**Reply** **form**

Consultation Paper on the Regulatory Technical Standards (RTS) on the European Single Electronic Format (ESEF) defining marking up rules for sustainability reporting and revising the marking up rules for the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements and, on the amendments to the RTS on the European Electronic Access Point (EEAP)

Responding to this paper

ESMA invites comments on all matters in the 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 ESMA should consider.

ESMA will consider all comments received by **31 March 2025.**

Instructions

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

* Insert your responses to the questions in the Consultation Paper in this reply form.
* Please do not remove tags of the type <ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_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\_ESEFEEAP\_nameofrespondent.

For example, for a respondent named ABCD, the reply form would be saved with the following name: ESMA\_ESEFEEAP\_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 ESMA’s 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

Information on data protection can be found at [www.esma.europa.eu](http://www.esma.europa.eu) under the headings ‘Legal notice’ and heading ‘[Data protection](https://www.esma.europa.eu/about-esma/data-protection)’.

# General information about respondent

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of the company / organisation | ONCE Social Group | | | |
| Are you representing an association? |  | | | |
| Country/Region | Spain | | | |
| Activity |  | Information provider (issuer, undertaking or preparer) of corporate reports subject to digitalisation requirements in the EU |  | Public interest entity (entities governed by the law of an European Union Member State whose transferable securities are admitted to trading on a regulated market of any Member State; (ii) credit institutions; (iii) insurance undertakings, or (iv) entities designated by Member States as public-interest entities) |
|  | Non-public interest entity (large non-listed EU company, including large EU company with securities only listed outside EU regulated markets) |
|  | Non-public interest entity (large non-EU company with securities listed in EU regulated markets) |
|  | Non-public interest entity (SME listed in EU regulated markets) |
|  | Other (provide comment):  Social economy |
|  | User of digitalised corporate reporting from EU companies |  | Investor |
|  | Data analyst |
|  | Data aggregator |
|  | Asset manager |
|  | Other (provide comment): |
|  | Software provider | | |
|  | Auditor of corporate reporting subject to digitalisation requirements in the EU | | |
|  | Other (provide comments) | Entity promoting the inclusion of persons with disabilites | |

# Questions

Marking up sustainability reporting

**Question 1:** Do you agree with the assessment framework and the manner in which the various elements and factors are to be considered in developing the marking up rules and the phased approach? If not, please explain your reasons and suggest any elements or factors that should be added or removed, or propose sound alternative assessment frameworks.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_01>

The ONCE Social Group welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the ESMA’s Consultation Paper on the Regulatory Technical Standards on the European Single Electronic Format (ESEF) defining marking up rules for sustainability reporting.

Having contributed to the development of the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and of the ESRS, we welcome the continuation of the effort to ensure the efficient implementation of the ESRS, which ensures that companies are required to report on the employment and inclusion of persons with disabilities in a mindful way, in full coherence with the disability-related provisions of the final CSRD text. The ONCE Social Group believes that the obligation to digitalise sustainability information is another key asset of the CSRD, as it will allow for the analysis and comparability of the information disclosed. The digitalization of the information will undoubtedly contribute to a wider dissemination of sustainability information, while easing the compilation, analysis and comparison amongst undertakings. In order to fully exploit the potential of the new rules to render sustainability information more accessible to all interested audiences, we urge ESMA to take into account, in its development of the assessment framework,accessibility requirements for persons with disabilities.

In this regard, it is important to note the inclusion of Article 6 of the CSRD, requiring that the Commission conducts an assessment on the accessibility for people with disabilities to the sustainability reporting published by undertakings under the Directive by 2029.

