

Targeted consultation on the implementation of the Sustainable Finance Disclosures Regulation (SFDR)

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The [Sustainable Finance Disclosures Regulation \(SFDR\)](#) started applying in March 2021 and requires financial market participants and financial advisers to disclose at entity and product levels how they integrate sustainability risks and principal adverse impacts in their processes at both entity and product levels. It also introduces additional product disclosures for sustainable financial products making sustainability claims.

This targeted consultation aims at gathering information from a wide range of stakeholders, including financial practitioners, non-governmental organisations, national competent authorities, as well as professional and retail investors, on their experiences with the implementation of the SFDR. The Commission is interested in understanding how the SFDR has been implemented and any potential shortcomings, including in its interaction with the other parts of the European framework for sustainable finance, and in exploring possible options to improve the framework.

The main topics to be covered in this questionnaire are:

1. current requirements of the SFDR
2. interaction with other sustainable finance legislation
3. potential changes to the disclosure requirements for financial market participants
4. potential establishment of a categorisation system for financial products

Sections 1 and 2 cover the SFDR as it is today, exploring how the regulation is working in practice and the potential issues stakeholders might be facing in implementing it. Sections 3 and 4 look to the future, assessing possible options to address any potential shortcomings. As there are crosslinks between aspects covered in the different sections, respondents are encouraged to look at the questionnaire in its entirety and adjust their replies accordingly.

Please note that::

- we advise you to **save your draft reply regularly** by clicking on the “**Save as draft**” button on the right side of the screen
- some questions of this online questionnaire are displayed only when a specific response is given to a previous question
- in order to ensure a fair and transparent consultation process **only responses received through our online questionnaire will be taken into account** and included in the report summarising the responses. Should you have a problem completing this questionnaire or if you require particular assistance, please contact fisma-sfdr@ec.europa.eu

More information on

- [this consultation](#)
- [the consultation document](#)
- [the related public consultation](#)
- [sustainability-related disclosure in the financial services sector](#)
- [the protection of personal data regime for this consultation](#)

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
-

- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Alba

* Surname

Berhami Sintomer

* Email (this won't be published)

alba.berhami-sintomer@e3g.org

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

E3G

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Martinique | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia | <input type="radio"/> Fiji | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan | <input type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh

- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan

- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria

- Burkina Faso
- Burundi

- Cambodia
-

- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands

- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland

- Grenada
- Guadeloupe

- Guam

- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau

- Guyana

- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
-

- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova

- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma

- Namibia
- Nauru

- Nepal

- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua

- Niger

- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
-

- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland

- Syria

- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand

- The Gambia

- Timor-Leste
- Togo

- Tokelau
- Tonga

- Trinidad and Tobago
-

- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena
- Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

* Field of activity or sector

- Accounting
- Auditing
- Banking
- Credit rating agencies
- Insurance
- Pension provision
- Investing
- Investment management (e.g. hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, money market funds, securities)
- Financial advice
- Administration of benchmarks
- Providing of ESG data and/or ratings
- Structuring/issuance of securities
- Market infrastructure operation (e.g. CCPs, CSDs, Stock exchanges)
- Social entrepreneurship
- Other
- Not applicable

* Please specify your activity field(s) or sector(s)

Independent Climate Change Think Tank

* To which category do you mainly belong or do you mainly represent:

- I am a financial market participant as defined in Article 2(1) of the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR)
- I am a financial adviser as defined in Article 2(11) of SFDR
- I am both a financial market participant as defined in Article 2(1) of the SFDR and a financial adviser as defined in Article 2(11) of SFDR
- I am another type of financial undertaking that does not fall under the definition of financial market participant of the SFDR
- I am a non-financial undertaking
- I am a non-professional investor
- I am a professional investor
- I am a national authority or supervisor
- I am an NGO
- I am an ESG data and/or ratings provider

- I am a benchmark administrator
- I am an academic
- My organisation is none of the above

Please indicate your revenues, if applicable as published in your most recent financial statement (in million EUR):

Please indicate your balance sheet size, if applicable as published in your most recent financial statement (in million EUR):

* Do you have more than 500 employees on average during the financial year?

- Yes
- No

* Will your organisation be subject to the reporting requirements under the [Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive \(CSRD\)](#)?

(The CSRD requirements will apply to all large and all listed undertakings with limited liability (except listed micro-enterprises) according to categories defined in Article 3 of [Directive 2013/34/EU \(the Accounting Directive\)](#). Credit institutions and insurance undertakings with unlimited liability are also in scope subject to the same size criteria. Non-EU undertakings listed on the EU regulated markets and non-EU undertakings with a net turnover above EUR 150 million that carry out business in the EU will also have to publish certain sustainability-related information through their EU subsidiaries that are subject to CSRD (or - in the absence of such EU subsidiaries – through their EU branches with net turnover above EUR 40 million).

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

The Commission will publish all contributions to this targeted consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its**

transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.

Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Would you be available for follow-up questions under the contact information you provided above?

- Yes
 No

Section 1. Current requirements of the SFDR

The EU's sustainable finance policy is designed to attract private investment to support the transition to a sustainable, climate-neutral economy. The SFDR is designed to contribute to this objective by providing transparency to investors about the sustainability risks that can affect the value of and return on their investments ('outside-in' effect) and the adverse impacts that such investments have on the environment and society ('inside-out'). This is known as double materiality. This section of the questionnaire seeks to assess to what extent respondents consider that the SFDR is meeting its objectives in an effective and efficient manner and to identify their views about potential issues in the implementation of the regulation.

We are seeking the views of respondents on how the SFDR works in practice. In particular, we would like to know more about potential issues stakeholders might have encountered regarding the concepts it establishes and the disclosures it requires.

Question 1.1 The SFDR seeks to strengthen transparency through sustainability-related disclosures in the financial services sector to support the EU's shift to a sustainable, climate neutral economy.

In your view, is this broad objective of the regulation still relevant?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 1.2 Do you think the SFDR disclosure framework is effective in achieving the following specific objectives (included in its [Explanatory Memorandum](#) and mentioned in its recitals):

Note: In this questionnaire we refer to the term ‘end investor’ (retail or professional) to designate the ultimate beneficiary of the investments in financial products (as defined under the SFDR) made by a person for their own account.

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Increasing transparency towards end investor with regard to the integration of sustainability risks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increasing transparency towards end investor with regard to the consideration of adverse sustainability impacts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strengthening protection of end investors and making it easier for them to benefit from and compare among a wide range of financial products and services, including those with sustainability claims	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Channelling capital towards investments considered sustainable, including transitional investments ('investments considered sustainable' should be understood in a broad sense, not limited to the definition of sustainable investment set out in Article 2(17) of SFDR)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>Ensuring that ESG considerations are integrated into the investment and advisory process in a consistent manner across the different financial services sectors</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Ensuring that remuneration policies of financial market participants and financial advisors are consistent with the integration of sustainability risks and, where relevant, sustainable investment targets and designed to contribute to long-term sustainable growth</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 1.3 Do you agree that opting for a disclosure framework at EU level was more effective and efficient in seeking to achieve the objectives mentioned in Question 1.2 than if national measures had been taken at Member State level?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 1.4 Do you agree that the costs of disclosure under the SFDR framework are proportionate to the benefits it generates (informing end investors, channelling capital towards sustainable investments)?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

We are seeking the views of respondents on how the SFDR works in practice and the impact it has had.

Question 1.5 To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The SFDR has raised awareness in the financial services sector of the potential negative impacts that investment decisions can have on the environment and/or people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Financial market participants have changed the way they make investment decisions and design products since they have been required to disclose sustainability risks and adverse impacts at entity and product level under the SFDR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The SFDR has had indirect positive effects by increasing pressure on investee companies to act in a more sustainable manner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

We would also like to know more about potential issues stakeholders might have encountered regarding the concepts that the SFDR establishes and the disclosures it requires.

Question 1.6 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Some disclosures required by the SFDR are not sufficiently useful to investors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Some legal requirements and concepts in the SFDR, such as 'sustainable investment', are not sufficiently clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The SFDR is not used as a disclosure framework as intended, but as a labelling and marketing tool (in particular Articles 8 and 9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Data gaps make it challenging for market participants to disclose fully in line with the legal requirements under the SFDR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Re-use of data for disclosures is hampered by a lack of a common machine-readable format that presents data in a way that makes them easy to extract	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
There are other deficiencies with the SFDR rules (please in text box following question 1.7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Question 1.7 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The issues raised in question 1.6 create legal uncertainty for financial market participants and financial advisers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The issues raised in question 1.6 create reputational risks for financial market participants and financial advisers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The issues raised in question 1.6 do not allow distributors to have a sufficient or robust enough knowledge of the sustainability profile of the products they distribute	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
The issues raised in question 1.6 create a risk of greenwashing and mis-selling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The issues raised in question 1.6 prevent capital from being allocated to sustainable investments as effectively as it could be	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The current framework does not effectively capture investments in transition assets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The current framework does not effectively support a robust enough use of shareholder engagement as a means to support the transition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Others



Please provide any additional explanations as necessary for questions 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G believes that the SFDR has been a landmark legislation in its push for sustainable financial markets: the SFDR has improved transparency on integration of sustainability risks and consideration of adverse sustainability impacts in investment decisions and financial advice as well as raised awareness among markets participants on how these are integrated in decisional investment processes.

While it does contain room for improvement - due to its complex reporting system which needs some reform in terms of coherence and effective coordination with other more recent legislations – the SFDR does remain effective in its initial intent and objectives.

Under this general remark, E3G considers that the SFDR also needs updating on more technical grounds for a harmonized result that could serve its users and objectives more effectively.

In particular, E3G regrets that there is no requirement for Article 8 and Article 9 products to reveal the intended investor impact, leaving the door open to greenwashing practices (particularly in the context of misleading environmental impact claims for financial products).

Under Article 8, there are no regulatory criteria to specify eligible investment targets, investing styles, investing tools, strategies or methodologies to be employed.

Article 9 merely refers to ‘investing in an economic activity that has a positive impact.’ As such, it fails to consider what role the investor may have played in bringing about or increasing said positive impact.

