



SEPTEMBER 2025

**AMENDED ESRS EXPOSURE DRAFTS:
AMF RESPONSE TO EFRAG PUBLIC
CONSULTATION SURVEY**

This document reproduces the AMF responses to the EFRAG public consultation online survey.

It includes the responses to:

- **Part 2.** General feedback (Q11 to 34)
- **Part 3.** Detailed feedback at level of DR

Please note that not all items from the consultation have been answered.

PART 2: GENERAL FEEDBACKS: (Q11-Q34)

11) Clarifications and simplification of the Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) (ESRS 1 Chapter 3) and materiality of information as the basis for sustainability reporting

Question: do you agree that the proposed amendments have sufficiently simplified the DMA process, reinforced the information materiality filter and have succeeded in striking an acceptable balance between simplification and robustness of the DMA? Do you agree that the wording of Chapter 3 of ESRS 1 is sufficiently simplified?

YES

PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE

NO

Overall, the AMF supports the simplification of the DMA. However, we have some reservations:

- The AMF supports the aggregation of IROs principle but recalls the objective of the ESRS to give “*information necessary to understand the undertaking’s [IRO]*” (based on CSRD’s Art.19a). In particular, IRO-2, §28(a) shall clearly require from companies to indicate –at least once, when reporting on the DMA results, if material topics are related to either positive/negative impact, risk and/or opportunity; for instance, there could be 3 columns labelled impact, risk and opportunity, and a simple “check” in the corresponding column(s) would be sufficient. This is to avoid cases where companies only report at topic-level in their entire statement, thereby leaving the user without any information about the actual IROs.
- The ESRS should specify that companies do not need to conduct DMA every year but that the DMA should be reviewed where a company’s circumstances have changed (§29 ESRS 1)
- IRO-1 datapoints could be streamlined to avoid redundancies. For instance, regrouping in one § methodological aspects: assumptions, inputs (including stakeholders’ engagement), and explanations on thresholds. Guidance should better explain how companies can avoid boilerplate disclosures by disclosing data/tools used in relation to specific topics.
- Information on thresholds is key but ESRS 1 §28 could be simplified by not requiring thresholds for each and every criterion (severity/likelihood), cf. part 3.
- The AMF supports the overall reduction of list of topics in appendix A (previous AR 16) but does not agree with the idea of merging topics for S1 & S2 and regrouping multiple G1 subtopics under “corporate culture”. This may reduce the length of the ESRS but does not improve useability and readability of the standards (especially when this results in additional footnotes that are difficult to read).

12) New guidance in ESRS 1 on how to consider remediation, mitigation and prevention actions in assessing materiality of negative impacts

Question: do you agree that the new guidelines clarify how to consider remediation, mitigation and prevention implemented actions in the DMA, contributing to more relevant and comparable reporting?

- YES
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE
- NO**

The AMF does not support the proposed approach and strongly recommends retaining the actual ESRS methodology given that:

- (1) the new rules are excessively complex and leave too much room for judgement on the criteria proposed, especially for potential impacts. This does not simplify the useability of the ESRS.
- (2) the proposed rules will create significant burden for companies as it significantly changes the DMA methodology compared to methodology used in 2024/2025 reports, which limits the possibility to leverage on previous DMA.
- (3) information on gross impact is key to understand the need for/context of mitigation measures. Direct feedbacks from companies show that many negative impacts would be omitted as a result of the new methodology, resulting in a significant loss of relevant information for stakeholders (or might demonstrate the risk of overly broad interpretation of these rules).
- (4) risks and potential impacts should be treated in a consistent manner (both on gross basis)

However, based on the experience from the 1st application of the ESRS, we see merit in clarifying in the DR/AR that material IROs shall be assessed without considering mitigation actions (clearer guidance/terminology in the ESRS) to increase comparability, because this methodological principle has not been uniformly applied by all companies although it was required.

13) Improved readability, conciseness and connectivity of ESRS Sustainability Statements

Question: do you agree that these proposed Amendments, when combined with the other changes in the Amended ESRS, provide an appropriate level of flexibility to support more relevant and concise reporting, as well as to promote better connectivity with corporate reporting as a whole?

- YES
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE**
- NO

The AMF supports the inclusion of an executive summary and use of appendices. We also support that the revised ESRS allow for more flexibility on the structure to limit redundancies (several ESRS 2 datapoints can be placed in topical sections). However, we have two reservations:

- This flexibility should also be possible for IRO-1 (e.g. if the company describes input parameters specific to one topic) and BP-2 to reflect the current practices as many companies find it easier to describe their material impact, risks and opportunities and the associated methodology in the topical chapters associated with the IROs and not necessarily in the general section to avoid redundancies).
- These proposed changes may increase the difficulty readers to compare/navigate through the reports. While we support this added flexibility, we also strongly advocate to add a requirement for companies to indicate the DR number the text in the sustainability statement is referring to, such as “IRO-1” or “E2-4” (and not only in content tables/index). This is a practice already adopted by many issuers. There could be several options to do this human tagging (in the title, subtitles, text of the paragraph, etc.). Based on our experience as supervisors this year, this is the most efficient and simple solution to find the right balance between flexible structure and comparability.