In this regard, the ONCE Social Group strongly believes that ESMA’s work on the ESEF can facilitate the future-proofing of the Directive by integrating accessibility standards from the outset. In this regard, ESMA would not only be preparing the grounds for the accessibility review of 2029, but would also align with existing EU legislation such as the Accessibility Act (Directive (EU) 2019/882) or the Web Accessibility Directive (Directive (EU) 2016/2102)

**If action is not taken now, and accessibility is not considered from the outset, it is likely that future outcomes will not comply with accessibility standards, necessitating avoidable extra effort and costs in the future**.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_01>

**Question 2:** Do you agree with the phased approach and the proposed timeline? Do you concur that the first phase should be implemented for the same financial year or the following financial year depending on the publication date of amendments to the RTS on ESEF in the OJ (before or after 30 June of the given year)? If not, please provide your reasons and suggest any well-founded alternative timelines for implementation.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_02>

The ONCE Social Group would like to emphasize that regulatory clarity in reporting – and by extension, on the availability of the ESMA’s reporting tools – is key for the successful implementation of the CSRD and ESRS.

In this regard, the ONCE Social Group would like to see further clarity on the timeline, taking into account the recent changes proposed by the European Commission on the scope of the CSRD and the application of the ESRS (the so-called Omnibus proposals).

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_02>

**Question 3:** Do you agree with only considering an additional staggered approach based on the type of large undertakings? If not, please explain your reasons and suggest alternatives or other factors that should be considered and why.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_03>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_03>

**Question 4:** Do you agree with the phases and the content to be marked up as outlined for each phase? If not, please provide your reasons and suggest any well-founded alternative regarding the content for each phase, together with the rationale behind your suggestions.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_04>

The ONCE Social Group appreciates the requirement to mark up all ESRS 2 datapoints regardless of data type (numerical, semi-narrative, and narrative) at all levels, as well as disclosure targets that apply to the description of policies, actions, targets or metrics. It is vital to ensure that both qualitative, and quantitative information is disclosed comprehensively, especially with regards to topics in the Own Workforce standard, such as the metrics regarding diversity, inclusion and disability. In that regard, and taking into account the phased-in approach regarding disclosures under ESRS 2 Appendix C, the ONCE Social Group believes that the reporting of those requirements should be enabled for companies wishing to report on these aspects, despite the phased-in approach followed by the ESRS Delegated Act.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_04>

**Question 5:** Do you think it is necessary to establish a clear timeline and content for each phase from the outset? If not, please explain your reasons and propose alternative approaches.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_05>

Overall, the ONCE Social Group thinks it is relevant and necessary to establish a clear timeline and content for each phase from the outset, in order to ensure that stakeholders can already prepare the necessary actions and invest in coherent data gathering. Further, as discussed above, the ONCE Social Group believes that regulatory clarity for reporters will be crucial to ensure efficient and effective implementation of the ESRS and the CSRD objectives. In that regard, further clarity as to the timeline following the Commission’s intention to revise the CSRD would be required, in order to avoid further fragmentation in implementation.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_05>

**Question 6:** Do you agree with the approach to limit the creation of extension taxonomy elements for marking up sustainably reports? If not, please explain your reasons and suggest alternative approaches.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_06>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_06>

**Question 7:** Do you agree with the inclusion of a review clause that would trigger stock-taking by ESMA on the need to make necessary adjustments in response to changing circumstances? If not, please explain your reasons.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_07>

Bearing in mind the recent changes introduced by the Omnibus simplification proposal, the ONCE Social Group believes it is appropriate to include a review clause to trigger stock-taking by ESMA. This should be done in collaboration with stakeholders from across the reporting landscape, bearing in mind the potential implications for reporting entities and stakeholders across the value chain.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_07>

Marking up Article 8 sustainability disclosures

**Question 8:** Do you agree with having a closed taxonomy for Article 8 sustainability disclosures? If not, please explain your reasons and provide examples on when entity-specific extensions might be necessary.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_08>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_08>

**Question 9:** Do you agree with the proposed requirement to fully mark up the Article 8 sustainability disclosures without implementing a phased approach in relation to the content of the information to be marked up? Do you agree with only considering a staggered approach based on the type of large undertakings? If not, please explain your reasons and suggest alternative approaches.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_09>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_09>