In practice, most FMPs disclosure methodologies linked to Article 8 and Article 9 criteria refer to self-referencing metrics in explaining how they assess the degree of sustainability of an investment. No clear indicators of the results of this assessment are provided, making it impossible for end-investors to understand how the sustainability was assessed and whether and how the PAI indicators were applied. This is often the case for green products claiming to pursue climate change targets or characteristics while failing to properly inform on their assessment methodologies concerning, for example, climate targets and transition plans.

Sustainability assessment requirements and greenwashing are key areas to be addressed to fulfil the objective of reorienting finance towards sustainable investment.

E3G recommends developing minimum criteria for both Article 8 and Article 9 products.

E3G’s specific recommendations include the following:

- Provide a definition of ‘sustainable investments’ that is clear and fit for purpose as well as introduce and define transition investments with a dedicated product category
- Set clear product categories that engage in sustainability claims and have selective minimum criteria underpinning each category
- Require minimum disclosure requirements for all financial products, including mandatory reporting against PAI indicators
- Require specific and tailored disclosure requirements for each category of products.
- Adjust the Principal Adverse Impact indicators to better suite correspondence with entity-level disclosures in order to strengthen the disclosure of PAI indicators at product level
- Include a product related disclaimer in precontractual arrangements to clarify which products do not integrate sustainability or ESG-related features

Disclosures of principal adverse impacts (PAIs)

There are several disclosures concerning PAIs in the SFDR. As a general rule, the SFDR requires financial market participants who consider PAIs to disclose them at entity level on their website. It also includes a mandatory requirement for financial market participants to provide such disclosures when they have more than 500 employees (Article 4). The [Delegated Regulation](#) of the SFDR includes a list of these PAI indicators. These entity level PAI indicators are divided into three tables in the Delegated Regulation. Indicators listed in table 1 are mandatory for all participants, and indicators in tables 2 and 3 are subject to a materiality assessment by the financial market participant (at least one indicator from table 2 and one from table 3 must be included in every PAI statement).

Second, the SFDR requires financial market participants who consider PAIs at entity level to indicate in the pre-contractual documentation whether their financial products consider PAIs (Article 7) and to report the impacts in the corresponding periodic disclosures (Article 11). When reporting these impacts, financial market participants may rely on the PAI indicators defined at entity level in the Delegated Regulation.

Finally, in accordance with the empowerment given in Article 2a of SFDR, the Delegated Regulation requires that the do no significant harm (DNSH) assessment of the sustainable investment definition is carried out by taking into account the PAI indicators defined at entity level in Annex I of the Delegated Regulation.

In this context:

Question 1.8 To what extent do you agree with the following statements about entity level disclosures?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
I find it appropriate that certain indicators are always considered material (i.e. "principal") to the financial market participant for its entity level disclosures, while having other indicators subject to a materiality assessment by the financial market participant (approach taken in Annex I of the SFDR Delegated Regulation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would find it appropriate that all indicators are always considered material (i.e. "principal") to the financial market participant for its entity level disclosures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would find it appropriate that all indicators are always subject to a materiality assessment by the financial market participant for its entity level disclosures	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 1.8.1 When following the approach described in the first statement of question 1.8 above, do you agree that the areas covered by the current indicators listed in table 1 of the Delegated Regulation are the right ones to be considered material in all cases?

- 1 - Totally disagree
 - 2 - Mostly disagree
 - 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
 - 4 - Mostly agree
 - 5 - Totally agree
 - Don't know / no opinion / not applicable
-

Question 1.9 To what extent do you agree with the following statements about product level disclosures?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The requirement to 'take account of' PAI indicators listed in Annex I of the Delegated Regulation for the DNSH assessment, does not create methodological challenges	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the context of product disclosures for the do no significant harm (DNSH) assessment, it is clear how materiality of principal adverse impact (PAI) indicators listed in Annex I of the Delegated Regulation should be applied	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The possibility to consider the PAI indicators listed in Annex I of the Delegated Regulation for product level disclosures of Article 7 do not create methodological challenges	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is clear how the disclosure requirements of Article 7 as regards principal adverse impacts interact with the requirement to disclose information according to Article 8 when the product promotes environmental and/or social characteristics and with the requirement to disclose information according to Article 9 when the product has sustainable investment as its objective	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any additional explanations as necessary for questions 1.8, 1.8.1 and 1.9:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The SFDR significantly incorporates the notion of 'adverse sustainability impacts' in Articles 1, 4, 7, 19 and 'principal adverse impact on sustainability factors' in Articles 4 and 7. The EU Taxonomy Regulation has introduced the concept of 'Do No Significant Harm' (DNSH) through technical screening criteria in Article 17, supplemented by Articles 10-15. We notice that the DNSH concept is re-used in the definition of sustainable investment in Article 2(17) SFDR in the following way: 'provided that such investments do not significantly harm any of those objectives'. This configuration of regulatory safeguarding concepts does, in our view, create an inconsistency as the DNSH concept is absent from the provisions of Articles 4 and 7 rather focusing on adverse impacts and principal adverse impacts.

This discrepancy of terms and definitions in both texts of law is prone to generate confusion. E3G supports a more harmonized approach that ensures alignment between the SFDR's adverse impact provisions and the DNSH criteria laid out in the EU Taxonomy Regulation, wherever relevant and possible. This adjustment would prove beneficial in terms of cross-harmonization and consistency of the EU sustainable finance regulatory framework as well as in reducing complexity for FMPs during the implementation phase.

E3G considers essential to maintain the current list of PAI indicators in Tables 1, 2 and 3 of Annex I of the SFDR Delegated Regulation and the consideration of a number of these indicators as always material for all financial products, while improving their usability and comparability vis-à-vis FMPs.

We support the extension of the list of PAIs to specific social indicators as suggested by the ESAs in their final report amending the RTS in the SFDR Delegated Regulation.

E3Gs maintains that the social indicators concerning human rights and sustainability due diligence need to be overhauled. Indicators #10 and #11 related to the OECD Guidelines and UN Guiding Principles in Table 1 are not supported by meaningful metrics and indicators in Table 3 do not result in meaningful information if applied in isolation.

Most of the environmental indicators are not outcome/objective-oriented, and therefore there is a lack of clarity on how they should be considered in the context of the DNSH principle.

Product-level PAI disclosures need to be strengthened and a harmonized approach to the use of PAI indicators is crucial in order to make comparability of products with similar objectives and investment strategies possible.

Currently, the SFDR requires only financial market participants who consider PAIs at entity-level to indicate in pre-contractual documentation whether their financial products consider PAIs. E3G believes that the SFDR framework should require FMPs to disclose whether their financial products consider PAIs regardless of whether or not they consider PAIs at entity-level.

In particular, disclosure of some PAI indicators should be mandatory for all financial products and should cover all the PAIs that are listed in Table 1 of Annex I of the SFDR Delegated Regulation.

The SFDR should require FMPs to disclose PAIs at the product level by specifying the modalities of their consideration in investment strategies decision making processes and contain - at a minimum - the applicable climate, own workforce, and human rights indicators.

Additional mandatory disclosure of relevant PAI indicators should also be required at product-level to

illustrate sustainability claims of products falling within the categories of the reviewed SFDR framework.

Entity-level disclosures of PAI indicators are essentially a consolidation of product-level PAI indicators, therefore, we consider that FMPs already have the necessary data to disclose. End-investors also interested in the sustainability performance of the entity, consider entity-level PAIs disclosures to be an important factor in their selection and consideration of investment products – where said products have similar characteristics and are offered by different FMPs wider comparability terms become more relevant. Therefore, we consider that there is an interest in keeping entity-level PAIs separate from product-level PAIs disclosures.

The cost of disclosures under the SFDR today

Questions 1.10, 1.10.1 and 1.11 are intended for financial market participants and financial advisors subject to the SFDR.

The following two questions aim to assess the costs of the SFDR disclosure requirements distinguishing between one-off and recurring costs. One-off costs are incurred only once to implement a new reporting requirement, e.g. getting familiarised with the legal act and the associated regulatory or implementing technical standards, setting-up data collection processes or adjusting IT-systems. Recurring costs occur repeatedly every year once the new reporting is in place, e.g. costs of annual data collection and report preparation. In the specific case of precontractual disclosures for example, there are one-off costs to set up the process of publishing precontractual disclosures when a new product is launched, and recurring annual costs to repeat the process of publishing pre-contractual disclosures each time a new product is launched (depends on the number of products launched on average each year). These two questions apply both to entity and product level disclosures.

Question 1.10 Could you provide estimates of the one-off and recurring annual costs associated with complying with the SFDR disclosure requirements (EUR)?

Please split these estimates between internal costs incurred by the financial market participant and any external services contracted to assist in complying with the requirements (services from third-party data providers, advisory services, etc.).

If such a breakdown is not possible, please provide the total figures.

Please leave the cell blank for the data you are not able to provide.

	Estimated one off costs (in euros)	Estimated recurring annual costs (in euros)
Total internal costs		
Internal costs for personnel		
Internal costs for IT		
Total external costs		
External costs for data providers		
External costs for advisory services		

Total costs of SFDR disclosure requirements		
--	--	--

Question 1.10.1: Could you split the total costs between product level and entity level disclosures?

Please leave the cell blank for the data you are not able to provide.

	Product-level disclosures (in %)	Entity-level disclosures (in %)
Estimated percentage of costs		

If you wish, please provide additional details:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Question 1.11 In order to have a better understanding of internal costs, could you provide an estimate of how many full-time-equivalents (FTEs - 1 FTE corresponds to 1 employee working full-time the whole year) are involved in preparing SFDR disclosures?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Question 1.11.1 Could you please provide a split between:

Please leave the cell blank for the data you are not able to provide.

