relation to its work on how to account for derivatives in the Taxonomy.

More recently, we took part in consultations that raised questions on derivatives such as ESMA’s guidelines’ consultation on funds’ names ([*AMAFI / 22-13*](https://www.amafi.fr/download/pages/fQB8KqIL4FQ3X5MPtpbmLFuG6SyDotyachAUkuBx.pdf)) or the ESAs’ call for evidence on better understanding greenwashing ([*AMAFI / 23-03*](https://www.amafi.fr/download/pages/5oKPHplenvSSItYCwaj8R9TyQWrCqqolR9bxvtel.pdf)) to provide our analysis and insights on derivatives and the role they play in sustainability.

As such, we are grateful to the ESAs that they are raising questions related to the consideration of derivatives through their consultation paper.

AMAFI would like to stress the importance of a consistent treatment of derivatives in the sustainable finance regulation, which is currently not the case. Work needs to be done to agree both on the role of derivatives in sustainable finance and on the calculation method to account for them. The proposed approach in the present consultation paper shows a paradox in that it considers the exposure provided by derivatives only when “harmful” and not when contributing to sustainability. Such approach should be discussed thoroughly, as it seems influenced by prejudices towards these financial instruments without demonstrated foundation. There is a need to develop a single methodology for the consistent inclusion of derivatives in the various sustainable finance regulation (SFDR, Taxonomy, MiFID II), building on the PSF’s work[[2]](#footnote-2), the ESA’s previous consultations and in coordination with the European Commission and the industry stakeholders. This should be done while taking into account the different challenges at stake, especially the need to consider all angles of contribution to sustainability (i.e. exposure as well as cash proceeds), and not the sole consideration of the risk of greenwashing.

Consistent with the focus of AMAFI’s work on derivatives, we will focus on questions 14 and 15 of this joint consultation paper.

**Answer to question 14**

**Exposure provided by derivatives**

It is proposed to include “*any derivative with an equivalent long net exposure in the numerator of the PAI indicator, because in such cases the transaction would have resulted in money going towards the adverse impacts identified in the indicators*”, with the possibility to exclude it where it can be shown that it “*does not ultimately result in a physical investment in the underlying security by the counterparty*”.

AMAFI agrees that derivatives should also be considered as investment decisions and that indeed when they provide exposure to an asset with an adverse impact, they should be included in the calculation of the corresponding PAI indicator(s). The possibility to exclude them where it “*does not ultimately result in a physical investment in the underlying security by the counterparty*” is not relevant to us: the critical factor is not the ownership of a physical asset but the resulting overall exposure. The way to account for derivatives should be the same all along the chain of stakeholders (see example in the box below): the counterparty’s hedging is irrelevant to represent the investor’s own exposure to the asset.

Such logic of considering the ability of a derivative to provide exposure to an asset should however be applied in all situations, i.e. not only in those where the exposure is to an asset with adverse impacts but also in those where exposure to sustainable assets is achieved (see Question 15). There should be consistency across the three ratios in this respect. This consistency should also be effective with regards to the inclusion of both short and long positions in the three ratios.

**Methodology to calculate the “equivalent net exposure”**

As for the methodology to calculate the equivalent net exposure provided by a derivative to an asset, it should be clearly defined, so as to ensure consistency across the various pieces of regulation where such calculation is needed (Taxonomy, SFDR, MIF II ESG preferences, future ESMA’s position on fund names). The revision of SFDR RTS is unlikely to be the right vehicle to clearly define such methodology, as it focuses on greenwashing risks and it does not consider the other pieces of regulation and the work done / still ongoing by the PSF[[3]](#footnote-3). It seems necessary to adopt a transversal approach on this subject to amend consistently all the provisions needed in the various pieces of regulation.

AMAFI has been working on proposing a computation for those derivatives whose underlying can be easily assessed from a Taxonomy viewpoint, with a focus on derivatives with an equity or a corporate bond underlying (this focus does not preclude that derivatives based on other types of underlyings may also contribute to sustainability but further work is needed).

