Contribution ID: 6303df9d-7aed-44dd-9076-974ab3dd3888
Date: 20/07/2018 14:27:32

Public consultation: Fitness check on the EU framework for public reporting by companies

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

UPDATE: Due to numerous requests, the public consultation on the EU framework for public reporting by companies will remain open till end of July 2018.

This consultation is also available in German and French.

Public reporting by companies[1] is based on a number of EU Directives, Regulations and Recommendations that were adopted at different points in time over the last 40 years. The current body of EU law (the "acquis") comprises a range of requirements applying to listed and non-listed companies, sector specific requirements (banks and insurers), as well as additional disclosure requirements applicable to listed companies. The initial Directive on annual accounts aimed at harmonising financial information to capital providers and for creditor protection. More recently, public reporting requirements have been expanded to non-financial reporting for a much broader audience.

The Commission is now conducting a comprehensive check of the fitness of the EU framework on public reporting by companies. The objectives of this fitness check are:

1. to assess whether the EU public reporting framework is overall still relevant for meeting the intended objectives, adds value at the European level, is effective, internally consistent, coherent with other EU policies, efficient and not unnecessarily burdensome;

2. to review specific aspects of the existing legislation as required by EU law[2]; and

3. to assess whether the EU public reporting framework is fit for new challenges (such as sustainability and digitalisation).

Throughout this consultation, certain concepts should be understood as follows:

- **Effectiveness** – whether an intended objective is met;
- **Relevance** – whether a requirement is necessary and appropriate for the intended objectives;
- **Efficiency** – whether the costs associated with the intervention are proportionate to the benefits it has generated;
- **Coherence** – whether requirements are consistent across the board;
- **Added value** – whether the EU level adds more benefits than would have been the case if the requirements were only introduced at the national level.

The Commission published an action plan on financing sustainable growth that builds on the recommendations of the High Level Expert Group (HLEG) on sustainable finance. This fitness check on the EU framework for public reporting by companies is one of the actions announced in the Action plan. Several questions in this fitness check, in particular in the section on non-financial reporting, should be considered also in the context of the HLEG recommendations on sustainability.

The replies to this consultation will feed into a Staff Working Document on the fitness of the EU framework for public reporting by companies, to be published in 2019.

[1]For this consultation "companies" mean limited liability companies of the types listed in the accounting Directive, companies that have issued securities on an EU regulated market, and banks or insurance companies including cooperatives and mutual structures.

[2]According to legislation, a series of reviews will have to be performed by the Commission:

- A report on the implementation of Non-Financial Reporting Directive 2014/95/EU, addressing its scope, particularly as regards large non-listed undertakings, its effectiveness and the level of guidance and methods provided.
- A report on the situation of micro-undertakings having regard to the number of micro-companies and the reduction of administrative burdens resulting from the simplifications introduced in 2013.

- A report on the implementation and effectiveness of the Country-By-Country Reporting by extractive and logging industries, including examining the case for an extension of the Country-By-Country reporting to other sectors.
- A report on the 2013 Amendments to the Transparency Directive, considering the impact on small and medium-sized issuers and the application of sanctions.

Please note: 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-public-reporting-by-companies@ec.europa.eu.

More information:

- on this consultation
- on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation

1. Information about you

* Are you replying as:

- ( ) a private individual
- (•) an organisation or a company
- ( ) a public authority or an international organisation

* Name of your organisation:

Polish Association of Listed Companies (Stowarzyszenie Emitentów Giełdowych)

Contact email address:

The information you provide here is for administrative purposes only and will not be published

mchodorowska@seg.org.pl

* Is your organisation included in the Transparency Register?
(If your organisation is not registered, we invite you to register here, although it is not compulsory to be registered to reply to this consultation. Why a transparency register?)

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No

* If so, please indicate your Register ID number:

702659131074-73

* Type of organisation:

- ○ Academic institution
- ○ Company, SME, micro-enterprise, sole trader
- ○ Consultancy, law firm
- ○ Consumer organisation
- ○ Industry association
- ○ Media
- ◉ Non-governmental organisation
- ○ Think tank
- ○ Trade union
- ○ Other

* In what category do you classify your company? (if applicable)

- ○ Group with cross-border subsidiaries
- ○ Group without cross-border subsidiaries
- ◉ An individual company
- ○ Not applicable

* Where are you based and/or where do you carry out your activity?

Poland

* Field of activity or sector (*if applicable*):

at least 1 choice(s)

- ☐ Accommodation and food service activities
- ☐ Accounting
- ☐ Administrative and support service activities
- ☐ Agriculture, forestry and fishing
- ☐ Arts, entertainment and recreation
- ☐ Auditing
- ☐ Banking
- ☐ Construction
- ☐ Consumer protection
- ☐ Credit rating agencies
- ☐ Digital
- ☐ Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply
- ☐ Human health and social work activities
- ☐ Information and communication
- ☐ Insurance
- ☑ Investment management (e.g. UCITS, hedge funds, private equity funds, venture capital funds, money market funds)
- ☐ Manufacturing
- ☑ Market infrastructure / operators (e.g. CCPs, CSDs, Stock exchanges)
- ☐ Mining and quarrying
- ☐ Pensions
- ☐ Professional, scientific and technical activities
- ☐ Real estate activities
- ☐ Service provider
- ☐ Transportation and storage
- ☐ Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities
- ☐ Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Not applicable

Important notice on the publication of responses

* Contributions received are intended for publication on the Commission's website. Do you agree to your contribution being published?
(see specific privacy statement)

- (selected) Yes, I agree to my response being published under the name I indicate (*name of your organisation /company/public authority or your name if your reply as an individual*)
- No, I do not want my response to be published

2. Your opinion

This consultation seeks stakeholder views on whether the EU framework for public reporting by companies is fit for purpose.

Considering the size of this public consultation please feel free to respond only to sections or questions of interest to you.