	Retrieving the data (in %)	Analysing the data (in %)	Reporting SFDR disclosures (in %)	Other (in %)
Estimated percentage				

Please specify what corresponds to “other” costs:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Data and estimates

Financial market participants' and financial advisers' ability to fulfil their ESG transparency requirements depends in part on other disclosure requirements under the EU framework. In particular, they will rely to a significant extent on the [Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive \(CSRD\)](#). However, entities are not reporting yet under those new disclosure requirements, or they may not be within the scope of the CSRD. Besides, even when data is already available today, it may not always be of good quality.

Question 1.12 Are you facing difficulties in obtaining good-quality data?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 1.12.2 Is the SFDR sufficiently flexible to allow for the use of estimates?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 1.12.3 Is it clear what kind of estimates are allowed by the SFDR?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 1.12.4 If you use estimates, what kind of estimates do you use to fill the data gap?

a) For entity level principal adverse impacts:

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Estimates from data providers, based on data coming from the investee companies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Estimates from data providers, based on data coming from other sources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In-house estimates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Internal ESG score models	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
External ESG score models	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

b) For taxonomy aligned investments (product level):

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Estimates from data providers,						

based on data coming from the investee companies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Estimates from data providers, based on data coming from other sources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In-house estimates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Internal ESG score models	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
External ESG score models	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) For sustainable investments (product level):

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Estimates from data providers, based on data coming from the investee companies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Estimates from data providers, based on	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

data coming from other sources						
In-house estimates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Internal ESG score models	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
External ESG score models	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

d) Other data points:

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Estimates from data providers, based on data coming from the investee companies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Estimates from data providers, based on data coming from other sources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In-house estimates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Internal ESG score models	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

External ESG score models	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 1.12.5 Do you engage with investee companies to encourage reporting of the missing data?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please provide further explanations to your replies to questions 1.12 to 1.12.5:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In relation to Q 1.12.5.: multiple sources of data analysis suggest that investment managers have not been particularly demanding in terms of pushing investee companies enough to report the required data set. Investors need to have access to sustainability data from scope 1, 2, and 3 GHG emissions, climate targets, net zero transition plans and other sustainability metrics. Data points necessary for reporting under the SFDR are included in the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS), which applies starting 1 January 2024. The current ESRS indicators are, regrettably, subject to materiality assessment. In order to push for a streamlined regulatory framework for data point collection, reporting and transparent accessibility E3G supports the proposition made by the ESAs in their reviewed RTS to the SFDR Delegated Regulation that seeks alignment of the wording used in a number of PAI indicators with that used in the ESRS.

Question 1.13 Have you increased your offer of financial products that make sustainability claims since the disclosure requirements of Articles 8 and 9 of the SFDR began to apply (i.e. since 2021, have you been offering more products that you categorise as Articles 8 and 9 than those you offered before the regulation was in place and for which you also claimed a certain sustainability performance)?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
-

- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 1.13.1 Please specify how the share of financial products making sustainability claims has evolved in the past years

(Please express it as a percentage of the total financial products you offered each year)

	Percentage of the total financial products
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	

Question 1.13.2 If you have increased your offering of financial products making sustainability claims, in your view, has any of the following factors influenced this increase?

	1 (not at all)	2 (not really)	3 (partially)	4 (mostly)	5 (totally)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
SFDR requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Retail investor interest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional investor interest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Market competitiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other factors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide further explanations to your replies to questions 1.13, 1.13.1 and 1.13.2:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Section 2. Interaction with other sustainable finance legislation

The SFDR interacts with other parts of the EU's sustainable finance framework. Questions in this section will therefore seek respondents' views about the current interactions, as well as potential inconsistencies or misalignments that might exist between the SFDR and other sustainable finance legislation. There is a need to assess the potential implications for other sustainable finance legal acts if the SFDR legal framework was changed in the future. Questions as regards these potential implications are included in section 4 of this questionnaire, when consulting on the potential establishment of a categorisation system for products, and they do not prejudice future positions that might be taken by the Commission.

The SFDR mainly interacts with the following legislation and their related delegated and implementing acts:

- the [Taxonomy Regulation](#)
- the [Benchmarks Regulation](#)
- the [Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive \(CSRD\)](#)
- the [Markets in Financial Instruments Directive \(MiFID 2\)](#) and the [Insurance Distribution Directive \(IDD\)](#)
- the [Regulation on Packaged Retail Investment and Insurance Products \(PRIIPs\)](#)

Other legal acts that are currently being negotiated may also interact with the SFDR in the future. They are not covered in this questionnaire as the detailed requirements of these legal acts have not yet been agreed. At this stage, it would be speculative to seek to assess how their interaction with SFDR would function.

Both the SFDR and the Taxonomy Regulation introduce key concepts to the sustainable finance framework. Notably, they introduce definitions of 'sustainable investment' (SFDR) and 'environmentally sustainable' economic activities (taxonomy). Both definitions require, inter alia, a contribution to a sustainable objective and a do no significant harm (DNSH) test. But while these definitions are similar, there are differences between them which could create practical challenges for market participants.

Question 2.1 The [Commission recently adopted a FAQ](#) clarifying that investments in taxonomy-aligned 'environmentally sustainable' economic activities can automatically qualify as 'sustainable investments' in those activities under the SFDR.

To what extent do you agree that this FAQ offers sufficient clarity to market participants on how to treat taxonomy-aligned investment in the SFDR product level disclosures?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

The Benchmarks Regulation introduces two categories of climate benchmarks – the EU climate transition benchmark (EU CTB) and the EU Paris-aligned benchmark (EU PAB) - and requires benchmark administrators to disclose on ESG related matters for all benchmarks (except interest rate and foreign exchange benchmarks). The SFDR makes reference to the CTB and PAB in connection with financial products that have the reduction of carbon emissions as their objective. Both legal frameworks are closely linked as products disclosing under the SFDR can for example passively track a CTB or a PAB or use one of them as a reference benchmark in an active investment strategy. More broadly, passive products rely on the design choices made by the benchmark administrators.

Question 2.2 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The questions & answers published by the Commission in April 2023 specifying that the SFDR deems products passively tracking CTB and PAB to be making 'sustainable investments' as defined in the SFDR provide sufficient clarity to market participants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The approach to DNSH and good governance in the SFDR is consistent with the environmental, social and governance exclusions under the PAB/CTB	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ESG information provided by benchmark administrators is sufficient and is aligned with the information required by the SFDR for products tracking or referencing these benchmarks	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Both the SFDR and the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) introduce entity level disclosure requirements with a double-materiality approach^[1]. The CSRD sets out sustainability reporting requirements mainly for all large and all listed undertakings with limited liability (except listed micro-enterprises)^[2], while the SFDR introduces sustainability disclosure requirements at entity level for financial market participants and financial advisers as regards the consideration of sustainability related factors in their investment decision-making process. Moreover, in order for financial market participants and financial advisers to meet their product and entity level disclosure obligations under the SFDR, they will rely to a significant extent, on the information reported according to the CSRD and its [European Sustainability Reporting Standards \(ESRS\)](#) (provided positive scrutiny of co-legislators of the [ESRS delegated act](#)).

¹ Transparency requirements relate to the sustainability risks that can affect the value of investments (SFDR) or companies (CSRD) ('outside-in' effect) and the adverse impacts that such investments or companies have on the environment and society ('inside-out').

² Credit institutions and insurance undertakings with unlimited liability are also in scope subject to the same size criteria. Non-EU undertakings listed on the EU regulated markets and non-EU undertakings with a net turnover above EUR 150 million that carry out business in the EU will also have to publish certain sustainability-related information through their EU subsidiaries that are subject to CSRD (or - in the absence of such EU subsidiaries – through their EU branches with net turnover above EUR 40 million).

Question 2.3 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The SFDR disclosures are consistent with the CSRD requirements, in particular with the European Sustainability Reporting Standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is room to streamline the entity level disclosure requirements of the SFDR and the CSRD	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Financial advisors (under MiFID 2) and distributors of insurance-based investment products (under IDD) have to conduct suitability assessments based on the sustainability preferences of customers. These assessments rely in part on sustainability-related information made available by market participants reporting under the SFDR.

Question 2.4 To what extent do you agree that the product disclosures required in the SFDR and [its Delegated Regulation](#) (e.g. the proportion of sustainable investments or taxonomy aligned investments, or information about principal adverse impacts) are sufficiently useful and comparable to allow distributors to determine whether a product can fit investors' sustainability preferences under MiFID 2 and the IDD?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 2.5 MIFID and IDD require financial advisors to take into account sustainability preferences of clients when providing certain services to them.

Do you believe that, on top of this behavioural obligation, the following disclosure requirements for financial advisors of the SFDR are useful?

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Article 3, entity level disclosures about the integration of sustainability risks policies in investment or insurance advice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Article 4, entity level disclosures						

about consideration of principal adverse impacts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Article 5, entity level disclosures about remuneration policies in relation to the integration of sustainability risks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Article 6, product level pre-contractual disclosures about the integration of sustainability risks in investment or insurance advice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Article 12, requirement to keep information disclosed according to Articles 3 and 5 up to date	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 2.6 Have the requirements on distributors to consider sustainability preferences of clients impacted the quality and consistency of disclosures made under SFDR?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

PRIIPs requires market participants to provide retail investors with [key information documents \(KIDs\)](#). As part of the [retail investment strategy](#), the Commission has recently proposed to include a new sustainability section in the KID to make sustainability-related information of investment products more visible, comparable and understandable for retail investors. Section 4 of this questionnaire includes questions related to PRIIPs, to seek stakeholders' views as regards potential impacts on the content of the KID if a product categorisation system was established.

Please clarify your replies to questions in section 2 as necessary:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In order to increase the quality and consistency of disclosures made under the SFDR, client sustainability preferences should require distributors to access more sustainability information to enable them to assess that information and issue recommendations tailored on specific financial products.

Although, in principle consistent with the ESRS in the environmental area, disclosure requirements concerning climate targets and transition plans are significantly more granular under the ESRS, therefore, E3G considers further alignment between PAI indicators and the ESRS to be beneficial to both FMPs and investee companies and a desirable outcome to prevent greenwashing practices from occurring.

For disclosures pertaining to the social area, the PAI indicators are far less aligned, in particular with respect to corporate sustainability due diligence and human rights.