We believe that, for those derivatives, using the delta is the best method to calculate the exposure to the underlying shares or corporate bonds. The delta represents the amount by which the derivative’s value increases or decreases for a given change in the price of the underlying. All financial institutions (such as banks, investment firms, asset managers and insurers) use derivatives to compute the delta of their derivative positions on a daily basis for risk management purpose.


The net exposure (calculated as the full algebraic sum of the delta positions, both positive and negative) is what ultimately needs to be considered, as it reflects the risk taken or offloaded on the assets, which shows the commitment (negative or positive) of the holder of the position to the corresponding companies. This measure of the exposure provided by derivatives is the one considered by the PSF and is already used in EU legislation, although in different contexts, such as for the purposes of calculating the net short position in shares in the Short Selling Regulation, already referenced in the present consultation: in this regard, the Annex II, Part I of the [Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 918/2012](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:02012R0918-20150212&from=EN#tocId38) should also be referenced, as it provides a method to consider derivatives: “*Any derivative and cash position shall be accounted for on a delta-adjusted basis, with cash position having delta 1. To calculate the delta of a derivative, investors shall take into account the current implied volatility of the derivative and the closing price or last price of the underlying instrument. In order to calculate a net short position including equity or cash investments and derivatives, natural or legal persons shall calculate the individual delta-adjusted position of every derivative that is held in the portfolio, adding or subtracting all cash positions as appropriate.*”.

For the sake of clarity, both positive and negative delta exposures need to be considered, as this is key to reflect the true picture of all positions held by the various stakeholders.

The example below illustrates that accounting for both long and short delta positions provides a true picture of the exposures across the whole chain of stakeholders.

**Example**

An investor, subject to the publication of the Green investment ratio and SFDR product Taxonomy ratio, purchases a call option on the shares of the company Windturbine for a nominal of 10M euros.





The above long call position results in the investor having a Taxonomy exposure, and the seller of the shares having the opposite Taxonomy exposure. Therefore, when both long and short delta exposures are considered, no actor in the trading chain can report more than what it truly holds, and the holder of the derivative takes all the credit associated with taking the corporate business risk.

**Method to perform netting**

Regarding the method FMPs should use to perform netting, it is suggested that “*In accordance with Q&A 3.1 of the November 2022 Q&As, adverse impacts should be netted at the level of an individual counterpart without going below zero*”. The said Q&A provides that “*The calculations for short positions should apply the methodology used to calculate net short positions laid down in Article 3(4) and (5) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2012[[4]](#footnote-4) of the European Parliament and of the Council. The principal adverse impacts of long and short positions should also be netted accordingly at the level of the individual counterpart (investee undertaking, sovereign, supranational, real estate asset), but without going below zero*”.

AMAFI agrees that such methodology could be used but does not agree with the proposal to discard altogether net negative exposures, as these are the reflection of a disengagement from the asset with principal adverse impacts, reflecting the undesirability of the asset, hence putting pressure on its valuation and overall desirability to investors. In our view, a net short exposure to an asset with a principal adverse impact should thus not be discarded, otherwise providing a partial picture of the exposure to the asset, which is inconsistent with SFDR’s core objective of accurate disclosure. The way to depict such net short exposure would however need to be defined.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_14>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_15>

**Long net exposure on a given issuer**

As mentioned before, it is very important to have a consistent approach towards derivatives among the various ratios more specifically, and in sustainable finance regulations more generally, to clarify how derivatives can be considered both for the positive and negative exposures they provide.