The questionnaire is structured as follows:

- Assessing the fitness of the EU public reporting framework overall (Section I; Questions 1-7)
- The EU financial reporting framework applicable to all companies (Accounting Directive: companies with cross border activities, SMEs, and content of the information) (Section II; Questions 8-18)
- The EU financial reporting framework for listed companies (IAS regulation, Transparency Directive) (Section III; Questions 19-29)
- The EU financial reporting framework for banks and insurance companies (Sectoral Accounting Directives) (Section IV; Questions 30-39)
- Non-financial reporting framework (Non-Financial Reporting Directive, Country-by-Country Reporting

I. Assessing the fitness of the EU public reporting framework overall

Depending on its type, activity or situation, a company has a number of public reporting obligations under EU law. The current EU level public reporting framework considered for this consultation consists of the following:

- **Publication of individual and consolidated financial statements in accordance with national GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles)** by any limited liability company established in the EU. By virtue of the Accounting Directive 2013/34/EU Member States must ensure that any company in their jurisdiction with a legal form that limits its liability must prepare financial statements and a management report. These shall be audited / checked by a statutory auditor and published in the relevant business register according to national law that is compliant with this Directive. For companies other than a public-interest entity (bank, insurance company or company with securities listed), EU requirements are proportionate to the company's size.
- **Publication of consolidated financial statements in accordance with the International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) adopted** by the EU and other specific items by any company established in the EU that has securities (e.g. shares, bonds) listed on an EU regulated market by virtue of the IAS Regulation (EC) No 1606/2002, the Transparency Directive 2004/109/EC and the Market Abuse Regulation (EU) No 596/2014. The use of IFRS makes company accounts comparable within the single market and globally. Companies established in third countries may use their national standards (e.g. US GAAP) if these are accepted on the basis of EU equivalence decisions. The Transparency Directive (2004/109/EC) makes the issuers' activities more transparent, thanks to regular publication of yearly and half-yearly financial reports, as well as the publication of major changes in the holding of voting rights and ad hoc inside information which could affect the price of securities. Issuers have to file such information with the national Officially Appointed Mechanisms (OAMs).

- **Publication of individual and consolidated financial statements in accordance with sectoral layouts and principles** by any bank or insurance company in the EU by virtue of the Bank Accounting Directive (86/635/EEC) and the Insurance Accounting Directive (91/674/EEC). Unless they prepare IFRS financial statements, any bank or insurance company in the EU must publish financial statements in compliance with national accounting rules that are in line with these sectoral Accounting Directives. Specific sectoral rules provide for, inter alia, layouts (balance sheet and Profit and Loss Account) and accounting treatments for e.g. loans, repurchase agreements or technical provisions.

- **Publication of non-financial information by any public-interest entity (bank, insurance company or listed company) with more than 500 employees** by virtue of Directive 2014/95/EU. The information should be part of the management report, or published in a separate report. Non-binding guidance was issued in 2017 in order to assist companies – Commission Communication C /2017/4234.

- **Publication of country-by-country reports on payments to governments by any large company that is active in extraction or logging** by virtue of Chapter 10 of Accounting Directive 2013/34/EU and Article 6 of Transparency Directive 2004/109/EC. This fosters transparency on payments to governments, including third country governments, made in relation to these activities.

The table below provides an overview of the different objectives of the current EU framework mapped to individual legal instruments in the field of public reporting by companies:

MAIN OBJECTIVES	OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES	EU LEGAL INSTRUMENTS * –				
		AD	IAS	TD	BAD	IAD
Stakeholder protection	→ Shareholder protection	X	X	X		
	→ Creditor protection	X				
	→ Depositor protection				X	
	→ Policy holder protection					X
Internal market	**Facilitate:**					
	→ Cross border investments	X	X	X	X	X
	→ Cross border establishment	X			X	X

Integrated EU capital markets	**Market efficiency:**					
	→ Access to capital	X	X	X		
	→ Capital allocation		X	X		
	→ Integrated securities market		X	X		
Financial stability	→ Public confidence in company reporting	X	X	X		
	→ Trust in the resilience of specific sectors (banking and insurance)				X	X
Sustainability	→ Enhanced corporate responsibilities / accountability/ good corporate governance	X		X		
	→ Empower stakeholders	X		X		
	→ Foster globally sustainable activities	X				
	→ Foster long term investments	X				
	→ Fight corruption	X		X		

* Accounting Directive (AD); IAS regulation / IFRS (IAS); Transparency Directive (TD); Bank accounts Directive (BAD); Insurance Accounts Directives (IAD)

General questions

Question 1. Do you think that the EU public reporting requirements for companies, taken as a whole, have been **effective** in achieving the intended objectives?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Ensuring stakeholder protection	○	○	○	●	○	○

Developing the internal market	○	○	●	○	○	○
Promoting integrated EU capital markets	○	○	○	●	○	○
Ensuring financial stability	○	○	○	●	○	○
Promoting sustainability	○	○	○	●	○	○

Please explain your response to question 1 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

In general, the EU reporting framework has been effective. Nevertheless, we don't find much evidence how the reporting framework has contributed to development of the internal market.
We would like to stress that only partial assessment is possible on promotion of sustainability, as the Non-Financial Reporting Directive is very recent and the first reports in certain countries are only available. For example, in Poland ca. 150 listed companies published their first non-financial reports covering the year 2017, while before the Non-Financial Reporting Directive only 30-40 of them published voluntary non-financial reports. Concerning the quality of reports, it's still being assessed and we will be able to share results of this assessment with the EC when it's ready (in October 2018).

Question 2. Do you think that the EU public reporting requirements for companies, taken as a whole, are **relevant** (necessary and appropriate) for achieving the intended objectives?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Ensuring stakeholder protection	○	○	○	●	○	○
Developing the internal market	○	○	○	●	○	○

Promoting integrated EU capital markets	○	○	○	○	●	○
Ensuring financial stability	○	○	○	●	○	○
Promoting sustainability	○	○	○	○	●	○

Please explain your response to question 2 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples of any requirement that you think is not relevant:

> Promotion of integrated EU capital market is a task to be achieved mainly on the EU level. Sustainability is a relatively new issue to many companies and therefore needs coordinated promotion on the EU level, combined with tools and solutions that would facilitate its adoption by companies and reduce resulting costs. However, it should be noted that in the case of SMEs (and in particular in case of micro companies) it is important that they have lighter transparency regime, since current regulations are too burdensome for them.