E3G is of the view that the ESRS are much better aligned with the international instruments defining sustainability due diligence (i.e. OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprise and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights).

E3G reiterates that in order for financial assets' distributors to proactively meet investor's sustainability preferences it is essential that the SFDR makes the disclosure of key PAI indicators at product level prescriptive in their nature and that the criteria for product classification must be clearly and unequivocally stated.

The missing minimum criteria for the different product categories and the absence of harmonized PAIs disclosures already prevent a thorough assessment of financial products and hinder their comparability profiles for end-users as well as for distributors.

Question 2.1.: E3G believes there is merit in trying to improve the consistency between the investee company-level assessment of a 'sustainable investment' under the SFDR and the activity-level assessment of an 'environmentally sustainable' activity under the Taxonomy Regulation, which are complementary.

Identification of investments' adverse impacts should be conducted at investee company-level and consider the entirety of investee companies' activities. Investments in activities satisfying the Taxonomy TSC could be considered as sustainable investments under the SFDR under condition that they are tied to strict use of proceeds requirements vis-à-vis Taxonomy-aligned activities and provide guarantees that the remainder of the investee company's activities do not cause significant harm to environmental or social objectives as framed under the SFDR.

The Taxonomy framework should be extended to cover for social objectives as well as harmful and intermediate activities.

Question 2.2.: The list of mandatory PAI indicators in the RTS should be extended to the SFDR Delegated Regulation in order to ensure streamlining with other regulations such as the BMR PAB lists of exclusions.

Question 2.3.: The interaction between the SFDR and the CSRD is strategic and would ensure high quality disclosures by companies to investors looking for detailed information to inform their decision-making processes and to comply with the SFDR disclosure requirements. Investors need to have access to sustainability data from companies including key social & environmental indicators (scope 1, 2, and 3 GHG emissions, climate targets, net zero transition plans) and other sustainability metrics.

The datapoints necessary for investors to report under the SFDR are included in the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS), in force as of January, 1 2024 and subject to double materiality.

As previously stated, E3G supports maintaining investor-specific entity-level disclosures applicable under the SFDR.

Question 2.4./Question 2.5.: MiFID/IDD sustainability preferences categories, in their current formulation, might not be easy to understand for end-investors and are inconsistent with the current de facto market categorisation of products using the SFDR Articles 6, 8 and 9 classifications. The alignment of future product categorisation bearing clear sustainability objectives in the reviewed text of SFDR needs, therefore, to also be reflected in the MiFID/IDD sustainability preferences advisory process.

Section 3. Potential changes to disclosure requirements for financial market participants

3.1 Entity level disclosures

The SFDR contains entity level disclosure requirements for financial market participants and financial advisers. They shall disclose on their website their policies on the integration of sustainability risks in their investment decision-making process or their investment or insurance advice (Article 3). In addition, they shall disclose whether, and if so, how, they consider the principal adverse impacts of their investment decisions on sustainability factors. For financial market participants with 500 or more employees, the disclosure of a due diligence statement, including information of adverse impacts, is mandatory (Article 4). In addition, financial market participants and financial advisers shall disclose how their remuneration policies are consistent with the integration of sustainability risks (Article 5).

Question 3.1.1 Are these disclosures useful?

	1 (not at all)	2 (not really)	3 (partially)	4 (mostly)	5 (totally)	Don't know No opinion Not applicable
Article 3	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Article 4	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Article 5	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your replies to question 3.1.1 as necessary:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G considers reporting requirements fundamental, without entity-level reporting retail investors would lack understanding of the qualities of a product and whether a provider's behaviour is to be deemed consistent with the sustainability characteristics of a product.

E3G equally believes that all mandatory PAI indicators in table 1 of Annex 1 are necessary to form a proper sustainability picture on either product or entity.

E3G does not consider current SFDR Article 4 disclosures sufficient to compare entity-level PAI indicators between FMPs, although, we do see merit in calculating an FMP's entity-level metric to assess its adverse impacts over time.

Entity-level PAI indicators disclosure should focus on the specific due diligence policies established by FMPs vis-a-vis the environmental and social adverse impacts across the whole range of their financial products and product-level PAIs should be aggregated and disclosed at entity-level as part of the annual PAIs statement. Disclosure of FMPs integration of sustainability risks and their related remuneration policies should also be maintained as we consider this information to be useful and foster transparency and accountability vis-a-vis investors and the public of entity-level commitments to sustainable trajectories.

It is important to make sure that these do not duplicate or overlap with potential CSRD/ESRS disclosure requirements for entities falling under the scope of both regulations.

Complementing the [consultation by the European Supervisory Authorities \(ESAs\) on the revision of the regulatory technical standards of the SFDR](#), the Commission is interested in respondents' views as regards the principal adverse impact indicators required by the current Delegated Regulation.

Question 3.1.2 Among the specific entity level principal adverse impact indicators required by the [Delegated Regulation of the SFDR](#) adopted pursuant to Article 4 (tables 1, 2 and 3 of Annex I), which indicators do you find the most (and least) useful?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G sustains that ensuring consistent sustainability-disclosure requirements for all financial products within the EU - regardless of the sustainability claims they make -, is a necessary step toward transparency and investor confidence.

E3G recommends obtaining minimum sustainability information for all funds, not only for the green or sustainable ones.

E3G also believes that all mandatory PAI indicators in tables 1, 2 and 3 of Annex 1 are equally necessary to form a proper sustainability picture on either product or entity, and adds others to the list of recommendations:

Social and Governance related PAIs:

- Amount of accumulated earnings in non-cooperative tax jurisdictions
- Share of investments in investee companies with instances of interference in the formation of trade

unions or elections of workers' representatives as well as average collective bargaining agreement and trade union coverage rate.

- Share of employees earning less than the adequate wage across the value chain
- Collective bargaining coverage in investee companies according to ESRS S1-8.
- Women in management positions across the organisation in %
- Use of non-guaranteed-hour employees in investee companies,
- Use of temporary contract employees in investee companies,
- Use of non-employee workers in investee companies
- Employment of persons with disabilities in the workforce

Environment related PAIs:

- Decarbonisation related PAIs should be aligned with the ESRS, particularly where they mandate companies to report on transition plans.
- Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuels sector should be tackled in terms of share of investments in a) fossil fuel sector, b) coal sector, c) oil sector and d) gas sector.
- On PAI #4, a more detailed breakdown of fossil fuels exposures would offer additional and more relevant information vis-a`-vis investment decisions and would better align with the EU Taxonomy.

E3Gs maintains that the social indicators concerning human rights and sustainability due diligence need to be overhauled. Indicators #10 and #11 related to the OECD Guidelines and UN Guiding Principles in Table 1 are not supported by meaningful metrics while indicators in Table 3 do not result in meaningful information, if applied in isolation.

Most of the environmental indicators are not outcome/objective-oriented, therefore, we are of the view that there is a lack of clarity on how they should be considered in the context of the DNSH principle.

Overall, E3G welcomes the ESAs proposals to extend the list of mandatory and opt-in PAIs as part of their final report amending the RTS, laid down under the SFDR Delegated Regulation.

Several pieces of EU legislation require entity level disclosures, whether through transparency requirements on sustainability for businesses (for example the CSRD) or disclosure requirements regarding own ESG exposures (such as the Capital Requirements Regulation (CRR) and its Delegated Regulation).

Question 3.1.3 In this context, is the SFDR the right place to include entity level disclosures?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - Not really
- 3 - Partially
- 4 - Mostly
- 5 - Totally
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 3.1.4 To what extent is there room for streamlining sustainability-related entity level requirements across different pieces of legislation?



- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain your replies to questions in section 3.1 as necessary:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Entity-level disclosures in the SFDR are effectively the only mechanism which is specifically intended to enable retail investors (as well as other stakeholders) to scrutinize information vis-a-vis the sustainability motivations of investment decisions, which makes it necessary to have consistent, harmonized PAI requirements between product and entity level (as per our responses above). E3G is not supportive of any streamlining of entity-level disclosures which entails the removal of the mechanism intended to enable retail investors (as well as other stakeholders) to scrutinize entity-level disclosures information.

3.2 Product level disclosures

The SFDR includes product level disclosure requirements (Articles 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11) that mainly concern risk and adverse impact related information, as well as information about the sustainability performance of a given financial product. The regulation determines which information should be included in precontractual and periodic documentation and on websites.

The SFDR was designed as a disclosure regime, but is being used as a labelling scheme, suggesting that there might be a demand for establishing sustainability product categories. Before assessing whether there might be merit in setting up such product categories in Section 4, Section 3 includes questions analysing the need for possible changes to disclosures, as well as any potential link between product categories and disclosures. The need to ask about potential links between disclosures and sustainability product categories is the reason why this section contains some references to 'products making sustainability claims'. However, this does not pre-empt in any way a decision about how a potential categorisation system and an updated disclosure regime would interact if these were established. The Commission services are openly consulting on all these issues to further assess potential ways forward as regards the SFDR.

The Commission services would therefore like to collect feedback on what transparency requirements stakeholders consider useful and necessary. We would also like to know respondents' views on whether and how these transparency requirements should link to different potential categories of products.

The general principle of the SFDR is that products that make sustainability claims need to disclose information to back up those claims and combat greenwashing. This could be viewed as placing additional burden on products that factor in sustainability considerations. This is why, in the following questions Commission services ask respondents about the usefulness of uniform disclosure requirements for products across the board, regardless of related sustainability claims, departing from the general philosophy of the SFDR as regards product disclosures. Providing proportionate information on the sustainability profile of a product which does not make sustainability claims could make it easier for some

investors to understand products' sustainability performance, as they would get information also about products that are not designed to achieve any sustainability-related outcome. This section also contains questions exploring whether it could be useful to require financial market participants who make sustainability claims about certain products to disclose additional information (i.e. in case a categorisation system is introduced in the EU framework, the need to require additional information about products that would fall under a category).