14) Restructuring of the architecture and interaction between ESRS 2 and Topical Standards

Question: do you agree that these proposed amendments strike an appropriate balance between (1) prescriptiveness of the requirements and preparation effort from the one hand, and (2) need for relevant and comparable information from the other?

- YES**
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE
- NO

We support EFRAG’s proposals.

15) Improved understandability, clarity and accessibility of the Standards

Proposed amendment:

1. “May disclose” datapoints have been all eliminated.
2. All the “shall disclose” datapoints are now in the main body of the standard (no more datapoints in AR) and mandatory application requirements are relocated below the DR to which they belong (and below each Chapter in ESRS 1), covering ‘how to disclose’ guidelines.
3. Language of the Standards has been improved for understandability, conciseness and consistency of ESRS.

Question: do you agree that these proposed amendments achieve the desired level of clarity and accessibility?

- YES
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE**
- NO

We overall support the measures described in point (1) to (3).

There might however be cases where the status of datapoints remains ambiguous. In particular AR 23, ESRS 1 is requiring undertakings to “*consider disaggregating reported information by location—such as by site, water basin or local ecosystem—when material impacts, risks or opportunities are highly dependent on local context, in line with [Draft] Amended ESRS 1 paragraph 51*” (= shall consider datapoint). This AR relates to §51 which is requiring to “*aggregate or disaggregate the reported information to reflect the level at which significant variations of material impacts, risks or opportunities arise*” (= shall datapoint). Does AR 23 leave undertakings the choice not to disclose by location when material IRO are highly dependent on local context?

16) Usefulness and status of “Non-Mandatory Illustrative Guidance” (NMIG)

Question: select the NMIG - you are invited to provide your comments on the purpose of NMIG, if any.

- All**
- NMIG – ESRS 1
- NMIG – ESRS 2**
- NMIG – ESRS E1**
- NMIG – ESRS E2
- NMIG – ESRS E3
- NMIG – ESRS E4**
- NMIG – ESRS E5

- NMIG – ESRS S1
- NMIG – ESRS S2
- NMIG – ESRS S3
- NMIG – ESRS S4
- NMIG – ESRS G1

We support the publication of NMIG as a separate document (vs. delegated act) so that there is no confusion on its legal status. Overall, we support the content of NMIG, with few exceptions:

- “ESRS 2, NMIG 12 for §28(a) for Social Topic” on the different types of social impacts is a useful definition (neither an example or a methodology). As such, it should be added to the glossary or in the AR.
- Climate: NMIG 4 for §24 explains that “information on resource allocation can be disaggregated between [...] the planned allocation of resources over specific time horizons covering future periods of implementing actions and where the figures can be reported as ranges”. This does not replicate the distinction in E1 between “quantitative short- and medium-term CapEx, and/or OpEx figures” and “anticipated long-term CapEx and/or OpEx ranges”. We are not sure to understand if ranges can also be reported for short-term and medium-term Capex and OpEx.
- Biodiversity: in view of the streamlining of E4, we would suggest to reinforce NMIG in order to help preparers:
 - o Echo the new suggested AR: highlight the importance of the value chain when it comes to biodiversity DMA: according to different studies (for instance: Finance for Biodiversity Foundation, Report, October 2024), the majority of the total impact occurs in the companies’ value chains, encompassing both upstream and downstream activities; stress the importance of disclosing land-use change based on a Life Cycle Assessment (voluntary basis), as provided in the currently in-force E4-5, §36.
 - o Add guidance on biodiversity targets:
 - contribution to alignment with ecological thresholds and recognised frameworks including Kunming-Montreal Framework
 - focus on key impacts, such as land use change and ecosystem conversion while considering the local ecological context
 - The undertaking may refer to the following sources: TNFD and SBTN

17) Burden reliefs and other suggested clarifications

Proposed amendments:

1. The relief “undue cost or effort” has been introduced, including for the calculation of metrics.
2. A relief for lack of data quality has been introduced for metrics (ESRS 1 Paragraph 91), allowing to report a partial scope and disclosing actions to improve the coverage in future periods.
3. The systematic preference for direct data as input to the calculation of value chain metrics has been removed and undertakings may use direct data or estimates depending on practicability and reliability (ESRS 1, Paragraph 91).
4. Undertakings may exclude from the calculation of metrics their activities that are not a significant driver of IROs (ESRS 1, Paragraph 90) and may exclude joint operations on which they do not have operational control when calculating environmental metrics other than climate (ESRS 1, paragraph 60).
5. Disclosure about resilience is now limited to risks only and limited to qualitative information only (ESRS 2, Paragraph 24 and ESRS E1, Paragraph 21).
6. When disclosing financial effects, the information on investments and plans is now limited to those that are already announced (ESRS 2, AR 16 Paragraph 23(b)).