Question 3. Companies would normally maintain and prepare a level of information that is fit for their own purposes, in a "business as usual situation". Legislation and standards tend to frame this information up to a more demanding level.

With regards to the objectives pursued, do you think that the EU legislation and standards on public reporting are **efficient** (i.e. costs are proportionate to the benefits generated)?

- ○ 1 - totally disagree
- ○ 2 - mostly disagree
- ○ 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- ● 4 - mostly agree
- ○ 5 - totally agree
- ○ Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 3 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples of requirements that you consider most burdensome:

> The assessment “mostly agree” is true regarding large companies. We would like to stress that for small and micro companies current reporting framework is very demanding, burdensome and causing significant relative compliance costs. In particular vague definition of inside information under MAR implies, that the smaller the company is, the less important information may be regarded useful by reasonable investor, hence requiring SMEs to excessive transparency harming their competitiveness.

Question 4. If you are a preparer company, could you please indicate the **annual recurring costs** (in € and in relation to the total operational cost) incurred for the preparation, audit (if any) and publication of mandatory public reporting:

Total amount in Euros of annual recurring costs for mandatory public reporting:

Amount as a % of total operating costs of annual recurring costs for mandatory public reporting:

%

Coherence

Question 5. Do you agree that the intrinsic coherence of the EU public reporting framework is fine, having regard to each component of that reporting?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Financial statements (preparation, audit and publication)				X		
Management report (preparation, consistency check by a statutory auditor, publication)				X		
Non-financial information (preparation, auditor's check and publication)			X			
Country-by-country reporting by extractive / logging industries (preparation, publication)						X

Please explain your response to question 5 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

> Concerning non-financial information please refer to answer to Q2 – it is too early to assess the coherence of non-financial reporting. The above regulations on periodical reporting are quite coherent, however they are incoherent in relation to current reporting under MAR. Periodical reporting is aimed at long-term approach, preventing short-termism, while MAR requires immediate publication of any information which may be considered important by reasonable investor, thus forcing ultrashort-term approach.

Question 6. Depending on circumstances, a company may have public reporting obligations on top of those being examined here. Such legislation may have been developed at the EU[3], national or regional level. Should you have views on the interplay of these additional reporting obligations with the policies examined in this consultation, please comment below and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples.

[3] For example, under the Shareholders' Rights Directive 2007/36/EC, companies must publicly announce material transactions with related parties, establish remuneration policy and draw up a remuneration report for the attention of the shareholders, etc. Under the Directive on Capital Requirements for banks (2013/36/EU, Art. 96) banks must maintain a website explaining how they comply with corporate governance requirements, country by country reporting and remuneration requirements. The Solvency II Directive (2009/138/EC) requires Insurance and reinsurance undertakings to publish their Solvency and Financial Condition Report. A prospectus, regulated by the Prospectus Directive (2003/71/EC) and Regulation ((EU) 2017/1129) is a legal document that describes a company's main line of business, its finances and shareholding structure. As regards Market Abuse Directive and Regulation, see specific questions further down.

EU Added value

Question 7. Do you think that, for each respective objective, the EU is the right level to design policies in order to obtain **valuable results**, compared to unilateral and non-coordinated action by each Member State?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Ensuring stakeholder protection	○	○	○	○	●	○
Developing the internal market	○	○	○	○	●	○
Promoting integrated EU capital markets	○	○	○	○	●	○
Ensuring financial stability	○	○	○	●	○	○
Promoting sustainability	○	○	○	○	●	○

Please explain your response to question 7 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

In general we are in favour of harmonization of reporting on the EU level, but it would be good to leave a possibility for member states to create (or support self-created) local reporting frameworks for small and micro companies. The specificities of small and micro companies differ significantly among member states and it is not possible to create a single reporting framework that would fit them all without being burdensome and without causing excessive compliance costs.

II. The financial reporting framework applicable to all EU companies

The financial reporting framework for any EU company is broadly shaped by the Accounting Directive. Member States' accounting laws, regulations and standards for the preparation of annual accounts (national GAAP) must incorporate the provisions of the Accounting Directive. The Accounting Directive includes financial statements (balance sheet, profit or loss statement, and notes to the accounts) as well as a management report, depending on the size of the company. Several Member States allow or require the use of IFRS instead of national GAAP for the preparation of annual financial statements. But even when a company prepares financial statements using IFRS, many requirements from the Accounting Directive still apply such as the management report, statutory audit or publication (for further details, see the guidance on Interaction between IFRS reporting and other EU accounting rules).

Companies operating cross-border

Companies often structure their cross-border business activities within the EU by establishing local entities in a host Member State controlled by a parent established in the home Member State. Together they form a group of controlled entities. Even though a group usually acts and is seen as a single economic entity, EU law does not recognise the legal personality of a group. Nevertheless, EU law addresses certain specific group situations, for instance, by requiring the preparation of consolidated financial statements as if the group were a single entity (Accounting Directive 2013/34/EU, IAS Regulation (EC) No 1606/2002), structuring bankruptcy (Regulation (EU) 2015/848 on insolvency proceedings) or implementing sectoral regulatory supervision (Capital Requirement Directive and Capital Requirement Regulation (banks), Solvency Directive (Insurance).).

When doing cross border business, a group usually faces a variety of business, tax and legal environments. These differences tend to hinder the application of consistent policies and procedures within a group and weaken the comparability of financial statements for users.

Some of these differences arise from options or lacunas in the Accounting Directive or the way in which Member States have complemented the minimum European accounting requirements. For example, the Accounting Directive does not address some economically important transactions such as lease contracts, foreign currency transactions, government grants, cash flows statements, income recognition or deferred taxes. These lacunas are addressed by each Member States in their own way.

More recently the Commission has proposed to harmonise the basis for the taxation of corporate profits for certain groups by ways of a proposal for a Directive on a Common Corporate Tax Base (CCTB) (COM (2016)685 final). It also seeks to organise the free flow of non-personal data by ways of a proposal for a Regulation on a framework for the free flow of non-personal data in the European Union (COM(2017)495), which would legally enable centralised storage and processing of the group's non-personal data by removing unjustified data localisation restrictions within the EU.