Question 3.2.1 Standardised product disclosures - Should the EU impose uniform disclosure requirements for all financial products offered in the EU, regardless of their sustainability-related claims or any other consideration?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 3.2.1 a) If the EU was to impose uniform disclosure requirements for all financial products offered in the EU, should disclosures on a limited number of principal adverse impact indicators be required for all financial products offered in the EU?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please specify which principal adverse impact indicators should be required for all financial products offered in the EU:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G is persuaded that all mandatory PAI entity-level disclosures requirements should be applied to all financial products, to make room for use of comparable criteria. For sustainability focused financial products further information on the specific sustainability features of the financial products should be provided. Retail investors should have transparency on adverse impacts of all financial products – regardless of if they have a sustainability focus. This would generate support for more transparency on adverse impacts and allow retail clients to make properly informed investment decisions. Also, given the significant improvements expected in the coming years regarding sustainability data availability due to the application of the ESRS, all mandatory PAI indicators included in Table 1 of Annex I of the SFDR Delegated Regulation should be disclosed by all financial products when in the reviewed framework of the SFDR framework.

Under these premises, a minimum set of disclosures for all financial products should include at minima the following PAI indicators:

- 1- GHG emissions (and carbon footprint)
- 2- Exposure to companies active in the fossil fuel sector,
- 3- Share of non-renewable energy consumption & production
- 4- Energy consumption intensity per high impact climate sector
- 5- Activities negatively affecting biodiversity sensitive areas
- 6- Lack of processes and compliance mechanisms to monitor compliance with UN Guiding Principles and OECD Guidelines
- 7- Unadjusted gender pay gap
- 8- Employees earning less than an adequate wage

In addition, the following indicators from Table 2 and Table 3 of Annex I of the SFDR Delegated Regulation are also deemed highly relevant:

- 1- Investments in companies without carbon emission reduction initiatives
- 2- Land degradation, desertification, soil sealing
- 3- Low coverage of collective bargaining agreements
- 4- Excessive use of non-guaranteed-hour employees in investee companies
- 5- Excessive use of temporary contract employees in investee companies
- 6- Excessive use of non-employee workers in investee companies

Question 3.2.1 b) Please see a list of examples of disclosures that could also be required about all financial products for transparency purposes.

In your view, should these disclosures be mandatory, and/or should any other information be required about all financial products for transparency purposes?

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Taxonomy-related disclosures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engagement strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exclusions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Information about how ESG-related information						

is used in the investment process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Please explain as necessary your replies to questions 3.2.1 and its sub-questions:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

All products should also disclose whether investees are screened for their compliance with international norms or widely recognized frameworks of minimum business standards (i.e. Paris Agreement, UN treaties, Security Council sanctions, UN Global Compact (UNGC)/Guiding Principles, Universal Declaration of Human Rights and OECD guidelines).

E3G considers that sustainability reporting should be applicable to all products without distinctions in order to level the playing field by allowing a transparent comparison within non-sustainable products. This would also favour avoidance of 'greenwashing' practices and create transparency on adverse impacts which enhances responsible decisions from consumers. Additional reporting burden on product providers will be generally mitigated by the data already sourced at entity-level reporting.

Question 3.2.2 Standardised product disclosures - Would uniform disclosure requirements for **some financial products be a more appropriate approach, regardless of their sustainability-related claims (e.g. products whose assets under management, or equivalent, would exceed a certain threshold to be defined, products intended solely for retail investors, etc.)?**

(Please note that next question 3.2.3 asks specifically about the need for disclosures in cases of products making sustainability claims.)

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 3.2.2 a) If the EU was to impose uniform disclosure requirements for **some financial products, what would be the criterion/criteria that would trigger the reporting obligations?**

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Having uniform disclosure requirements for some but not all financial products would impair comparability of products by end consumers, especially in terms of adverse impact on sustainability issues.

Question 3.2.2 b) If the EU was to impose uniform disclosure requirements for **some financial products, should a limited number of principal adverse impact indicators be required?**

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 3.2.2 c) Please see a list of examples of disclosures that could also be required about the group of financial products that would be subject to standardised disclosure obligations for transparency purposes (in line with your answer to Q 3.2.2 above).

In your view, should these disclosures be mandatory, and/or should any other information be required about that group of financial products?

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Taxonomy-related disclosures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engagement strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Exclusions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Information about how ESG-related information is used in the investment process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify what other information should be required about the financial products that would be subject to disclosure obligations:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Please explain as necessary your replies to questions 3.2.2 and its sub-questions:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G has concerns related to the conditionality aspect on reporting as we retain that the main interest of applying disclosure requirements to all financial products is to level the playing field between them and applying disclosure requirements only to a subset of products would end up adding to more complexity whilst lessening comparability, further confusing markets.

The following and last section of this questionnaire (section 4) includes questions about the potential establishment of a sustainability product categorisation system at EU level based on certain criteria that products would have to meet. It presents questions about different ways of setting up such system, including whether additional category specific disclosure requirements should be envisaged. There are therefore certain links between questions in this section (section 3) and questions in the last section of the questionnaire (section 4).

Question 3.2.3 If requirements were imposed as per question 3.2.1 and/or 3.2.2, should there be some additional disclosure requirements when a product makes a sustainability claim?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain as necessary your replies to question 3.2.3:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

All products should report on the same baseline disclosures. Products making sustainability claims should have to disclose the relevant information to back these claims, i.e. percentage of alignment with the Taxonomy, their engagement strategy, exclusion and positive/negative screening. These would form the basis to assess whether the product meets the criteria for the relevant categories.

Sustainability product information disclosed according to the current requirements of the SFDR can be found in precontractual and periodic documentation and on financial market participants' websites, as required by Articles 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Question 3.2.4 In general, is it appropriate to have product related information spread across these three places, i.e. in precontractual disclosures, in periodic documentation and on websites?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 3.2.5 More specifically, is the current breakdown of information between precontractual, periodic documentation and websites disclosures appropriate and user friendly?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain as necessary your replies to questions 3.2.4 and 3.2.5:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G supports simplification and rationalization of the information made available to end-investors, particularly to retail clients. Information should be harmonized and streamlined.
A dashboard at the top of Annexes II-V of the SFDR Delegated Regulation could summarize the pre-contractual and periodic disclosures of key investor information.

Current website disclosures make it mandatory for product sustainability information to be publicly available. This includes portfolios managed under a portfolio management mandate, which can mean a large number of disclosures, as each of the managed portfolios is considered a financial product under the SFDR. A [Q&A published by the Commission in July 2021](#) (see question 3 of section V of the consolidated questions and answers (Q&A) on the SFDR and its Delegated Regulation published on the ESAs websites) clarified that where a financial market participant makes use of standard portfolio management strategies replicated for clients with similar investment profiles, transparency at the level of those standard strategies can be considered a way of complying with requirements on websites disclosures. This approach facilitates the compliance with Union and national law governing the data protection, and where relevant, it also ensures confidentiality owed to clients.

Question 3.2.6 To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
It is useful that product disclosures under SFDR are publicly available, (e.g. because they have the potential to bring wider societal benefits)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Confidentiality aspects need to be taken into account when specifying the information that should be made available to the public under the SFDR	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sustainability information about financial products should be made available to potential investors, investors or the public according to rules in sectoral legislation (e.g.: UCITS, AIFM, IORPs directives); the SFDR should not impose rules in this regard	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain as necessary your replies to question 3.2.6:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G strongly supports the product disclosures under the SFDR to be made publicly available and welcomes the fact that the SFDR disclosures are to be made publicly available under the European Single Access Point (ESAP). It is in the public interest to be informed on the sustainability (or the adverse impact) features of financial products. This will contribute to the comparability of information across products.

We consider the use of specific sectoral legislation to be detrimental to comparability and to the level playing field between different types of products. A possible exception would be following regulations targeting retail investors (i.e. KID PRIIPs) where access to information could be made easier to understand.

Current product-level disclosures have been designed to allow for comparability between financial products. The SFDR requires pre-contractual disclosures to be made in various documents for the different financial products in scope of the regulation. The disclosure requirements are the same, even though these documents have widely varying levels of detail or complexity, i.e. a UCITS prospectus can be several hundred pages long, while the Pan-European Pension Product Key Information Document (PEPP KID) comprises a few pages.

Question 3.2.7 To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The same sustainability disclosure topics and the exact same level of granularity of sustainability information (i.e. same number of datapoints) should be required in all types of precontractual documentation to allow for comparability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The same sustainability disclosure topics should be required in all types of precontractual documentation to allow for comparability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain as necessary your replies to question 3.2.7:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G supports comparability of information as well as same level of granularity to be available across all products range.

The SFDR requires pre-contractual disclosures to be made in various documents for the different financial products in scope of the regulation and, while the disclosure requirements are the same, these documents have widely varying levels of detail or complexity. We would like to point out that there is a critical need for empirical research on market practice concerning how relevant sustainability information is provided to retail investors.

Question 3.2.8 Do you believe that sustainability related disclosure requirements at product level should be independent from any entity level disclosure requirements, (i.e. product disclosures should not be conditional on entity disclosures, and vice-versa)?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain as necessary your replies to question 3.2.8:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G believes that the SFDR disclosures – especially related to Principal Adverse Impacts – should focus on product level. On this basis, entity-level disclosures should coherently integrate the picture of how sustainability risks and PAIs featured in said products.

The SFDR is intended to facilitate comparisons between financial products based on their sustainability considerations. In practice, investors, and especially retail investors, may not always have the necessary expertise and knowledge to interpret SFDR product-level disclosures, whether it is about comparing these disclosures to industry averages or credible transition trajectories.

Question 3.2.9 Do you think that some product-level disclosures should be expressed on a scale (e.g. if the disclosure results for similar products were put on a scale, in which decile would the product fall)?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 3.2.9 a) How should those scales be established and which information should be expressed on a scale?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G recommends showing the impact potential in product-level disclosures so that an impact-oriented client can easily compare different financial products.

Question 3.2.10 If you are a professional investor, where do you obtain the sustainability information you find relevant?