The table proposed in the consultation is illustrative of the current inconsistencies in dealing with derivatives between the Taxonomy regulation and SFDR. Inconsistencies of two kinds show in the table:

* Like in question 14., there is an explicit recognition that derivatives do provide exposure to assets. However, only when this exposure is detrimental to sustainable investment it is considered (short positions for Taxonomy-alignment and share of sustainable investments and long ones for PAI calculations). In other words, the exposure that derivatives can provide to assets is discarded when those are sustainable or Taxonomy-aligned. The role of derivatives is recognized only when it has a negative impact, but not when it has a positive one, which in not consistent. This calls for a general position on the role of derivatives, not just in relation to the SFDR RTS (see below “*how derivatives can contribute to sutainability*”).
* Recital (33) of SFDR RD states that “*Due to the lack of reliable methodologies to determine to what extent exposures achieved through derivatives are exposures to environmentally sustainable economic activities, such exposures should not be included in the numerator*”. The table (first column) concludes that short positions achieved through derivatives should be included, while still not including the long ones. Such conclusion lacks legal basis as it is not consistent with recital (33) which does not distinguish between short and long exposures. This adds to the inconsistency described in the paragraph above.

Both the amount of exposure achieved by long and short positions ought to be reflected for their full value so as to represent the entire economic exposure. AMAFI hence does not agree with the proposed treatment as it sees an asymmetry in the consideration of derivatives that conveys a biased representation of the true exposure achieved through these financial instruments.

The approach for taking derivatives into account needs to make sense for all three ratios this consultation paper deals with. This means that long positions and short positions should unequivocally be taken into account and netted in the numerator of these ratios to avoid any inconsistency.

**Method to calculate net positions**

AMAFI agrees with using the **method to calculate net positions** prescribed by the Short Selling Regulation. The long and short positions considered to obtain the net position should however include all the exposures provided by derivatives, both positive and negative. All impacts must be included to obtain a truthful value of the contribution (negative or positive) to sustainable assets.

With regards to **applying such method to other asset classes**, AMAFI considers, that in line with the PSF’s work and our own previous work, the asset classes to be considered are shares and corporate bonds.

**Net short exposure in a given issuer**

Regarding net short exposure on a given issuer (last line of the Table), as explained in Question 14, AMAFI considers that a negative exposure to an issuer can be useful information when it is the reflection of a disengagement from an issuer with activities having principal adverse impacts.

**How derivatives can contribute to sustainability in the context of SFDR**

The role of derivatives as financial instruments used in an SFDR product needs to be considered fully. As derivatives do not directly provide financing to the underlying company, their contribution to sustainability is often questioned. It should be noted however that the absence of such direct financing is not specific to derivatives. It is indeed the case of all secondary market investments where investors exchange with each other rather than with the issuing entity, i.e. without directing new capital to the company.

As referred to by the FCA in a consultation paper[[5]](#footnote-5), there are three ways to influence corporate behavior for a positive outcome to sustainability: bringing new financing (e.g. loans and primary markets), exercising stewardship through voting & engaging, and influencing the cost of capital.

Derivatives through the negative or positive economic exposure help investors achieve (for e.g. on the shares of a company) impact demand on these shares on the secondary markets, contributing to their liquidity and price formation[[6]](#footnote-6). The liquidity of the securities and their valuation on the secondary markets are critical factors for investors in the primary market to consider purchasing a security. Derivatives hence play an integral part in the setting of the cost of capital of companies, i.e. the cost at which they are able to raise financing on markets. This is particularly meaningful with regards to sustainability where investors’ appetite or lack of appetite for a company is likely to be gradually reflected in its valuation and cost of capital as the impact of climate change increases.

The impact of derivatives on the cost of capital can be illustrated as shown below.

**Contribution of derivatives to the cost of equity of listed companies**

**Primary market**

**Secondary valuation** drives cost of equity

**Secondary Market**

**Supply / demand** for shares in secondary market drives valuation

**Derivatives**

**Derivatives** **demand** on listed equities influences demand of shares in secondary market

Denying such impact of derivatives would likely lead to a reduction in the use of derivatives by investors to favor cash investments. This would deprive them from the benefits of derivatives in facilitating exposure to companies, tailoring it with their risk appetite, and in providing wider access to markets and investment opportunities. As for retail clients with ESG objectives, it would make the offering of structured products to them more difficult, even though these products enable them to participate to the equity market while benefiting from an amount of capital protection.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_15>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_16>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_16>