Question 8. In your view, to what extent do the addition of, and differences in, national reporting rules hinder the ability of companies to do cross border business within the EU single market?

- ( ) Differences seriously hinder the ability to do business within the EU
- ( ) Differences hinder to some extent
- (•) Differences do not hinder the ability to do business within the EU / are not significant
- ( ) Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 8 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 9. To what extent to you think that the following differences, because they affect public reporting by companies, are significant impediments to cross-border establishment in the EU?

Areas covered by EU requirements

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Differences and lacunas in accounting standards or principles	○	●	○	○	○	○
Differences in corporate governance standards	○	●	○	○	○	○
Differences and overlaps arising from the presentation of the financial statements (balance sheet, etc.)	○	●	○	○	○	○
Differences arising from publication rules / filing with business registers (publication deadlines, publication channels, specifications)	○	●	○	○	○	○
Differences arising from audit requirements	○	●	○	○	○	○
Differences arising from dividends distribution rules or capital maintenance rules	○	●	○	○	○	○

Areas not covered by EU requirements

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Differences arising from specific bookkeeping requirements such as charts of accounts, audit trail requirements, data storage and accessibility	○	○	○	●	○	○
Differences arising from language requirements (Bookkeeping documentation, publication of financial statements)	○	○	○	●	○	○
Differences arising from the determination of taxable profit	○	○	○	●	○	○
Differences arising from digital filing requirements (for instance taxonomies used)	○	○	○	●	○	○
Differences arising from software specifications	○	○	○	●	○	○
Other differences (please rate here and specify below)	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please specify what other differences are significant impediments to cross-border establishment in the EU:

Please explain your response to question 9 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

The differences do not hinder comparability of companies operating in EU countries.
However, fulfilling reporting requirements of a group operating in a few countries would be easier if the choice of software, chart of accounts, ledger structure and format of accounting evidence was not restricted by local legislation or practice. Impediments in this area include prescribed charts of accounts, detailed extracts from accounting systems required as a form tax reporting, specific record formats or obligatory paper form of a document.

Question 10. How do you evaluate the impact of any hindrances to cross border business on costs relating to public reporting by companies?

- ( ) The impact of hindrances on costs are negligible or not significant
- (x) The impact of hindrances on costs are somehow significant
- ( ) The impact of hindrances on costs are very significant
- ( ) Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 10 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Example of such cost is developing and maintaining business software extensions and modifications for each country.

Question 11. On top of differences in national accounting rules, national tax laws will usually require the submission of a tax return in compliance with self-standing national tax rules, adding another layer of reporting standard.

Once a Common Corporate Tax Base is adopted at the EU level, would you consider that the profit before tax reported in the Profit or Loss statement and the determination of the taxable profit should be further aligned across EU Member States?

- ( ) 1 - totally disagree
- ( ) 2 - mostly disagree
- ( ) 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- (x) 4 - mostly agree
- ( ) 5 - totally agree
- ( ) Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 11 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 12. As regards the **preparation of consolidated and individual financial statements** how do you assess the ability of the following approaches to reduce barriers to doing business cross-borders?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
The EU should reduce the variability of standards from one Member State to another through more converged national GAAPs, possibly by removing options currently available in the EU accounting legislation	○	●	○	○	○	○
The EU should reduce the variability of standards from one Member State to another by converging national GAAPs on the basis of a European Conceptual Framework	○	●	○	○	○	○
The EU should reduce the variability of standards from one Member State to another by converging national GAAPs and in addition by addressing current lacunas in the Accounting Directive (leases, deferred taxes, etc.)	○	●	○	○	○	○

The EU should reduce the variability of standards from one Member State to another by establishing a "pan-EU GAAP" available to any company that belongs to a group. Such "pan-EU GAAP" may be the IFRS, IFRS for SMEs, or another standard commonly agreed at the EU level.	○	○	○	○	●	○
Do nothing (status quo)	●	○	○	○	○	○
Other approaches (please rate here and specify below)	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please explain your response to question 12 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

> Reduction of barriers resulting from differences in reporting should be done by adoption of international standards (IFRS, IFRS for SMEs), and not by creation or development of other reporting frameworks. This approach would contribute to higher level of coherence in reporting.

Question 13. As regards the publication of individual financial statements, the Accounting Directive (Article 37) allows any Member State to exempt the subsidiaries of a group from the **publication of their individual financial statements** if certain conditions are met (inter alia, the parent must declare that it guarantees the commitments of the subsidiary). Would you see a need for the extension of such exemption from a Member State option to an EU wide company option?

- ● Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 13 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

SMEs

Since 2016, EU law requires small companies to prepare and publish **only** a balance sheet, a profit or loss statement and a few notes, thanks to the harmonisation agreed at the EU level. Each Member State may fine-tune this regime as regards the level of detail in the balance sheet or profit and loss, and as regards the need for an audit or for a management report. In addition Member State can simplify even further the regime of micro companies and bring it down to only a super simplified balance sheet, a super simplified profit or loss statement and lightweight publication regime. The Member States have used these possibilities to varying extents. The Commission has commissioned a consortium led by the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) to conduct a study on the accounting regime of micro companies with limited liability (FISMA/2017/046/B)). These simplifications are not available to banks, insurance companies or listed companies which are considered as public-interest entities.

Question 14. Do you agree that the EU approach is striking the right balance between preparers' costs and users' needs, considering the following types of companies?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Medium-sized	○	○	○	●	○	○
Small	○	○	●	○	○	○
Micro	○	●	○	○	○	○

Please explain your response to question 14 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 15. EU laws usually define size categories of companies (micro, small, medium-sized or large) according to financial thresholds. Yet definitions may vary across EU pieces of legislation. For instance, the metrics of size-criteria for a micro-company in the Accounting Directive (for the financial statements) differ from those in the Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC (Commission Recommendation of 6 May 2003 concerning the definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (for the support by certain EU business-support programmes). For instance, the turnover may not exceed €700,000 for micro-companies in the Directive whereas it may not exceed €2,000,000 in the Recommendation).