7. A new relief for acquisitions (disposals) of subsidiaries has been introduced (ESRS 1, Chapter 5.4) allowing the undertaking to include (exclude) the subsidiary starting from the subsequent (from the beginning of the) period.
8. From October 2024 to February 2025, several implementation issues were identified in the EFRAG ESRS Appendix dedicated to the Q&A implementation platform (Chapter of Basis for Conclusions (BfC)). These issues have now been addressed by clarifying the corresponding provisions.

Question: do you agree that these proposed Amendments provide sufficient relief and strike an acceptable balance between (a) responding to the stakeholders' demands for burden reliefs and (b) preserving the transparency needed to achieve the objectives of the EU Green Deal, as well as interoperability with the ISSB's IFRS S1 and S2?

YES

PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE

NO

Overall, we support the different reliefs to reduce the reporting burden, but suggest to fine tune some of them:

- The undue cost or effort relief is a strong simplification that we support. While it seems appropriate to apply this principle to all metrics (except scope 3) today because we lack perspective on which metrics are most challenging for companies and because companies' facts and circumstances differ, it may however be necessary to set a time-bound limit and plan to transform this general principle into a more targeted undue cost and effort relief for certain well-identified complex metrics in the future to take into account companies' learning curve.
- §90 of ESRS 1, which refers to the possibility for companies to exclude from the calculation of metrics activities that are not a significant driver of IROs, raises questions as it is not clear how it should apply in practice given how vague some terms are ("activities"; "not expected to be", "driver of the IRO"...). In addition, the inclusion/exclusion of activities should be based on the materiality assessment to drive the identification of IROs. If an activity is not linked to a material IRO, it should not be included in the scope of the associated metric.
- On resilience, consistency between the reporting on anticipated/current financial effects and the resilience analysis need to be ensured: if quantitative reporting turns out to be expected for financial effects, then the same should be expected from the resilience. A graph that would help make the connection between the materiality analysis, the business model resilience, anticipated financial effects reporting and E1 resilience analysis could be useful.
- We support the relief for acquisitions/disposals but suggest to make this subject to the condition that the company cannot make the necessary adjustments without undue costs or efforts.

18) Relief for lack of data quality on metrics (ESRS 1 paragraph 92)

Question: do you agree that the proposed relief for lack of data quality on metrics strikes an acceptable balance between providing the necessary flexibility for preparers and avoiding undue loss of information?

YES

PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE

NO

The AMF supports the §91 relief but suggests that EFRAG considers companies' learning curve for the application of the relief (the AMF does not comment on §92)

19) Relief for anticipated financial effects

Question: The Amended ESRS currently includes two possible options, which would apply to all topics, including climate (DR E1-11); please select from the alternatives below the one that represents your view:

I agree with Option 1

I agree with Option 2

I disagree with both Options

We support Option 1 for the following reasons:

- This disclosure is not new, at least for climate, as documented in the TCFD work, which already recommended to “describe the impact of climate-related risks and opportunities on the organization’s businesses, strategy, and financial planning”.
- This is valuable information for investors and other stakeholders, who can use it to better understand the articulation of the quantitative figures with the financial statements and with other elements displayed within the sustainability report (DMA, information on strategy...).
- For climate in particular, it seems crucial to us that stakeholders and investors understand how undertakings are putting a price on their transition. This is done through giving both quantitative and qualitative elements on anticipated effects on the financial position, the cash-flows and the financial performance of an undertaking. Although the disclosure is phased-in for the first year of reporting under the current ESRS standards, we have seen some encouraging good practices by a few undertakings who provided some data as of the first year.
- As voiced by the ISSB in its communication, Option 2 would jeopardise the interoperability between the ESRS and the ISSB standards on a key reporting aspect. We note that the ISSB requires quantitative disclosure on anticipated financial effects in ISSB S1 and S2 (i.e. not only for Climate).
- Finally, EFRAG is proposing relieves on metrics that accommodate concerns raised around reporting on challenging metrics such as quantitative anticipated financial effects.

If needed, one way to further accommodate concerns raised by proponents of Option 2 would be to apply Option 1 for climate standard and to grant more flexibility for standards other than Climate, as quantitative assessment is probably less mature on these topics.

21) Enhanced interoperability with the ISSB’s Standards IFRS S1 and S2

Question: do you agree that these proposed Amendments achieve an appropriate balance between increasing interoperability and meeting the simplification objectives?

