**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 | ENGIE |
| Are you representing an association? |[ ]
| Country/Region | France |
| Activity |[x]  Information provider (issuer, undertaking or preparer) of corporate reports subject to digitalisation requirements in the EU |[x]  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): Click here to enter text. |
|  |[ ]  User of digitalised corporate reporting from EU companies |[ ]  Investor |
|  |  |  |[ ]  Data analyst |
|  |  |  |[ ]  Data aggregator |
|  |  |  |[ ]  Asset manager |
|  |  |  |[ ]  Other (provide comment): Click here to enter text. |
|  |[ ]  Software provider |
|  |[ ]  Auditor of corporate reporting subject to digitalisation requirements in the EU |
|  |[ ]  Other (provide comments) | Click here to enter text. |

# 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>

We believe that phase 1 should focus on the quantitative aspects and that a macro markup (block tagging) of the whole narrative and semi-narrative sections should be sufficient. More importantly, in order to avoid any undue implementation actions and costs, any marking-up obligation (including phase 1) should be postponed until the ESRS have been thoroughly reviewed (and subsequently been adopted by the co-legislators) as announced by the Commission in the first Simplification Omnibus on sustainability reporting.

<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>

See also Q1: In order to avoid unnecessary implementation measures and costs, it is necessary to postpone any mandatory tagging of sustainability reports until the current ESRS have been reviewed and published in the OJEU. Once the revised ESRS are adopted, the XBRL taxonomy should be revised accordingly and be subject to a new public consultation.

Secondly, following the publication of the revised ESRS, companies should be allowed to gain experience with the new standards and publish at least one report in paper format on the basis of the revised ESRS, before introducing the electronic format. In the meantime, ESMA could organise field tests with a group of voluntary companies as was done when ESEF was introduced for financial reporting.

We also believe that the idea of aligning with ESAP and the deadline of July 2027 for the first submissions should be abandoned.

More generally, the Commission should reassess the need of digital tagging considering the incremental use and benefits of artificial intelligence.

<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>

Yes, we believe. that non-PIEs groups should benefit from the experience and feedback of large undertakings. However, the overall implementation timeline should be revised based on the comment above

<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>

Based on the experience of the first report published under the current ESRS, we believe that some narrative or semi-narrative information is repetitive and should be removed.

More generally, the digital tagging of sustainability data should be delayed until the ESRS have been revised and published in the OJEU, and companies have had at least one year of experience with the revised standards before having to implement any phase of the mandatory tagging.

<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>

TYPE YOUR TEXT HERE

<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>

We agree that in general, the creation of extensions should be limited, as is the case for financial statements. However, considering that there is entity-specific information and some information that may be important but not material, there should not be strong limitations on the use of extensions in the sustainability statement.

<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>

Yes, we are in agreement with the inclusion of a review clause, however this should not be too frequent and should be bundled with other updates where possible.

<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>

As mentioned under Q.6, the creation of extensions should be encouraged to be limited. However, considering that some additional information can be provided we strongly believe that ESMA should not close the taxonomy information for the use of extension.

<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>

We disagree with the current approach. Similar to financial and sustainability statements, taxonomy information includes both quantitative (tables) and qualitative elements. Therefore, we believe a phased approach for all (large) undertakings would be more appropriate:

* **Phase 1**: Apply all templates.
* **Phase 2**: Implement block tagging for description/contextual information.
* **Phase 3**: Introduce more granular narrative details, but only after feedback indicates that Phase 2 is insufficient.

<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>

See also Q.4 and Q6: The overall timeline for mandatory tagging requirements should be adjusted to account for the announced simplification/review exercise of the ESRS as announced by the Commission in its first simplification omnibus. This timeline should also allow companies to publish at least one paper report based on the new standards, before having to start implementing any digital tagging requirements.

In any case, given the process and IT changes required withing a company’s system, it is not operationally realistic to give companies only 6 months to implement (if the RTS on ESEF are published in the OJEU before H1 of a given year). Companies should have at least one year (12m) to implement the necessary changes after the publication of the RTS on ESEF, which should only take place after the entry into force of the revised and simplified ESRS.