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
In general, should the EU strive to use a single definition and unified metrics to identify SMEs across all the EU policy areas?	○	○	○	○	●	○
In particular, should the EU strive to align the SME definition metrics in the Accounting Directive with those in Recommendation 2003/361/EC?	○	○	○	○	●	○

Please explain your response to question 15 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

> There should be one single definition of SMEs, applied in all EU legislation, or at least in all legislation relating to capital markets. The most useful and simple definition would be the one based on the market cap of a company.

Relevance of the content of financial reporting

A company's financial statement, together with the management report and related documents (corporate governance report, non-financial information) aim to provide a reliable picture of a company's performance and financial position at the reporting date. However, certain users argue that financial statements give only an image of the (recent) past and lack forward-looking information (see for instance Conference Shaping the future of corporate reporting, panel 5 – Matching expectations with propositions, investors' views). The financial statements may also fail to provide a complete picture of the long term value creation, business model, cash flows (non-IFRS financial statements) and internally generated intangible assets (See for instance expert group's report on Intellectual Property Valuation, 2013). There is also only scarce information required at the EU level on dividend distribution policies and risks (see for instance the UK FRC Lab). The search for other sources of information to remedy this situation may increase costs for users and undermine the level playing field.

Question 16. How do you think that the current EU framework as regards the content of financial reporting is relevant (necessary and appropriate), having regards to the following information:

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
A company's or group's **strategy, business model, value creation**	○	○	○	●	○	○
A company's or group's **intangible assets**, including goodwill,						

irrespective of whether these appear on the balance sheet or not	○	○	○	◉	○	○
A company’s or group’s **policies and risks on dividends**, including amounts available for distribution	○	○	○	◉	○	○
A company’s or group’s **cash flows**	○	○	○	◉	○	○

Please explain your response to question 24 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Please explain, including if in your view additional financial information should be provided:

Question 17. Is there any other information that you would find useful but which is not currently published by companies?

○ Yes
◉ No
○ Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Question 18. Financial statements often contain alternative performance measures such as the EBITDA. (An APM is a financial measure of historical or future financial performance, financial position, or cash flows, other than a financial measure defined or specified in the applicable financial reporting framework.)

Do you think that the EU framework should define and require the disclosure of the most commonly used alternative performance measures?

- 1 - totally disagree
- 2 - mostly disagree
- 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - mostly agree (selected)
- 5 - totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 18 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

> There is a small number of alternative performance measures (APMs) that are commonly used by investors to evaluate companies and therefore are reported by companies. These APMs include, i.a. EBITDA (and its variations in some industry sectors), CAPEX and backlog, as well as some measures resulting from them (such as EV/EBITDA or net debt/EBITDA). Standardization of these APMs on a pan-European level would be useful both for investors and for companies. This standardization should not however take form of imposition of new disclosure obligations, but rather be in form of best practice or guidelines (similar to the non-binding guidelines on non-financial information reporting).

III. The EU financial reporting framework for listed companies

The IAS Regulation and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS)

The IAS Regulation adopted in 2005 made the use of IFRS mandatory for the consolidated accounts of listed companies. The Commission Evaluation of the IAS Regulation in 2015 found that the use of IFRS had led to greater transparency and comparability of financial reporting within the single market, but that complexity had increased. It also concluded that the use of IFRS in the EU has significantly increased the credibility of IFRS and its use worldwide.

However, the current level of commitment to IFRS by third country jurisdictions differs significantly. Very few of the major capital markets and large jurisdictions have made the use of IFRS as issued by the IASB mandatory[4]. As a result, the level of global convergence achieved is sub-optimal compared to the initial objective on global use.

Before becoming EU law IFRSs have to be endorsed to ensure that they meet certain technical criteria, are not contrary to the true and fair view principle, and are conducive to the European public good[5]. The current endorsement process prevents the Union from modifying the content of the standards issued by the IASB. Some stakeholders, as mentioned in the final report of the High-Level Expert Group (HLEG), are concerned that this lack of flexibility would prevent the EU from reacting if these standards were to pose an obstacle to broader EU policy goals such as long-term investments and sustainability.

The IASB is addressing the complexity of the standards and the volume of disclosure requirements as part of its Better Communication" project. In addition, the Commission will continue to monitor progress on IASB commitment to improve disclosure, usability and accessibility of IFRS (see the Communication on the Mid-Term Review of the Capital markets Union Action Plan). This initiative is one of the actions set in motion by the Commission in order to make it easier for companies to enter and raise capital on public markets, notably on SME Growth Markets.

[4] As per the Pocket guide to IFRS standards 2017 published by the IFRS Foundation: Very few of the major capital markets and large jurisdictions require the use of IFRS as issued by the IASB. Some allow the use of IFRS by any listed company, or restrict the option to third country issuers. Many others have transposed IFRS into national GAAP which then become "substantially converged" with IFRS issued by the IASB. Several jurisdictions require IFRS as issued by the IASB albeit often relabelled as national GAAP.

[5] The IAS Regulation does not define the criterion "European public good". As a result the Commission has so far followed a pragmatic approach that allows identification of key matters of concern on a case by case basis.

Question 19. Given the different levels of commitment to require IFRS as issued by the IASB around the globe, is it still appropriate that the IAS Regulation prevents the Commission from modifying the content of IFRS?

- (x) Yes
- ( ) No, due to the risk of uneven level playing field for EU companies vis-à-vis companies established in third countries that do not require the use of IFRS as issued by the IASB.
- ( ) No, due to the risk that specific EU needs may not properly be addressed during the IASB standard setting process.
- ( ) No, due to other reasons.
- ( ) Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Question 20. Since the adoption of IFRS by the EU in 2005, topics such as sustainability and long-term investment have come to the forefront of the regulatory agenda. Is the EU endorsement process appropriate to ensure that IFRS do not pose an obstacle to broader EU policy objectives such as sustainability and long-term investments?