**Question 10:** Do you support the requirement to mark up the Article 8 sustainability disclosures for the same financial year or the following financial year depending on the publication of the RTS on ESEF in the OJ and align it with the sustainability marking up? If not, please provide your reasons and suggest alternative approaches.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_10>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_10>

**Question 11:** Do you agree with the inclusion of a review clause that would trigger stock-taking by ESMA to consider any necessary adjustments in response to the evolving circumstances? If not, please provide your reasons.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_11>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_11>

Common technical aspects: incorporating the ESRS and Article 8 digital taxonomies into the ESEF taxonomy framework

**Question 12:** Do you agree with the technical approach followed by ESMA with regards to incorporating ESRS and Article 8 digital taxonomies from EFRAG into the ESEF taxonomy framework?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_12>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_12>

**Question 13:** Should ESMA consider using the EFRAG taxonomy files ‘as-is’ and without developing a ‘technical’ extension, similar to the one developed for IFRS accounting taxonomy scope?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_13>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_13>

**Question 14:** Do you have any other suggestions in relation to the future ESEF taxonomy framework and how ESMA can further reduce the burden for the reporting entities?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_14>

At this stage, ESMA’s work will be crucial to ensure both a minimum burden on reporting entities, but also taking into account the accessibility dimension of corporate reporting. By ensuring that accessibility is integrated throughout ESEF, ESMA will ensure that there are minimum accessibility burdens in the future for reporters.

Taking into consideration all the EU acquis and obligations on accessibility, in addition to the review clause in the CSRD on the accessibility of the information reported under the CSRD, **we strongly recommend that ESMA takes into consideration the accessibility of the tagging system** by:

* Providing further clarity on how companies can finalise their sustainability reporting while adhering to international and EU legislation and standards on accessibility, such as the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG), EU standard EN 301 549 and the European Accessibility Act.
* Ensuring that its recommendations for information to be published in the European Single Electronic Format (ESEF) take into account accessibility requirements for people with disabilities, in line with the requirements established by the European Accessibility Act and the EU Web Accessibility Directive. Currently, the topic is not addressed by the ESEF framework system. Future discussions regarding the technical standards should also consider accessibility as a key component of new utilization of the platform.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_14>

Marking up the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements

**Question 15:** Do you agree that it is necessary to revise the marking up rules for the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements? If not, please explain your reasons.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_15>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_15>

**Question 16:** Do you agree with the phased-in approach and the proposed timeline? Do you also agree that the first phase should take effect with the annual financial report for the financial year when the amendment to the RTS on ESEF is published in the OJ before 30 September of the given year? If not, please explain your reasons and suggest any alternative timelines for the implementation.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_16>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_16>

**Question 17**: Do you agree with the content outlined for phase one? Specifically, do you support the proposed approach to text block mark up the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements? If not, please provide your reasons and suggest alternatives to marking up text blocks in the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_17>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_17>

**Question 18:** Do you agree with the content outlined in phase two? Do you think there is added value in detailed marking up of the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements, particularly for all figures in a declared currency within the tables? Do you think that detailed tagging of numerical elements for which issuers should create extensions because there is no corresponding core taxonomy element provide added value? If not, please provide your reasons and suggest alternatives to detailed-marking up the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_18>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_18>

**Question 19:** Do you agree with the proposal to remove the current list of mandatory core taxonomy elements outlined in Annex II of the RTS on ESEF and replace it with a more concise and targeted list of mandatory taxonomy elements? If not, please explain your reasons.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_19>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_19>

**Question 20:** Do you agree with the proposed list of mandatory elements? If not, please provide your reasons and suggest any elements that should be removed or added.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_20>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_20>

**Question 21:** Do you agree with the revised approach towards the creation of extension taxonomy elements for the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements and the principles outlined? If not, please explain your reasons and suggest alternatives.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_21>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_21>