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
From direct enquiries to market participants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Via SFDR disclosures provided by market participants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 3.2.11 If you are a professional investor, do you find the SFDR requirements have improved the quality of information and transparency provided by financial market participants about the sustainability features of the products they offer?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - Not really
- 3 - Partially
- 4 - Mostly
- 5 - Totally
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain as necessary your replies to questions 3.2.10 to 3.2.11:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

For disclosures to be effective, they need to be accessible and useable to end investors. We are seeking respondents' views about the need to further improve the accessibility and usability of this information, in particular in a digital context.

These questions are intended to complement question 42 in the [ESAs' joint consultation paper on the review of the SFDR Delegated Regulation \(JC 2023_09\)](#) which asks for criteria for machine readability of the SFDR Delegated Regulation disclosures.

Question 3.2.12 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Article 2(2) of the SFDR Delegated Regulation already requires financial market participants to make disclosures under the SFDR in a searchable electronic format, unless otherwise required by sectoral legislation. This is sufficient to ensure accessibility and usability of the disclosed information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
It would be useful for all product information disclosed under the SFDR to be machine-readable, searchable and ready for digital use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It would be useful for some of the product information disclosed under the SFDR to be machine-readable and ready for digital use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It would be useful to prescribe a specific machine-readable format for all (or some parts) of the reporting under the SFDR (e.g. iXBRL)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It would be useful to make all product information disclosed under the SFDR available in the upcoming European Single Access Point as soon as possible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Entity and product disclosures on websites should be interactive and offer a layered approach enabling investors to access additional information easily on demand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

It would be useful that a potential regulatory attempt to digitalise sustainability disclosures by financial market participants building on the European ESG Template (EET) which has been developed by the financial industry to facilitate the exchange of data between financial market participants and stakeholders regarding sustainability disclosures



Question 3.2.13 Do you think the costs of introducing a machine-readable format for the disclosed information would be proportionate to the benefits it would entail?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - Not really
- 3 - Partially
- 4 - Mostly
- 5 - Totally
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please provide any comments or explanations to explain your answers to questions 3.2.12 and 3.2.13:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G believes that introducing mandatory electronic formatting would significantly improve the effective use of the SFDR disclosure system vis-a`-vis retail investors and stakeholders to find, collect and analyse relevant data in a cost-effective way.

Current product-level disclosures have been designed to allow for comparability between financial products. These financial products and the types of investments they pursue can present differences.

Question 3.2.14 To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

“When determining what disclosures should be required at product level it should be taken into account: ...”

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Whether the product is a wrapper offering choices between underlying investment options like a Multi-Option Product	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Whether some of the underlying investments are outside the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Whether some of the underlying investments are in an emerging economy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Whether some of the underlying investments are in SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Whether the underlying investments are in certain economic activities or in companies active in certain sectors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other considerations as regards the type of product or underlying investments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your reply to question 3.2.14:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G is not of the view that the above criteria can be used to justify the implementation of less stringent disclosure requirements. As per response to Q.3.2.1., all financial products should be required to disclose a minimum set of information. Any disclosure exceptions for specific products risks leading to an unequal playing field for different financial products.

4. Potential establishment of a categorisation system for financial products

4.1 Potential options

The fact that Articles 8 and 9 of the SFDR are being used as de facto product labels, together with the proliferation of national ESG/sustainability labels, suggests that there is a market demand for such tools in order to communicate the ESG/sustainability performance of financial products. However, there are persistent concerns that the current market use of the SFDR as a labelling scheme might lead to risks of greenwashing (the Commission services seek respondents' views on this in section 1). This is partly because the existing concepts and definitions in the regulation were not conceived for that purpose. Instead, the intention behind them was to encompass as wide a range of products as possible, so that any sustainability claims had to be substantiated. In addition, a proliferation of national labels risks fragmenting the European market and thereby undermining the development of the [capital markets union](#).

The Commission services therefore seek views on the merits of developing a more precise EU-level product categorisation system based on precise criteria. This section of the questionnaire asks for stakeholders' views about both the advantages of establishing sustainability product categories and about how these categories should work. When asking about sustainability product categories, the Commission is referring to a possible distinction between products depending on their sustainability objectives or sustainability performances.

Replies to questions in this section will help assess which type of investor would find product categories useful. Some questions relate to different possibilities as to how the system could be set-up, including whether disclosure requirements about products making sustainability claims should play a role. There are therefore certain links between questions in this section and section 3 on disclosures. Accordingly, respondents are invited to reply to questions in both sections, so that the Commission services can get insights into how they view disclosures and product categories separately, but also how they see the interlinkages between the two.

Given the high demand for sustainability products, questions in this section assume that any potential categorisation system would be voluntary. This is because financial market participants would likely have an interest in offering products with a sustainability claim. The questions in this section presume that only products that claim to fall under a given sustainability product category would be required to meet the corresponding requirements. However, this should not be seen as the Commission's preferred policy approach, as the Commission is only consulting on these topics at this stage.

If the Commission was to propose the development of a more precise product categorisation system, two broad strategies could be envisaged. On the one hand, the product categorisation system could build on and develop the distinction between Articles 8 and 9 and the existing concepts embedded in them (such as environmental/social characteristics, sustainable investment or do no significant harm), complemented by additional (minimum) criteria that more clearly define the products falling within the scope of each article. On the other hand, the product categorisation system could be based on a different approach, for instance focused on the type of investment strategy (promise of positive contribution to certain sustainability objectives, transition focus, etc.), based on criteria that do not necessarily relate to those existing concepts. In such a scenario, concepts such as environmental/social characteristics or sustainable investment and the distinction between current Articles 8 and 9 of SFDR may disappear altogether from the transparency framework.

Question 4.1.1 To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Sustainability product categories regulated at EU level would facilitate retail investor understanding of products' sustainability-related strategies and objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sustainability product categories regulated at EU level would facilitate professional investor understanding of products' sustainability-related strategies and objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sustainability product categories regulated at EU level are necessary to combat greenwashing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sustainability product categories regulated at EU level are necessary to avoid fragmenting the capital markets union	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sustainability product categories regulated at EU level are necessary to have efficient distribution systems based on investors' sustainability preferences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is no need for product categories. Pure disclosure requirements of sustainability information are sufficient	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 4.1.2 If a categorisation system was established, how do you think categories should be designed?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Approach 1: Splitting categories in a different way than according to existing concepts used in Articles 8 and 9, for example, focusing on the type of investment strategy of the product (promise of positive contribution to certain sustainability objectives, transition, etc.) based on criteria that do not necessarily relate to those existing concepts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Approach 2: Converting Articles 8 and 9 into formal product categories, and clarifying and adding criteria to underpin the existing concepts of environmental/social characteristics, sustainable investment, do no significant harm, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain as necessary your replies to questions 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.

Please keep in mind that there are further questions in this section that elaborate on these first two questions:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G supports a re-categorization of Articles 8 and 9. This new configuration of categories should avoid adopting a different reporting requirements system from scratch which would only magnify the confusion around product categorization further. It is important to stress that the new categorization should not serve to differentiate reporting requirements. Building on existing SFDR key concepts does not mean that policymakers should be constrained to maintain the existing de facto labelling of 'Article 8' and 'Article 9'. 'Article 8' and 'Article 9' are both accompanied with specific market assumptions as to the sustainability features of their relative products. They are not fit for retail investor use and lack clarity for professional investors, as well.

Categorisation of products should focus on the sustainability objectives and demonstrated sustainability features via clear minimum requirements and specific disclosure requirements. They should be easy to understand especially from the point of view of retail audiences.

E3G envisages 3 categories of products in a reviewed SFDR framework:

- Products with 'sustainable investment' objectives: able to demonstrate an alignment with positive impacts on the environment and/or society and/or financing already sustainable activities;
- Products with 'transition investment' objectives: able to demonstrate a measurable contribution to positive real-world impacts;
- Products with 'binding sustainability criteria': currently marketed as 'promoting environmental and/or social characteristics', is an extremely wide classification which prevents meaningful comparisons between products characteristics and investment strategies and should, therefore, be reformed. This category should also be supported by clear and material KPIs and exclude non-transformable activities.

If a categorisation system was established according to approach 1 of question 4.1.2

Question 4.1.3 To what extent do you agree that, under approach 1, if a sustainability disclosure framework is maintained in parallel to a categorisation system, the current distinction between Articles 8 and 9 should disappear from that disclosure framework?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
-

5 - Totally agree

Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 4.1.4 To what extent would you find the following categories of sustainability products useful?

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
A - Products investing in assets that specifically strive to offer targeted, measurable solutions to sustainability related problems that affect people and/or the planet, e.g. investments in firms generating and distributing renewable energy, or in companies building social housing or regenerating urban areas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
B - Products aiming to meet credible sustainability standards or adhering to a specific sustainability-related theme, e.g.						

<p>investments in companies with evidence of solid waste and water management, or strong representation of women in decision-making.</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>C - Products that exclude investees involved in activities with negative effects on people and/or the planet</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>D - Products with a transition focus aiming to bring measurable improvements to the sustainability profile of the assets they invest in, e.g. investments in economic activities becoming taxonomy-aligned or in transitional economic activities that are taxonomy aligned, investments in companies, economic activities or portfolios with credible</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

targets and/or plans to decarbonise, improve workers' rights, reduce environmental impacts.						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

If you think there are other possible useful categories, please specify:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G considers that the product categorization under the SFDR should comprise three categories of sustainable products:

1- Products with a sustainable investment objective

Building on the SFDR concept of 'sustainable investments', these products should invest into activities that are already demonstrably aligned with sustainability objectives.

Products:

- are aligned with the 1.5°C goal, as well as
- with sustainability objectives that correspond to the material sustainability matters in the investee sector
- include a minimum requirement on percentage of alignment with the Taxonomy vis-a`-vis investments in sectors covered by this legislation
- satisfy the DNSH criteria, inter alia with binding exclusions (drawing from the list of exclusions established for Paris-aligned Benchmarks in the BMR) & binding positive screening for assets with positive impact
- invest in companies following good governance practices, which needs to be clearly linked with minimum safeguards such as investee company compliance with OECD guidelines / UN Guiding Principles. Minimum social and governance safeguards concept could be also applied from the Taxonomy Regulation
- demonstrate that all mandatory PAI indicators are considered in the investment decision-making process

2- Products with a transition objective

These products are able to effectively demonstrate a measurable and material contribution to transition to a sustainable economy. Minimum safeguard exclusions are considered necessary to assure progressive improvement on the transition trajectory.