- (x) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Question 21. How could the EU ensure that IFRS do not pose an obstacle to sustainability and long-term investments:

- ( ) By retaining the power to modify the IFRS standards in well-defined circumstances;
- (x) By making explicit in the EU regulatory framework that in order to endorse IFRS that are conducive to the European public good, sustainability and long term investment must be considered;
- ( ) Other
- ( ) Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Question 22. The True and Fair view principle should be understood in the light of the general accounting principles set out in the Accounting Directive . By requiring that, in order to be endorsed, any IFRS should not to be contrary to the true and fair view principle, a link has been established between IFRS and the Accounting Directive. However, the principle of true and fair view is not laid down in great detail in the Accounting Directive, nor is it underpinned by e.g. a European Conceptual Framework that would translate these principles into more concrete accounting concepts such as recognition and measurement, measurement of performance, prudence, etc. Do you think that an EU conceptual framework should underpin the IFRS endorsement process?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

If you answered no to question 22, please explain your position:

We don’t see the need for underpinning the IFRS endorsement by the European Conceptual Framework, as the use of IFRS is already required by the Transprancy Directive.

Question 23. The EU has not endorsed the IASB Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting. The conceptual framework is a set of concepts used to develop IFRSs but can also be helpful in interpreting how IFRS standards have to be understood and applied in specific circumstances. This could enhance a common application of IFRSs within the EU.

Should the EU endorse the IASB Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting?

- ○ 1 - totally disagree
- ○ 2 - mostly disagree
- ◉ 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- ○ 4 - mostly agree
- ○ 5 - totally agree
- ○ Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 23 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 24. Contrary to the Accounting Directives the EU endorsed IFRSs do not require companies to present financial information using a prescribed (minimum) lay-out for the balance sheet and income statement. Mandatory use of minimum layouts could enhance comparability of human readable financial statements (Electronic structured data reporting based on the IFRS taxonomy have an implicit layout as relationships between elements for which amounts shall be presented are defined).

Do you agree that prescribed (minimum) layouts enhance comparability of financial statements for users and should therefore be introduced for companies using IFRS.

- ( ) 1 - totally disagree
- ( ) 2 - mostly disagree
- ( ) 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- (•) 4 - mostly agree
- ( ) 5 - totally agree
- ( ) Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 24 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

IASB works currently on more precise definition of primary financial statements. EU shall not engage in any alternative standard setting.

Transparency Directive

The Transparency Directive requires issuers of securities traded on regulated markets within the EU to ensure appropriate transparency through a regular flow of information to the markets. The Transparency Directive was last amended in 2013 in order:

- To reduce the administrative burden on smaller issuers and promote long-term investment by abolishing the requirement to publish quarterly financial reports and,
- To strengthen investor protection by improving the efficiency of the disclosure regime of major holdings of voting rights, particularly regarding voting rights held through derivatives.

Question 25. Do you agree that the Transparency Directive requirements are **effective** in meeting the following objectives, notably in light of increased integration of EU securities markets?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Protect investors	○	○	○	●	○	○
Contribute to integrated EU capital markets	○	○	●	○	○	○
Facilitate cross border investments	○	○	●	○	○	○

Please explain your response to question 25 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 26. Do you agree that abolishing the quarterly reporting requirement in 2013 by issuers contributed to the following?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Reducing administrative burden, notably for SMEs	○	●	○	○	○	○
Promoting long-term investment (i.e. discouraging the culture of short-termism on financial markets).	●	○	○	○	○	○
Promoting long-term and sustainable value creation and corporate strategies	●	○	○	○	○	○
Maintaining an adequate level of transparency in the market and investors' protection	○	●	○	○	○	○

Please explain your response to question 26 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

In Poland quarterly reports are still mandatory for all companies listed on the regulated market and in the alternative trading system. The option provided in the Transparecy Directive allowing member states to continue requirement of quarterly report has resulted in continuation of this disclosure obligation. Nonetheless we would like to stress that:

- Preparation of quarterly reports was assessed by companies as not very burdensome (although resulting in costs)
- Investors are used to quarterly reports and require them from companies
- Concentration on annual reports (and only on them) in the EU legislation would work towards promotion of long-term and sustainable value creation and fighting short-termism. This would however require not only abolishing, but also ban of quarterly and half-yearly reports. We stand on the position that this issue should be market-driven, i.e. the EU should encourage investors to concentrate on annual financial and non-financial information, investors in turn would require companies to produce better annual report, gradually shifting their attention from quarterly and half-yearly reports over time.
- Short-termism on capital markets is caused mainly by the Market Abuse Regulation and results from the obligation of instant disclosure of excessive information.

Question 27. Do you consider that the notifications of major holdings of voting rights in their current form is **effective** in achieving the following?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion /

						not relevant
Strengthening investor protection				X		
Preventing possible market abuse situations				X		

Please explain your response to question 27 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 28. Do you agree that the disclosure and notification regime of major holdings of voting rights in the Transparency Directive is overall **coherent** with the following EU legislation?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Coherent with EU company law	○	○	○	●	○	○
Coherent with the shareholders' rights directive	○	○	○	●	○	○
Coherent with the obligation to disclose managers' transactions under Article 19 of the Market Abuse Regulation (Article 19(3) of MAR sets out the following disclosure obligations: The issuer (…) shall ensure that the information [on transactions carried out by managers or persons closely associated to the managers] is made public promptly and no later than three business days after the transaction in a manner which enables fast access to this information on a non-discriminatory basis)	●	○	○	○	○	○
Coherent with other EU legislation	○	○	○	○	○	●

Please explain your response to question 28 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

The regime of major holdings of voting rights is not coherent with Art. 19 of MAR. Especially the requirement to draw up and maintain a complete list of Persons Closely Associated is burdensome for all companies, their managers and all Persons Closely Associated, while serving no purpose in terms of investor protection or market integrity. In Poland, over 25.000 persons are listed on the lists of Persons Closely Associated (data from a test on Market Abuse Regulation done by the Polish Financial Supervision Authority one year after the introduction of MAR). We suppose that the number of Persons Closely Associated may amount for ca. 0,5 Million persons across the EU. The maintenance of those lists by companies is burdensome, time-consuming and costly and creates significant risks in terms of their coherence and GDPR regulations. Therefore we propose to abolish the obligation to draw-up an maintain lists of Persons Closely Associated (referred to in Article 19 (5) of the MAR), as this is a perfect example of redundant and superfluous regulation serving no purpose at all. Additionally, it is worth emphasizing that the obligation resulting from art. 18 MAR concerning keeping a list of all persons who have access to inside information should remain.