YES

PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE

NO

As already voiced by the AMF in previous contributions, it is extremely important that the standard-setters continue to cooperate to ensure the interoperability of the corporate sustainability reporting framework as a whole. We therefore encourage ISSB and EFRAG to undertake work at technical level in the spirit of the efforts made towards the elaboration of ESRS Set 1.

Overall, we support EFRAG’s efforts to better align with ISSB as interoperability is key for many companies. We also believe that EFRAG should be able to depart from ISSB when other simplifications are needed due to the specific circumstances of the ESRS (in particular, the fact that the ESRS covers more topics and datapoints than ISSB).

We still see room for interoperability improvements concerning a few elements:

- As mentioned, Option 2 around anticipated financial effects would represent a significant departure from interoperability ambitions (cf Q19).
- The envisaged GHG emission boundary provision would differ from both ISSB and the GHG Protocol, which does not seem justified, as the provision looks burdensome and complex.
- Information on connectivity

22) Reduction in the number of mandatory and voluntary datapoints

Question: do you agree that the proposed reduction in “shall disclose” datapoints (under materiality) strike an acceptable balance between burden reduction and preserving the information that is necessary to fulfil the objectives of the EU Green Deal?

- YES
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE
- NO

I BELIEVE SOME OF THE DELETED CONTENT SHOULD BE MAINTAINED (PLEASE SPECIFY IN THE COMMENTS BY INDICATING THE RELEVANT PARAGRAPH IN THE STANDARD)

The AMF supports the reduction of datapoints but has strong reservations on some of the removals:

1) We do not support the deletion of the definition of “net-zero target” in E1, despite its wide use in sustainability statements.

- o First, the net-zero target is well framed thanks to the associated 90-95% reduction pathway. Thanks to this ESRS definition, we have seen significant improvements in sustainability statements this year as compared to previous years. For instance, some companies that used to disclose net-zero targets in their Non-financial Statements have stopped using the notion this year, thanks to the strict ESRS definition. As supervisors, we have been relying on the ESRS net-zero denomination to prevent greenwashing practices and have managed to obtain improvements in reporting.
- o Second, SBTi target-setting validation, particularly its Net-Zero Methodology, will probably remain massively used amongst companies worldwide. This means that, irrespective of the ESRS framework, companies will keep on using this notion to promote their sustainability efforts, without the ESRS accompanying this state of play.
- o Consequently, the removal might lead to a heterogeneous use of the notion, with companies whose targets are approved by SBTi continuing to make use of the denomination, and companies deprived of a SBTi-validation being able to assert net-zero targets without supervisors being able to react.
- o We are therefore recommending the reinsertion of the notion in E1. This would also make sense considering the “net-zero” concept lies at the heart of the 2050 EU’s long-term strategy, as documented in the European Climate Law.

2) We also regret the voluntary application of existing requirements concerning connectivity between sustainability statements and financial statements (ESRS 1, §114 and 115). Such transparency will be valuable for investors and enhance ISSB interoperability.

23) Six datapoints exceptionally moved from “may” to “shall”

Datapoint	EFRAG Rationale for moving from “may” to “shall”
ESRS E3 Water - Own operations total withdrawal (Amended ESRS E3 paragraph 28 (c))	This requirement should not create an additional burden, as reporting water consumption already relies on understanding the water balance, including both withdrawals and discharges. Given this, the change from optional ('may') to mandatory ('shall') reflects the importance of these metrics in completing the water balance equation and ensuring fair presentation of material IROs. Water withdrawal—defined as the volume of water removed from ecosystems—is a key indicator for assessing pressure on local water resources, particularly in water-stressed regions.

<p>ESRS E3 Water – Own operations total discharges (Amended ESRS E3 paragraph 17)</p>	<p>This requirement should not impose an additional burden, as reporting water consumption already depends on understanding the water balance, including both withdrawals and discharges. Accordingly, the change from optional ('may') to mandatory ('shall') reflects the importance of these metrics in completing the water balance equation and supporting the fair presentation of material IROs. Water discharges, in particular, serve as a complementary indicator to water withdrawals, providing a fuller picture of pressure on water resources.</p>
<p>ESRS E4 Biodiversity and ecosystems- Disclosure of transition plan for biodiversity and ecosystems</p>	<p>Changed to mandatory as this disclosure is considered highly decision-useful for users in relation to undertakings operating in certain sectors. Disclosing information on a transition plan (TP) is conditional to have one that is publicly released. This does not add burden as the plan is already public and the information normally available. Implementing TPs, and disclosing on them, is an area that is normalizing and expected to become increasingly important in future years.</p>
<p>ESRS G1 Business conduct– Training of procurement team (Amended ESRS G1 paragraph 10 (c))</p>	<p>The revision G1 has consolidated previous scattered datapoints on training in one generic provision, while specifying the target audience considered critical in sustainability (such as the procurement team). This DP is an important information related to management of suppliers’ relationship for which several other DPs have been deleted.</p>
<p>ESRS G1 Business conduct confirmed incidents (Amended ESRS G1 paragraph 14)</p> <p>(1) Nature of incidents</p> <p>(2) Number of incidents</p>	<p>ESRS G1 did not include any mandatory metric on incidents of corruption and bribery, except for the SFDR indicators This provision replaces narrative information about corruption and bribery with a quantitative metric. The definition of confirmed incidents is well provided in the Glossary. The required disclosure does not include names or persons involved nor other recognisable characteristics, so that it does not interfere with any legal process.</p>

Question: do you agree that these exceptions to the general rule are appropriate and justified?