Products:

- are supported by a climate transition plan aligned with the 1.5°C goal as well as
- by clear measurable, outcome-oriented targets:
 - science-based environmental targets
 - social objectives expressed in terms of increasing positive outcomes for people affected by human rights violations as material in the investee sector
- exclude investment in non-transformable activities
- implement a corporate sustainability-focused action plan to achieve clear and measurable sustainability-linked targets and objectives, including escalation and divestment strategy
- invest in companies implementing a credible transition plan, relatable to transition plans under the

Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD)

- establish relevant PAI indicators assessing their evolution over time

3- Products that have binding sustainability criteria

These products apply selected ESG criteria across all investments.

Products:

- use ESG criteria material in the investee sectors
- demonstrate meeting ESG criteria through clear KPIs
- exclude investment in non-transformable activities that are incompatible with achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement
- in communications to end investors - and especially with concern to retail investors during the advisory process under the MiFID2/IDD sustainability preferences assessment -, they clearly mention that the category shows a lesser level of commitment to enabling a sustainable transition of the economy vis-à-vis the other two above mentioned categories

Question 4.1.5 To what extent do you think it is useful to distinguish between sustainability product category A and B described above?

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - To a limited extent
- 3 - To some extent
- 4 - To a large extent
- 5 - To a very large extent
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 4.1.6 Do you see merits in distinguishing between products with a social and environmental focus?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 4.1.7 How many sustainability product categories in total do you think there should be?

- 1 category
- 2 categories
- 3 categories
-

- 4 categories
- 5 categories
- More than 5 categories
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 4.1.8 Do you think product categories should be mutually exclusive, i.e. financial market participants should choose only one category to which the product belongs to in cases where the product meets the criteria of several categories (independently from subsequent potential verification or supervision of the claim)?

- Yes
- No
- There is another possible approach
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain what that other possible approach could be:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In general, product categories under the SFDR should be mutually exclusive so that the end-investor can easily understand them, and the sustainability claim they bear.
In specific cases, such as fund-of-funds or multi-assets/blended investment, a more tailored approach might be necessary to make sure that retail investors understand their characteristics and sustainability features of the products they entertain investing into.

Please explain your replies to questions 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7 and 4.1.8:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

See response to Q 4.1.4. above.

Question 4.1.9 If a categorisation system was established that builds on new criteria and not on the existing concepts embedded in Articles 8 and 9, is there is a need for measures to support the transition to this new regime?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain your reply to question 4.1.9 as necessary:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The categorization of products supported by specific criteria will considerably improve clarity vis-a`-vis the SFDR requirements for products on its own, although, we consider that additional guidance to map out the reclassification of products from FMPs might be necessary.

Question 4.1.10 What should be the minimum criteria to be met in order for a financial product to fall under the different product categories?

Could these minimum criteria consist of:

For product category A of question 4.1.4:

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Taxonomy alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engagement strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exclusions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pre-defined, measurable, positive environmental, social or governance-related outcome	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your answers for product category A:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G considers that products with a 'sustainable investment' objective could fall within this category if they can demonstrate alignment with positive impacts on the environment and/or society and/or financing already sustainable activities. This category should be based on the existing concept of 'sustainable investments' under SFDR and its underlying key notions, i.e.:

- having a clear environmental and/or social objective
- satisfying the DNSH criteria
- invest in companies following good governance practices, linked with minimum safeguards such as investee company compliance with OECD guidelines/UN Guiding Principles
- consider all mandatory PAI indicators throughout the investment process.

For more specifics, please refer to our proposal for 3 product categories redacted under Q 4.1.4.

For product category B of question 4.1.4:

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Taxonomy alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engagement strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exclusions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pre-defined, measurable, positive environmental, social or governance-related outcome	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your answers for product category B:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G considers that products with a 'sustainable investment' objective could fall within this category if they are able to demonstrate an alignment with positive impacts on the environment and/or society and/or financing already sustainable activities. This category should be based on the existing concept of 'sustainable investments' under SFDR and its underlying key notions, i.e.:

- having a clear environmental and/or social objective
- satisfying the DNSH criteria
- invest in companies following good governance practices, linked with minimum safeguards such as investee company compliance with OECD guidelines / UN Guiding Principles
- consider all mandatory PAI indicators throughout the investment process

For more specifics, please refer to our proposal for 3 product categories redacted under Q 4.1.4.

For product category C of question 4.1.4:

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Taxonomy alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engagement strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exclusions	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pre-defined, measurable, positive environmental, social or governance-related outcome	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your answers for product category C:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G believes that exclusions by themselves should not constitute a specific category for classification under the SFDR. Exclusions alone are not sufficient to retain a product 'eligible' and a minimum element of engagement as well as focus on outcome should be required.

E3G's proposal for replacement is the indicated category of products applying 'binding sustainability criteria' throughout the investment process and across the entire investment portfolio.

In communications to end investors and especially for retail investors during the advisory process under the MiFID2/IDD sustainability preferences assessment, it should be clearly mentioned that this category shows a lesser level of commitment to enabling a sustainable transition of the economy than the two above mentioned categories.

For more details, please refer to our proposal for this category of products under Q 4.1.4.

For product category D of question 4.1.4:

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Taxonomy alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engagement strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exclusions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pre-defined, measurable, positive environmental, social or governance-related outcome	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your answers for product category D:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G believes that these products could fall within its proposal for a category of products with a 'transition investment' objective.

In order to be eligible for this category, products should have to be vetted on transitional elements i.e., on the basis of a transition taxonomy, exclude a minimum of harmful activities and focus on engagement.

Criteria for product inclusion:

- a climate transition plan aligned with the 1.5°C goal as well as
- by clear measurable, outcome-oriented targets:
 - science-based environmental targets
 - social objectives expressed in terms of increasing positive outcomes for people affected by human rights violations as material in the investee sector
- exclusion of investment in non-transformable activities
- Implementation of a corporate sustainability-focused action plan to achieve clear and measurable sustainability-linked targets and objectives, including escalation and divestment strategy
- investment in companies implementing a credible transition plan, relatable to transition plans under the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive (CSDDD)
- establishment of relevant PAI indicators assessing their evolution over time

Reference for this category of products is in our proposal redacted under Q 4.1.4.

Question 4.1.11 Should criteria focus to any extent on the processes implemented by the product manufacturer to demonstrate how sustainability considerations can constrain investment choices (for instance, a minimum year-on-year improvement of chosen Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), or a minimum exclusion rate of the investable universe)?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't No of ↑ appl
Category A of question 4.1.4	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	

Category B of question 4.1.4	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Category C of question 4.1.4	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Category D of question 4.1.4	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 4.1.11 a) If the criteria should focus on the processes implemented by the product manufacturer, what process criteria would you deem most relevant to demonstrate the stringency of the strategy implemented?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Please refer to our response to Q 4.1.4. above.

If a categorisation system was established according to approach 2 of question 4.1.2

Question 4.1.12 If a categorisation system was established based on existing Articles 8 and 9, are the following concepts of the SFDR fit for that purpose?

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The current concept of 'environmental and/or social characteristics'	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The current concept of						

'sustainable investment'	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The current element of 'contribution to an environmental or social objective' of the sustainable investment concept	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The current element 'do no significant harm' of the sustainable investment concept, and its link with the entity level principal adverse impact indicators listed in tables 1, 2 and 3 of Annex I of the Delegated Regulation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The current element of 'investee companies' good governance practices' of the sustainable investment concept	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 4.1.12 a) If you consider that the elements listed in question 4.1.12 are not fit for purpose, how would you further specify the different elements of the ‘sustainable investment’ concept, what should be the minimum criteria required for each of them?

	Your answer
<p>‘contribution to an environmental or social objective’, element of the sustainable investment concept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept of investor impact needs to be integrated in the regulatory framework to distinguish investor impact or investee company impact • Alignment with the 1.5°C goal should always be required • The pursued sustainability objectives must be based on double materiality assessment of the most pressing sustainability matters in the investee sectors • There must be a minimum requirement on percentage of alignment with the Taxonomy vis-a`-vis investments in Taxonomy-covered sectors • E3G recommends finalizing a social Taxonomy and extend the Taxonomy to always harmful/transition activities, in order to provide for a comprehensive framework that can guide and inform investment decisions in a more thorough future SFDR framework
<p>‘do no significant harm’, element of the sustainable investment concept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DNSH criteria should be strengthened with mandatory exclusions for products with ‘sustainable investments’ objectives, (i.e. exposure to the fossil fuel industry) and binding positive screening, backed by a selected number of mandatory PAIs • For products with ‘sustainable investments’ objectives and ‘binding sustainability criteria’, mandatory exclusions could be based on the list of exclusions defined under BMR for Paris-aligned Benchmarks in conjunction with binding positive screening for assets with positive impact • For products with a ‘transition objective’, mandatory exclusions would focus on non-transformable activities/sectors and could build on the list of exclusions under BMR for Climate-transition Benchmarks – with possibility to add other exclusions

‘investee companies’ good governance practices’, element of the sustainable investment concept

- The good governance principle should be further specified and further linked with minimum safeguards mentioned in other pieces of the EU regulatory framework. Regarding the requirement that investee companies respect the UN Guiding Principles or OECD Guidelines for multinational companies, guidelines clarifying how to assess compliance with these should be established

Question 4.1.12 b) Should the good governance concept be adapted to include investments in government bonds?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

If the good governance concept should be adapted to include investments in government bonds, what should be the minimum criteria required for this element?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The defining threshold should be based on concerted consultations with NGOs and civil society.

Question 4.1.12 c) Should the good governance concept be adapted to include investments in real estate investments?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 4.1.13 How would you further specify what promotion of 'environmental/social characteristics' means, what should be the minimum criteria required for such characteristics and what should be the trigger for a product to be considered as promoting those characteristics?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

'Promoting' should be replaced by the 'ability to demonstrate' the sustainability features. The establishment of product categories in a reviewed SFDR should be based on objective minimum criteria rather than the intention ('intentionality') to promote any sustainability feature.