**Question 22:** Do you agree with the inclusion of a review clause that would trigger stock-taking by ESMA to consider any necessary adjustments in response to the changing circumstances and to bundle these adjustments with other updates where feasible? If not, please explain your reasons.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_22>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_22>

Targeted improvements to the existing drafting of the RTS on ESEF

**Question 23**: Do you agree with the proposals for the targeted amendments to the RTS on ESEF? If not, please explain your reasons and suggest alternatives. In your response, reference specific proposals by proposal number.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_23>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_23>

**Question 24:** Are there any additional targeted amendments that could be brought to the RTS on ESEF which are not considered in this proposed list? If yes, please provide additional comments, providing specific references to the RTS on ESEF and concrete wording proposals for ESMA to take into consideration.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_24>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_24>

Amendments to the RTS on the European Electronic Access Point (Delegated Regulation 2016/1437)

**Question 25**: Do you agree that it is necessary to amend the RTS on EEAP and with the way ESMA proposes to do so? If not, please explain your reasons.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_25>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_25>

**Question 26:** Do you agree with content of the proposed amendments to the RTS on EEAP? If not, please explain in which regards to you disagree and illustrate any alternative proposal.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_26>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_26>

Annex II. Draft Cost/Benefit Analysis on the RTS on ESEF

**Question 27:** Do you agree with ESMA’s high-level understanding of an approximate monetary cost associated with marking up disclosures in IFRS consolidated financial statements and the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements? If you have a different view on the approximate average monetary cost per markup, please supply supporting data.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_27>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_27>

**Question 28:** Do you agree with ESMA’s high-level understanding of an approximate monetary cost per markup and other additional costs associated with marking up disclosures of sustainability reporting? If you have a different view on the approximate average monetary cost per markup, please supply supporting data.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_28>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_28>

**Question 29:** Do you agree with the above-mentioned possible costs and benefits developed by ESMA with respect to defining the rules to mark up the sustainability statements? Which other types of costs or benefits (qualitative and/or quantitative) would you consider in that context?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_29>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_29>

**Question 30:** Do you agree with the above-mentioned possible costs and benefits developed by ESMA with respect to the use of a list of mandatory elements for marking up the sustainability statements? Which other types of costs or benefits (qualitative and/or quantitative) would you consider in that context?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_30>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_30>

**Question 31:** Do you agree with the above-mentioned possible costs and benefits developed by ESMA with respect to defining the rules for marking up Article 8 sustainability disclosures in the sustainability statements? Which other types of costs or benefits (qualitative and/or quantitative) would you consider in that context?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_31>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_31>

**Question 32**: Do you agree with the above-mentioned possible costs and benefits developed by ESMA with respect to the review of the current marking up approach for the Notes to the IFRS consolidated financial statements? Which other types of costs or benefits (qualitative and/or quantitative) would you consider in that context?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_32>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_32>

**Question 33:** Do you agree with the above-mentioned possible costs and benefits developed by ESMA with respect to the review of the list of mandatory elements under Annex II to RTS on ESEF? Which other types of costs or benefits (qualitative and/or quantitative) would you consider in that context?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_33>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_33>

Annex III. Draft Cost/Benefit Analysis relating to the amendment to the RTS on the EEAP

**Question 34:** Do you agree with the assessment of costs and benefits developed by ESMA with respect to the review of the RTS on EEAP?

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_34>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_34>

Annex IV. Legal text RTS on ESEF

**Question 35:** Do you agree with the proposed drafting amendments to the RTS on ESEF? If not, please explain your reasons and suggest alternatives. In your response, reference specific sections and paragraphs of the RTS on ESEF (i.e., Annex III, paragraph 1).

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_35>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_35>

**Question 36:** Are there any additional drafting amendments that could be brought to the RTS on ESEF which are not considered in this draft legal text? If yes, please provide additional comments, providing specific references to the RTS on ESEF, underlying reasoning and concrete wording suggestions for ESMA to take into consideration.

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_36>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<ESMA\_QUESTION\_ESEFEEAP\_36>