YES

PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE

NO

E4: The AMF supports this disclosure but suggests to clarify what constitutes a TP vs. any other biodiversity strategy (or other less strategic actions plans). If not, the transition plan “opt-in’ will not work and raise too many questions. In addition, we suggest to clarify the notion of “making public”, for instance, the plan should be published if it has been made public by the entity itself and not by third-parties.

G1: The AMF supports the consolidation of datapoints in relation to training scattered around into one paragraph, including several disclosures. However, the AMF disagrees with the proposal to transform the datapoint on “confirmed incidents of corruption or bribery” from voluntary to mandatory. There is already a datapoint requested on the number of convictions and this should be deemed sufficient. We therefore suggest removing the datapoint on confirmed incident, as the definition of what constitutes a “confirmed incident” lacks legal basis and will vary greatly from one country to another, making it difficult to have homogenous data and further complexifying the reporting. In addition, we disagree with EFRAG’s justification that this new metric replaces previous narrative information; we are not sure to understand which narrative information has been removed to justify the introduction of a new mandatory datapoint.

24) Four new mandatory datapoints (exception)

Datapoint	EFRAG Rationale for new datapoints
ESRS 2 General disclosures – BP 1 the undertaking shall state that the general requirements of ESRS 1 have been applied for the preparation of its sustainability statement.	This may be considered as a new datapoint but replaces several datapoints compared to the Delegated Act. The undertaking now must only state when certain principles were applied and when there is a divergent application from the general requirements, this means that it is not disclosed according to ESRS 1; examples are time horizons or changes in preparation or presentation of sustainability information.
E2-4 Secondary microplastics Resulting from the breakdown of larger plastic items or being unintentionally produced through the life cycle of the product. Clarification of former ESRS E2 paragraphs 28(b) and AR 20 led to new added DP.	The amount of secondary microplastics was already required to be reported in ESRS E2 through AR 20, which addressed both primary and secondary microplastics. However, the Q&A process and the outreach analysis highlighted a lack of clarity on the disclosure requirements in relation to primary and secondary microplastics. The addition of a new qualitative datapoint on secondary microplastics, separate from the Set 1 microplastics datapoint, was favoured to improve clarity and simplify the understanding of the microplastics requirements. Secondary microplastics represent the main source of microplastics released into the environment.
E5-4 Percentage of total weight that are critical and strategic raw material Added draft ESRS E5 paragraph 15(c).	Added for better alignment with recent EU regulatory developments, particularly the Eco-design for Sustainable Product Regulation and the Critical Raw Materials Act.
E5-5 Percentage and/or total weight for which the final destination is unknown. Added in draft ESRS E5 paragraph 18(e).	Added to allow mass balance of final destination of waste to be completely disclosed, not forcing undertakings to make unreasonable estimations but instead allowing them to disclose on the figures they have and can reasonably document.

Question: in the context of the comprehensive revision of some of the DRs, to promote more focused and relevant information, 4 datapoints have been added. Do you agree that these exceptions to the general rule are appropriate and justified?

- YES**
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE
- NO

We agree with these exceptions, subject to clarifications. It seems necessary to reinforce the guidance on the new metrics (clear definition of the metrics, clear methodology and guidance on input parameters) to ease their application, in particular for E2-4 on secondary plastics. In addition, the JRC guidance platform on raw materials should be added in the NMIG (<https://rmis.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>), in particular the section dedicated to critical materials (<https://rmis.jrc.ec.europa.eu/eu-critical-raw-materials>).

25) Emphasis on ESRS being a “fair presentation” reporting framework

Question: do you agree that explicitly requiring to adopt fair presentation in preparing ESRS sustainability statements will support a more effective functioning of the materiality filter, therefore enabling more relevant reporting and reducing the risk of excessive reported information?

- YES**
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE
- NO

We agree with EFRAG’s proposal to introduce a "fair presentation" principle in the ESRS, subject to clarifications. The application of fair presentation in the sustainability reporting area seems to trigger various interpretations, especially considering that the CSRD and subsequent ESRS rely on the double materiality principle (in particular the impact materiality approach, leading to a multi-stakeholder approach). It is essential to clarify the definition of this concept, in particular the difference – if any – with IAS 1/ISSA 5000 framework on which the ISSB standards are based. In addition, we suggest that EFRAG better explain the articulation of this concept with (1) the requirement to consider entity-specific information, for instance, clarify whether companies can “override” an ESRS metric with an entity-specific one; and (2) the possibility to use the different reliefs and phase-ins.