The formulation of 'environmental and/or social characteristics' should be clarified as per proposals on product categories in responses to Q 4.1.4. and Q 4.1.11a).

Question 4.1.14 Do you think that a minimum proportion of investments in taxonomy aligned activities shall be required as a criterion to:

	Yes	No	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
...fall under the potential new product category of Article 8?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...fall under the potential new product category of Article 9?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 4.1.14 b) What should be this minimum proportion for Article 9?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G believes that the notion of 'Article 8' and 'Article 9' products should be discarded going forward, they are not fit for purpose considering the objectives of the SFDR framework. In currently refer to articles prescribing disclosure requirements rather than to sustainable investment products or with E&S characteristics.

For 'Article 8' products please refer to our reviewed category of products with 'binding sustainability criteria' in a reviewed SFDR framework. We do not consider that requiring a minimum proportion of investments in taxonomy-aligned activities would be relevant as a criterion but we suggest having a Taxonomy-related disclosure requirement for these products.

If 'Article 9' is conceived as a 'sustainable investments' category of products in a reviewed SFDR framework then requiring a minimum proportion of investments in taxonomy-aligned activities would be relevant as a criterion. The threshold would have to be reviewed regularly according to market developments and potential future Taxonomy extensions.

In practice, this should mean 0% unsustainable activities exposure and at least 50% alignment with taxonomy-aligned activities.

Question 4.1.15 Apart from the need to promote environmental/social characteristics and to invest in companies that follow good governance practices for Article 8 products and the need to have sustainable investments as an objective for Article 9 products, should any other criterion be considered for a product to fall under one of the categories?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

The concept of 'promoting E/S characteristics' should be reshaped to establish a category of products with 'binding sustainability criteria'.

Please refer to our proposal under Q 4.1.4., Q 4.1.12a), and questions related to the minimum proportion of Taxonomy alignment.



4.2 General questions about the potential establishment of sustainability products categories

If a sustainability products categorisation system was established, products will need to be distinguished according to a set of pre-established criteria.

Question 4.2.1 In addition to these criteria, and to other possible cross-cutting /horizontal disclosure requirements on financial products, should there be some additional disclosure requirements when a product falls within a specific sustainability product category? This question presents clear links with question 3.2.3 in section 3.

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 4.2.1 a) Please see a list of examples of disclosures that could be required when a product falls within a specific sustainability product category.

Should this information be required when a product falls within a specific sustainability product category, and/or should any other information be required about those products?

	1 (not at all)	2 (to a limited extent)	3 (to some extent)	4 (to a large extent)	5 (to a very large extent)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Taxonomy-related disclosures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Engagement strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exclusions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Information about how the criteria required to fall within a specific sustainability product category have been met	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify to what other information you refer in your answer to question 4.2.1 a):

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Please refer to our response to Q 3.2.1. and following.

Question 4.2.2 If a product categorisation system was set up, what governance system should be created?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
Third-party verification of categories should be mandatory (i.e. assurance engagements to verify the alignment of candidate products with a sustainability product category and assurance engagements to monitor on-going compliance with the product category criteria)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Market participants should be able to use this categorisation system based on a self-declaration by the product manufacturer supervised by national competent authorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your answer to Question 4.2.2:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Unverifiable self-declarations from product providers would hardly guarantee a product's sustainability quality, therefore we support supervision or verification by national competent authorities. This might be difficult to practice in consideration of capacity constraints, therefore, we strongly prefer the third party verification.

We recognise that independent verifications might add to the cost of sustainable financial products, a cost ultimately borne by the (retail) investor, which, once again, raises the problem of impairing the level playing field for sustainable financial market products.

With this consideration in mind, we recommend that ALL financial products are to be required the same cross-cut, non discriminatory disclosure at product-level.

Question 4.2.3 If a categorisation system was established, to what extent do you agree with the following statement?

“When determining the criteria for product categories it should be taken into account...”

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
whether the product is a wrapper offering choices between underlying investment options like a Multi-Option Product	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
whether the underlying investments are outside the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
whether the underlying investments are in an emerging economy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
whether the underlying investments are in SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
whether the underlying investments are in certain economic activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
other considerations as regards the type of product or underlying investments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your answer to question 4.2.3:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Sector specifics may be added to universally applicable sector-agnostic criteria, as appropriate.

4.3 Consequences of the establishment of a sustainability products categorisation system

As highlighted in section 2, any potential changes to the current disclosure regime and the creation of a categorisation system would need to take into account the interactions between the SFDR and other sustainable finance legislation. The following questions address these interactions for different legal acts, in such a scenario of regulatory changes in the arena of financial product disclosures and categorisation.

Question 4.3.1 The objective of the PRIIPs KID is to provide short and simple information to retail investors.

Do you think that if a product categorisation system was established under the SFDR, the category that a particular product falls in should be included in the PRIIPS KID?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain your answer to question 4.3.1:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

E3G believes that a sustainability category for a product would be a significant element to facilitate investor information readiness and therefore should be included in the relative KIDs. For products not falling within a category, a clear disclaimer should be made on the PRIIPs KID that the product does not present any sustainability or ESG-related features.

Question 4.3.2 If new ESG Benchmarks were developed at EU level (in addition to the existing Paris-aligned benchmarks (PAB) and climate transition benchmarks (CTB), how should their criteria interact with a new product categorisation system?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The criteria set for the ESG benchmarks and the criteria defined for sustainability product categories should be closely aligned	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 4.3.3 Do you think that products passively tracking a PAB or a CTB should automatically be deemed to satisfy the criteria of a future sustainability product category?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 4.3.4 To what extent do you agree that, if a categorisation system is established, sustainability preferences under MiFID 2/IDD should refer to those possible sustainability product categories?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

4.4 Marketing communications and product names

Market participants are increasingly informing their clients about sustainability, both in the context of the SFDR and voluntarily in marketing communications and names. Potentially, any expression related to sustainability provided by market participants to describe and promote the entity or its products and services could mislead clients and other stakeholders if it does not appropriately consider the reasonable expectations.

The SFDR does address the issue of marketing communications in Article 13, prohibiting contradictions between such marketing communications and disclosures under the regulation. Article 13 also includes an empowerment for the European Supervisory Authorities to draft implementing technical standards on how marketing communication should be presented. This empowerment has not been used up to now.

Question 4.4.1 Do you agree that the SFDR is the appropriate legal instrument to deal with the accuracy and fairness of marketing communications and the use of sustainability related names for financial products?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Question 4.4.2 To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know - No opinion - Not applicable
The introduction of product categories should be accompanied by specific rules on how market participants must label and communicate on their products	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The use of terms such as 'sustainable', 'ESG', 'SDG', 'green', 'responsible', 'net zero' should be prohibited for products that do not fall under at least one of the product categories defined above, as appropriate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Certain terms should be linked to a specific product category and should be reserved for the respective category	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question 4.4.3 Would naming and marketing communication rules be sufficient to avoid misleading communications from products that do not fall under a product sustainability category?

- 1 - Totally disagree
- 2 - Mostly disagree
- 3 - Partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - Mostly agree
- 5 - Totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not applicable

Please explain your replies to questions 4.4.1, 4.4.2 and 4.4.3:

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Products that do not satisfy the criteria of any of the indicated categories should be prevented from using sustainability-related claims in marketing communication – in coordination with member states' national laws on marketing of financial products. Further guidance is needed in order to integrate environmental impact claims into national regulatory frameworks and financial institutions should be assisted to forge clear, accurate and non-misleading communication approaches vis à vis sustainability related marketing communications. Effective oversight could be achieved through an increased collaborative effort between financial regulators and advertising bodies.

This said, it is critical that the accuracy and fairness of marketing communications and the use of sustainability related names for financial products is regulated in the SFDR, which is the most appropriate EU legal instrument featuring exclusive criteria for sustainable product categorisation.

Additional information

Should you wish to provide additional information (e.g. a position paper, report) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your additional document(s) below. **Please make sure you do not include any personal data in the file you upload if you want to remain anonymous.**

The maximum file size is 1 MB.

You can upload several files.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Useful links

[More on this consultation \(https://finance.ec.europa.eu/regulation-and-supervision/consultations/finance-2023-sfd-implementation_en\)](https://finance.ec.europa.eu/regulation-and-supervision/consultations/finance-2023-sfd-implementation_en)

[Consultation document \(https://finance.ec.europa.eu/document/download/99bc25fe-4dd8-4b57-ab37-212b5ab05c41_en?2023-sfdr-implementation-targeted-consultation-document_en.pdf\)](https://finance.ec.europa.eu/document/download/99bc25fe-4dd8-4b57-ab37-212b5ab05c41_en?2023-sfdr-implementation-targeted-consultation-document_en.pdf)

[More on sustainability-related disclosure in the financial services sector \(https://finance.ec.europa.eu/sustainable-finance/disclosures/sustainability-related-disclosure-financial-services-sector_en\)](https://finance.ec.europa.eu/sustainable-finance/disclosures/sustainability-related-disclosure-financial-services-sector_en)

[Specific privacy statement \(https://finance.ec.europa.eu/document/download/a08edb89-59d8-44f8-873f-7a0f08b2f4c1_en?2022-sfdr-implementation-specific-privacy-statement_en.pdf\)](https://finance.ec.europa.eu/document/download/a08edb89-59d8-44f8-873f-7a0f08b2f4c1_en?2022-sfdr-implementation-specific-privacy-statement_en.pdf)

[Related targeted consultation \(https://finance.ec.europa.eu/regulation-and-supervision/consultations-0/public-consultation-implementation-sustainable-finance-disclosures-regulation-sfdr_en\)](https://finance.ec.europa.eu/regulation-and-supervision/consultations-0/public-consultation-implementation-sustainable-finance-disclosures-regulation-sfdr_en)

Contact

fisma-sfdr@ec.europa.eu