Question 29. As regards the following areas, did you identify a lack of coherence of legislation from one Member State to another that could jeopardise to some extent the objectives of investor protection, integrated capital markets and cross-border investment?

- [ ] Yearly and half-yearly financial information
- [ ] On-going information on major holdings of voting rights
- [x] Ad hoc information disclosed pursuant to the Market Abuse Directive
- [x] Administrative sanctions and measures in case of breaches of the Transparency Directive requirements
- [ ] Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 29 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

The construction of administrative sanctions in case of breaches in the Transparency Directive is dangerous and discouraging for smaller companies. That is due to the fact that smaller companies face a risk of receiving a larger sanction than large companies (large companies face a maximum administrative fine of 5%, while smaller companies risk a sanction of EUR 10M, which may be significantly more than 5%). The maximum sanction for smaller companies should be limited to the same level, as for large companies (5% of annual turnover). These penalties are listed in art. 28b (1) (c) (i) of Directive 2013/50 / EU (Transparency Directive).

Question 30. Should anything be done to improve public reporting by listed companies (documents, information, frequency, access, harmonisation, simplification)?

Issuers in particular jurisdictions are obliged to produce multiple reports for various authorities (tax, statistical, social insurance etc.). Introducing single reporting principle (i.e. one file prepared by issuer forwarded to one information hub available for various authorities) would result in simplification of reporting and would enhance the operations of particular authorities.

IV. The EU financial reporting framework for banks and insurance companies

Bank Accounts Directive (BAD)

All banks (credit institutions) and groups of banks established in the EU - irrespective of their legal form - have to prepare and publish annual financial statements in order to achieve comparability of financial statements. Member State accounting laws, regulations and standards for the preparation of banks' financial statements must incorporate EU law on bank accounting: the Bank Accounts Directive (BAD) adopted in 1986.

Following the endorsement of IFRS by the EU in 2002 all large banks, accounting for more than 65% of total European banking assets, are obliged to use EU endorsed IFRS for their consolidated financial statements. In addition to the mandatory use of IFRS for the consolidated accounts by listed banks, 15 Member States currently require IFRS for the consolidated accounts of non-listed banks and 12 Member States *require* IFRS for the individual accounts of non-listed banks instead of national GAAP (See for more details the table on page 64 of the Staff Working Document on the evaluation on the IAS Regulation)
.

The use of IFRS has reduced the relevance of the Bank Accounts Directive for achieving harmonised financial statements. The BAD has also lost relevance over time as it has not been updated to include more recent accounting treatments, for example on expected credit losses, (operational) leases or revenues from digital business models.

Harmonising banks' financial statements is not only important for the comparability of banks' financial statements. Bank prudential requirements and capital ratios are based on accounting values. Differences between national GAAPs or between national GAAPs and IFRS lead to different prudential outcomes, which hamper the comparability of capital ratios.

Question 31. 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 relevant

The BAD is still sufficiently **effective** to meet the objective of comparability						
The BAD is still sufficiently **relevant** (necessary and appropriate) to meet the objective of comparability						
The costs associated with the BAD are still **proportionate** to the benefits it has generated						
The current EU legislative public reporting framework for banks is sufficiently **coherent**						

Please explain your response to question 31 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 32. Do you agree with the following statement:

The BAD could be suppressed and replaced by a requirement for all EU banks to use IFRS 1.

- 1 - totally disagree
- 2 - mostly disagree
- 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - mostly agree
- 5 - totally agree
- Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 32 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 33. Do you think that the objective of comparability of financial statements of banks using national GAAP could be improved by including accounting treatments in the BAD for:

	Yes	No	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Expected Credit risk provisioning			
Leases			
Intangible assets			
Derivatives			
Other			

Please explain your response to question 33 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 34. Do you agree with the following statement:

The current **number of options** in the BAD may hamper the comparability of financial statements and prudential ratios 1.

- 1 - totally disagree
- 2 - mostly disagree
- 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - mostly agree
- 5 - totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 34 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 35. 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 relevant
Mandatory use of national GAAPs for the preparation of individual financial statements of bank subsidiaries reduces the efficiency of preparing consolidated financial statements	○	○	○	○	○	○
Allowing the use of IFRS for the preparation of individual financial statements by (cross border) banking subsidiaries, subject to consolidated supervision, would increase efficiency	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please explain your response to question 35 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 36. Do you agree with the following statement:

Cross border bank subsidiaries of an EU parent should be allowed not to publish individual financial statements subject to

1. being included in the consolidated financial statements of the group,
2. consolidated supervision and
3. the parent guaranteeing all liabilities and commitments of the cross border subsidiary?

- 1 - totally disagree
- 2 - mostly disagree
- 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - mostly agree
- 5 - totally agree
- Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 36 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Insurance Accounting Directive (IAD)

The Directive on the annual and consolidated accounts of insurance undertakings was adopted in 1991 in order to set a common European Framework consistent with the Accounting Directive. Where applicable, its scope includes the statutory accounts, which implies a strong interplay with National Legal Frameworks pertaining to insurance contract obligations, dividend distribution, taxation and prudential requirements applicable to small entities outside the scope of the Solvency II Directive.

Unlike in the banking sector where prudential requirements and ratios are based on accounting values, the Solvency II Directive applicable from 2016 includes dedicated measurement principles and public disclosure requirements independent from accounting standards.

IFRS 17 "insurance contracts" was issued by the IASB in May 2017 and should apply from 2021 onwards to the consolidated financial statements of listed companies (and to other companies depending on Member States options). In the context of the European endorsement process of IFRS 17, consultations have highlighted concerns that some provisions of IFRS 17 might contradict the Insurance Accounting

Directive and that the interaction between IFRS 17 and Solvency II public disclosure requirements may duplicate information.