However, we see merit in introducing this notion that relates to the qualitative characteristics for the presentation of sustainability information, which were already defined in Set 1. Besides, fair presentation is used in ISSB standards, therefore its introduction in the ESRS framework would contribute to better interoperability. This is also an opportunity to remind of the urgency of adopting EU audit standards which will help framing the use of this principle from an auditor view point.

26) Exception for Financial Institutions' Absolute Climate Reduction Targets

I agree that financial institutions should be exempted from disclosing climate absolute GHG emission values targets when they have only set intensity targets

I disagree that financial institutions should be exempted from disclosing climate absolute GHG emission values targets when they have only set intensity targets

We partially agree with exempting financial institutions from disclosing climate absolute GHG emission targets along with their intensity targets.

On the one hand, we see merit for investors to benefit from more comparable data on GHG emissions. On the other hand, we recognise that data collection might be challenging as (1) financial institutions are relying on their counterparties’ decarbonisation pathways to disclose their own targets; and (2) considering the width of their value chain (emissions being concentrated on Scope 3’s Category 15: Investments), data quality is not expected to be optimal. The first edition of sustainability statements confirms that, despite the ESRS requirement, financial institutions disclose their targets through intensity values, except for specific sectors (oil and gas, sometimes coal).

The key issue is not whether targets are in absolute value or not, it is primarily the comparability of GHG inventory and targets from one financial institution to another due to the various scope chosen by these actors. Requiring absolute targets might not completely address this issue, and this is why we do not disagree with this exemption. We believe that EFRAG should find a middle-way and focus on how to improve these shortcomings, for instance by harmonizing intensity target scope (increase coverage of material emissions and facilitate comparability) and definition (e.g. add reference to physical intensity ratio) and requiring contextual information (such as requiring simpler information on general trends in absolute value i.e. “up/down”).

In addition, we believe that it is of utmost importance to adjust the ESRS for financial sectors on other aspects such as: (1) the definition of “net revenue”, (2) financial resources allocated to decarbonation levers [allow to disclose sectoral breakdown of the portfolios instead of Capex/OpEx], and (3) guidance on the definition of the value chain, for instance, treatment of the third-party assets under management.

27) ESRS S1: New Threshold for Reporting Metrics Disaggregated at Country Level

Question: do you agree with the change to the threshold for country-by-country disclosure for the DRs ESRS S1-5 and ESRS S1-7?

- YES**
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE
- NO

We support the new threshold introduced as our analysis also shows that companies' reporting at country level tends to be limited given that the 10% threshold is rarely exceeded. However, if the "ten largest countries with at least 50 employees" threshold is retained, EFRAG should ensure that the wording is adjusted accordingly in every DR. For instance, DR S1-7, paragraph 27(b) states: "*in the EEA, whether it has one or more collective bargaining agreements and, if so, the overall percentage of its employees covered by such agreement(s) for each country in which it has significant employment, defined as at least 50 employees by head count and that are the ten largest countries in terms of employee numbers*". We assume that for consistency purposes with the other DR, the company needs to take into account the largest countries at global level and only report on those that are in the EEA, but the drafting is not clear and could also suggest that the company needs to report on the ten largest countries in the EEA.

28) ESRS S1: Calculation approach to adequate wages outside the European Union (EU)

Question: do you agree with the proposed change to the methodology for the calculation of non-EU adequate wages in ESRS S1?

- YES
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE**
- NO

The AMF welcomes the proposed changes to the calculation methodology of non-EU adequate wages. The more explicit references to "minimum wage" as well as to international standards – particularly ILO – and national legislative frameworks represent a clarification. However, we also note that by focusing more on the minimum wage as a reference, it highlights companies' difficulties to determine what constitutes an adequate wage in every country they operate. Given these difficulties, simplification measures could go further and we suggest that companies should focus on the countries where they have significant employment (as per the new definition proposed).

29) SFDR and other EU datapoints in Appendix B of Amended ESRS 2

Question: do you agree with the way the SFDR PAI have been incorporated in the Amended ESRS?

- YES**
- PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE
- NO

To implement non-financial strategies as well as to meet SFDR requirements, financial market participants need to have access to ESG data of the highest possible quality as easily as possible. In this regard, CSRD reporting has a key role to play and SFDR 2.0 should be consistent with the changes made to CSRD and the ESRS, i.e., future indicators to be disclosed by FMPs under SFDR 2.0 should be selected among datapoints set out in the updated ESRS.