1. : Do you agree with the ESAs’ assessment of the DNSH framework under SFDR?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_17>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_17>

1. : 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.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_18>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_18>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_19>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_19>

1. : 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>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_20>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_21>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_21>

1. : 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.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_22>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_22>

1. : 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.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_23>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_23>

1. : 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.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_24>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_24>

1. : 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.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_25>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_25>

1. : 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.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_26>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_26>

1. : 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.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_27>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_27>

1. : 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.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_28>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_28>

1. : 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.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_29>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_29>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_30>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_30>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_31>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_31>

1. : Do you have any suggestion on how to further simplify or enhance the legibility of the current templates?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_32>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_32>

1. : Is the investment tree in the asset allocation section necessary if the dashboard shows the proportion of sustainable and taxonomy-aligned investments?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_33>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_33>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_34>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_34>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_35>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_35>

1. : Do you have any feedback with regard to the potential criteria for estimates?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_36>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_36>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_37>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_37>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_38>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_38>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_39>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_39>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_40>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_40>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_41>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_41>

1. : 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?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_42>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_42>

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

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_43>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_SFDR\_43>

1. Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 23 October 2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 and Decision No 1247/2002/EC, OJ L 295, 21.11.2018, p. 39. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [Platform on Sustainable Finance's recommendations on data and usability of the EU taxonomy (europa.eu)](https://finance.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2022-10/221011-sustainable-finance-platform-finance-report-usability_en_1.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The European Union Platform on Sustainable Finance (PSF) published its Report on Data and Usability of the EU Taxonomy on October 11th, 2022 ([Platform on Sustainable Finance's recommendations on data and usability of the EU taxonomy](https://finance.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2022-10/221011-sustainable-finance-platform-finance-report-usability_en_1.pdf)). This report, which provides recommendations to the European Commission, includes a section on the consideration of derivatives in the Green asset ratio (GAR) whose publication is required from financial institutions by the EU Taxonomy. The PSF’s working group was however “*unable to reach a consensus on the way forward for derivatives within Taxonomy reporting and as such, recommends the European Commission mandate further work to the Platform 2.0 to research the consequences of the*” favoured approaches. More specifically, the PSF recommends that derivative instruments ought to be further examined until the 2024 review period. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. “*4. For the purposes of this Regulation, the position remaining after deducting any long position that a natural or legal person holds in relation to the issued share capital from any short position that that natural or legal person holds in relation to that capital shall be considered a net short position in relation to the issued share capital of the company concerned.*

   *5. For the purposes of this Regulation, the position remaining after deducting any long position that a natural or legal person holds in relation to issued sovereign debt and any long position in debt instruments of a sovereign issuer the pricing of which is highly correlated to the pricing of the given sovereign debt from any short position that that natural or legal person holds in relation to the same sovereign debt shall be considered a net short position in relation to the issued sovereign debt of the sovereign issuer concerned*” (*Regulation (EU) No 236/2012, Article 3(4) and (5)*) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See in this respect, [FCA’s consultation CP22/20, section 4.10, Box 3](https://www.fca.org.uk/publication/consultation/cp22-20.pdf), which describes the three main channels or mechanisms by which an investor may plausibly contribute to positive outcomes for the environment and/or society. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. We can refer to the Schiller - Fama debate (one “Nobel” price against the other) on the quantification of a trade’s price impact: if we side with Schiller, when an investor decides to grow the ranks of those willing to hold an exposure on a stock up to a certain price, it will result in a change in the price (persistently higher new price if that investment decision is a buy, lower if it is a sell) even in the absence of any fundamental news changing the “fundamental “ valuation of the stock. Work on the quantification of this impact has been carried out, for e.g. by Bouchaud (<https://arxiv.org/pdf/2108.00242.pdf>) for idiosyncratic stocks (what happens to a stock price when more buying of it happens) or Gabaix and Koijen (<https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3686935>) for more macro impact (what happens to prices when we inject new cash into the market). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)