<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>

Yes, we are in agreement with the inclusion of a review clause, however this should not be too frequent and should be bundled with other updates where possible.

<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>

Now that the first sustainability reports are publicly available, we recommend that ESMA/EFRAG assess and (field) test the feasibility and relevance of such incorporation before adopting such a technical approach and requiring such incorporation.

<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>

See also Q2: we believe that the Commission/ESMA should reassess the need (including a cost-benefit analysis) of digital tagging of sustainability information considering the incremental use and benefits of artificial intelligence.

<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>

We acknowledge that the tagging of the notes to the IFRS can be improved, however we strongly believe that companies should not be required to carry out several tasks simultaneously. The tagging of the consolidated financial statement is usually done by the accounting and finance departments, which are currently working on the implementation of IFRS 18 “Presentation and Disclosure in Financial Statements” (effective from January 1, 2027), and they can be mobilized to support the tagging of the sustainability statement (currently proposed for 2026 or 2027). It would be more appropriate to allow companies to focus their efforts and costs on the implementation of IFRS 18 and the sustainability report (if so decided following the proposed cost-benefit assessment) before addressing the modification or revision of the markup rules for the Notes to IFRS Consolidated Financial Statements.

<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>

We do not agree with the proposed timeline. Based on our experience with the previous tagging exercise, we do not believe that three months for implementation (if publication in the OJEU before Q3 of a given year) is sufficient to correctly apply the changes. Companies should have at least 12 months of implementation time following the publication of the revised RTS in the OJEU. Furthermore, we are concerned that the software publishers/venders (tools) may not be able to update promptly, or could/will find it difficult to integrate these changes.

<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>

We believe that Phase 1 will represent significant burden/work for issuers, with limited informational value, as the level of comparability will depend on the level of detail and format used by each issuer. We suggest that the level of granularity to be used by each issuer be voluntary/optional, and encourage the use of the closest/narrowest concept.

<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>

We believe that marking up the tables (with all the figures in a declared currency) will be very time consuming and complex to implement, and will require significant effort on the part of the companies, issuers and software publishers/venders. We believe that this process will not add value for users.

Regarding the mapping of IFRS notes, this will be unmanageable as the wording changes every year (making roll forward impossible), and the table may have last-minute figures/wording adjustments. As a result, there is a higher risk of error and unmanageable delays in both tagging and the subsequent audit process by auditors.

Moreover, the IFRS taxonomy may lack sufficient granularity, requiring extensions that conflict with the objective of minimizing such adjustments. Consequently, the overall effectiveness of the taxonomy, and therefore comparability, would be reduced.

From a technical perspective, marking up the tables would also increase the size of the reports for both issuers and users.

<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>

We agree with the proposal to remove the current list and replace it – after consultation with stakeholders - with a more concise and targeted list of mandatory taxonomy elements. In the latter case, auditors should also respect the final list and not ask for additional elements.

<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>

We are not sure to understand the usefulness to include this information as mandatory elements, since the information is already included(tagged) in the financial statement or would be included (tagged) in the sustainability report. This seems more like a duplication of tagging.

<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>

The objective should be to minimise the number of extensions as these would hinder comparability of the Notes between different issuers.

Regarding anchoring, it is still unclear if it will be technically difficult to implement or not.

<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>

Yes, we are in agreement with the inclusion of a review clause, however this should not be too frequent and should be bundled with other updates where possible.

<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>

The proposals that provide additional definition, clarification or simplification are welcome, but we do not have a detailed view of the impacts of the mandatory proposals in terms of cost and effort to implement the change.

<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>

We consider that the approximate costs are very conservative, and do not take into account the internal costs of understanding, training, testing and implementation time of the involved teams.

We estimate that the proposed changes will require the mobilization of a wide range of resources and may require the modification or upgrade of tools, resulting in significant additional costs to companies. Additionally, it could result in higher fees from auditors to review the new mapping.

<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>

Please refer to question 27.

<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>