32) ESRS G1 DR G1-2 and G1-6: Payment practices

Question: is the current replacement/formulation sufficient to meet the objectives of the CSRD in respect to the protection of SMEs?

YES

PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE

NO

We welcome the proposed changes to G1 where a clear PAT structure has been introduced, similar to the one observed in other topical standards. We consider that companies still need to report on payment practices, including for SMEs. However, with regard to DR G1-6, paragraph 20 (a), the requirement for companies to describe their “standard payment terms in number of days by main category of supplier, including SMEs” could be further specified, by explaining that SMEs should represent a separate category.

33) Overall feedback per standard

Question: do you agree that the proposed Amended ESRS strikes an appropriate balance between the need for significant simplification and meeting the core objectives of the European Green Deal?

	I AGREE	I PARTIALLY AGREE/PARTIALLY DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	COMMENTS
ESRS 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Why partial disagreement:</u> We do not agree with some simplifications (ex: on the DMA, the gross/net new rule, support the undue cost or efforts but suggest to introduce a time-bound limit, reduce reporting on connectivity, etc.) and we identified need for important clarifications (ex: on fair presentation). There are also areas for further simplifications (e.g. more flexibility on the presentation, on DMA).
ESRS 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Why partial disagreement:</u> we identified need for important clarifications and guidance (ex: for current and financial anticipated effects, guidance on DMA reporting). Some DR could be streamlined (ex: merge some IRO-1 datapoints) or deleted (ex: GOV-3 on due diligence)
ESRS E1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The deletion of the net-zero definition (E1-7) is detrimental to the core objective of the European Green Deal.
ESRS E2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Why partial disagreement:</u> some important datapoints related to expenditures on incidents/remediations costs deleted in previous E2-6 should be reintroduced (as an item of the Action section)
ESRS E3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ESRS E4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Why partial disagreement:</u> support the inclusion of the TP but important clarification are needed

				(minimum content, conditions for disclosures). In addition, need to highlight the importance of the value chain in the guidance.
ESRS E5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Unsold products appear to be a missing point in E5 even though they are key elements of circular economy and European Policy. As they are mentioned in the Regulation 2024/1781 ESPR (Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation which entered into force on 18 July 2024) as being eligible for inclusion in sustainability reports, an AR related to unsold products would ensure consistency between regulation and a better coverage of circular economy topic.</p>
ESRS S1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><u>Why partial disagreement:</u> We consider that disclosures on policies, actions and targets could be further simplified by removing redundancies. We also suggest to further simplify the information required on the adequate wage and annual total remuneration ratio. Finally,</p> <p><u>Other general S1 comment:</u></p> <p>1) The definitions of employees, non-employees and workers in the value chain (section “Objective” of S1) still lack enough details or examples to provide insights on how to classify some workers categories. For instance, should interns and franchisees be categorized as non-employees or workers in the value chain? This is important as some companies rely on franchisees as part of their business model.</p> <p>2) Paragraph 3 of ESRS S1 states that DR S1-5 and S1-16 should be applied whenever a company concludes that S1 is material; we consider that this creates different materiality regimes that may impair the readability and understandability of the standards. If even all DRs within ESRS 2 are now subject to the materiality assessment, it seems surprising to treat the S1 standard differently. Therefore, we consider that the materiality principle should apply regardless of the topic covered.</p>
ESRS S2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><u>Why partial disagreement:</u> We consider that disclosures on policies, actions and targets could be further simplified by removing redundancies.</p>
ESRS S3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><u>Why partial disagreement:</u> We consider that disclosures on policies, actions and targets could be further simplified by removing redundancies.</p>

ESRS S4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Why partial disagreement:</u> We consider that disclosures on policies, actions and targets could be further simplified by removing redundancies.
ESRS G1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Why partial disagreement:</u> We disagree with EFRAG’s proposal to change the metric on confirmed incidents of corruption from voluntary to mandatory. We consider that this metric lacks legal basis to ensure a uniform application.
Glossary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The AMF identifies two remaining comments related to the Glossary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water balance definition (from E3) is missing in the glossary. Since this concept, which originates from hydrology and agriculture, is not commonly used by companies, it would be useful to clarify the term and reiterate the formula described in the AR 1 for §17. - Double materiality definition: typo identified; the draft does not include the term “financial” when mentioning financial materiality (need to align with the second part of the definition that is given).

34) Any other comments

Question: please provide here any other comments on the 12 EDs or on the Glossary.

Please note that in the context of this consultation, the AMF conducted an in-depth study of the reporting practices of a sample of listed companies that published their first sustainability statement in 2025. This AMF’s study « [Corporate Sustainability reporting: the way forward](#) » available in English will be shared with EFRAG and will be published on the AMF’s website.

PART 3: DETAILED FEEDBACK AT LEVEL OF DR OR PARAGRAPH OF THE ED

Question: do you agree that the proposed Amended ESRS strikes an appropriate balance between the need for significant simplification and meeting the core objectives of the European Green Deal?

	I AGREE	I PARTIALLY AGREE/ DISAGREE	I DISAGREE	COMMENT
ESRS 1 – 3.3 Double materiality assessment		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Paragraph 28 of ESRS 1 seems to imply that materiality thresholds are to be set for each and every materiality criterion (scale, scope, likelihood, etc.) which seems disproportionate. While thresholds are key and should still be mentioned in ESRS 1 and ESRS 2, this paragraph could be simplified by deleting the first part of §28 (“When applying the criteria set under Chapters 3.3.1 and 3.3.2”)
ESRS 2 – IRO 1 Description of the process to identify and assess material impacts, risks and opportunities and material information to be reported		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Two comments: 1. reinforce guidance in AR 19 to avoid boilerplate disclosures. For instance, “data sources and tools used for specific sustainability topics” (reflect current reporting good practices). 2. Streamline IRO-1 datapoints to regroup methodological aspects in one §. Proposed wording: "26. The undertaking shall disclose the following: a) an overview of the methods, assumptions, inputs (including whether and how views of affected stakeholders are factored) and judgements used during the assessment, in particular regarding materiality (qualitative and/or quantitative) thresholds; b) whether and how the undertaking prioritises sustainability risks relative to other types of business risks, including its use of risk assessment tools; and c) a description of the decision-making procedures, including significant changes compared to prior reporting period."
E1-2 - Climate-related risks and scenario analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The current drafting does not help to understand that the scenario analysis is optional, contrary to what §247 of the BC (p.45) seems to indicate.

<p>E1-9 - GHG removals and GHG mitigation projects financed through carbon credits</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Clarify the definition of “removals”, in particular in relation to transferred emissions. 2) Clarify to what extent carbon credits and removals can both be used to net residual emissions in the context of net-zero targets (<u>Disagree</u>: cf. our comment related to the reintroduction of the “net-zero targets” definition, PART 2).
<p>E2-2 - Actions and resources related to pollution</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>It is important to keep as mandatory the metric related to the provisions for environmental protection and remediation costs, as it provides valuable information. The datapoints from “ex E2-6” should be moved under GDR-A §38 or E2-2 (Actions related to pollution) in relation to significant Capex/Opex dedicated to key action of remediation and protection, as this is more related to actions than anticipated financial effects.</p>
<p>E2-4 - Pollution of air, water and soil</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Clarify the term “regular operations”: does it mean “own operations” or does it also cover part of the value chain? The scope should be specified and the terminology streamlined.</p>
<p>E4-5 - Metrics related to biodiversity and ecosystems change</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In AR, make explicit that metrics chosen can cover both the perimeter of own operations and/or the value chain. 2) Use a terminology closer to the drivers of biodiversity and ecosystem changes, by referring to “use-changes” (which is also the term used in the Glossary) and provide guidance on the hierarchy of drivers based on IPBES hierarchy. 3) Delete reference to “IBAT” in AR8 (useful tool but private initiative that is fee-based).
<p>S1-1</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Reduce PAT datapoints: S1-1, paragraph 11 already requires the undertaking to describe its policies for managing its material IRO. Yet, paragraphs 12 and 13 <u>require again</u> for the undertaking to disclose if its policies explicitly address human rights issues and health and safety. Those two datapoints should be covered by paragraph 11 and therefore paragraphs 12 and 13 could be removed.</p>

S1-3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disclosures under ESRS 2, GDR-A seem sufficient to cover a company's actions and associated resources to manage IROs in relation to its own workforce. Therefore, paragraph 19 of S1-3 could be removed.
S1-4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Paragraph 21 could be limited to the link with ESRS 2, GDR-T only. The disclosure on whether and how the undertaking engaged directly with its own workforce for the purpose of target setting and tracking performance seems overly narrative and already not necessarily published by companies.
S1-5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The distribution of employees by age group should be maintained as this is an information that users are interested in to understand the overall workforce age management.
S1-9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Companies face difficulties in determining what constitutes an adequate wage in every country they operate. Given these difficulties, simplification measures could go further and we suggest that companies should focus on the countries where they have significant employment (as per the definition proposed).
S1-15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The annual total remuneration is difficult to calculate on a consolidated basis. We suggest to allow companies to publish a metric by country for countries with significant employment (as per the new definition proposed).
S1-16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Paragraph 3 of ESRS S1 states that DR S1-5 and S1-16 should be applied whenever a company concludes that S1 is material; we consider that this creates different materiality regimes that may impair the readability and understandability of the standards. If even all DRs within ESRS 2 are now subject to the materiality assessment, it seems surprising to treat the S1 standard differently. Therefore, we consider that the materiality principle should apply regardless of the topic covered.