Overall depending on Member States' use of options, the European accounting and prudential framework requires listed insurance groups to prepare multiple sets of financial statements (Statutory accounts as per National GAAPs, Solvency and Financial Condition Report under the Solvency II Directive and IFRS financial statements for consolidation purpose). This possibility of overlaps between the various pieces of legislation potentially affects their relevance, efficiency and consistency.

Question 37. 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 relevant
The Insurance Accounting Directive meets the objective of comparable financial statements within the European insurance industry (the Insurance Accounting Directive is **effective**)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
The Insurance Accounting Directive is still sufficiently **relevant** (necessary and appropriate) to meet the objective of comparable financial statements	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
The costs associated with the Insurance Accounting Directive are still proportionate to the benefits it has generated (the Insurance Accounting Directive is **efficient**)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Please explain your response to question 37 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 38. 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 relevant
There are contradicting requirements between the IAD and IFRS 17 which prevent Member States from electing IFRS 17 for statutory and consolidated accounts	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Insurance Accounting Directive should be harmonized with the Solvency II Framework	○	○	○	○	○	○
The Insurance Accounting Directive should be harmonized with the IFRS 17 Standard	○	○	○	○	○	○
Preparers should be allowed to elect for a European-wide option to apply Solvency II valuation principles in their financial statements	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please explain your response to question 38 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 39. Do you think that the current prudential public disclosure requirements and general public disclosure requirements applicable to insurance and reinsurance undertakings are **consistent** with each other?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
For European insurance and reinsurance companies under the scope of the mandatory application of IFRS according to the IAS regulation	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
For European insurance and reinsurance companies required to apply IFRS according to Member States options	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
For European insurance and reinsurance companies not required to apply the IFRS Standards	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎

Please explain your response to question 39 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

V. Non-financial reporting framework

Non-Financial Reporting Directive

Directive 2014/95/EU on disclosure of non-financial Information and diversity information (the NFI Directive) requires around 6.000 large companies with more than 500 employees listed on EU regulated markets or operating in the banking or insurance sectors to disclose relevant environmental and social information in their management report. The directive also requires the large listed companies to make a statement about their diversity policy in relation to the composition of their boards. The first reports have to be published in 2018 regarding financial year 2017. In addition to the NFI Directive, the Commission adopted guidelines in June 2017 to help companies disclose relevant non-financial information in a consistent and more comparable manner. The Commission is required to submit a review report on the effectiveness of the Directive by December 2018.

Question 40. The impact assessment for the NFI Directive identified the quality and quantity of non-financial information disclosed by companies as relevant issues, and pointed at the insufficient diversity of boards leading to insufficient challenging of senior management decisions. Do you think that these issues are still **relevant**?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
The quality and quantity of non-financial information disclosed by companies remain relevant issues.					X	
The diversity of boards, and boards' willingness and ability to challenge to senior management decisions, remain relevant issues.					X	

Please explain your response to question 40 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Both answers were "totally agree", but it is necessary to explain the rationale behind them:
1. The quantity and quality of non-financial information remains relevant issues due to the fact that the Non-

Financial Information Directive is still very young and companies have only finished their first reporting cycle. It is too early to assess the mid- and long-term impact of the Directive on quality and quantity of non-financial information. In our opinion at least three full reporting cycles should turn before any reasonable conclusions can be drawn as to whether the scope of the Directive is well tailored. At present we can only assess the impact of the Directive from the first reporting cycle and from a partial evaluation of ca. 150 reports published in Poland.
2. We regard diversity of boards as a relevant issue but in our opinion further disclosure requirements are not the right tool to support more diversity. In our opinion, the level of disclosure requirements in this issue is right and should not be changed in future.

Question 41. Do you think that the NFI Directive's disclosure framework is **effective** in achieving the following objectives?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Enhancing companies' performance through better assessment and greater integration of non-financial risks and opportunities into their business strategies and operations.	○	○	●	○	○	○
Enhancing companies' accountability, for example with respect to the social and environmental impact of their operations.	○	○	●	○	○	○
Enhancing the efficiency of capital markets by helping investors to integrate material non-financial information into their investment decisions.	○	○	○	●	○	○
Increasing diversity on companies' boards and countering insufficient challenge to senior management decisions	○	●	○	○	○	○

Improving the gender balance of company boards	○	●	○	○	○	○

Please explain your response to question 41 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Regarding first two issues: we suppose that the NFI Directive framework will be effective in achieving the objectives mentioned, but it is still too early to draw final conclusions and the matter should be assessed after at least three full reporting cycles.
Regarding the third issue: reporting framework has been set, now it is time for investors to use the information provided by companies and take ESG issues into their investment decisions. This can and should be facilitated and promoted through various initiatives set out in the Action Plan “Financing Sustainable Future”, aimed at investors’ community and at financial institutions, banks and insurance companies.
Regarding the last two issues: disclosure requirements are adequate in this area and should not be changed. It is important to stress that diversity and gender balance of company boards are appropriately presented under existing regulations and potential improvement in these areas is not a matter of transparency, so it should not be dealt with by reporting requirements.

Question 42. Do you think that the NFI Directive’s current disclosure framework is **effective** in providing non-financial information that is:

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant
Material	○	○	○	●	○	○
Balanced	○	○	○	●	○	○
Accurate	○	○	○	●	○	○
Timely	○	○	○	○	●	○
Comparable between companies	○	●	○	○	○	○
Comparable over time	○	○	●	○	○	○

Please explain your response to question 42 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

We assess positively the reporting framework set by the NFI Directive. Nonetheless the current reporting framework can't assure comparability of non-financial information between companies. Moreover, it should not seek any higher degree of comparability, as companies differ significantly in terms of their impact on various ESG issues. Comparability within industries and sectors should be looked for and can be achieved within the framework set by the NFI Directive. The Directive allows companies to use international or national reporting standard or set of rules. The Non-Financial Information Standard, a standard developed in Poland as a tool for companies to comply with the NFI Directive proved to be widely recognized and used by companies and well accepted by investors and other stakeholders for providing comparable measures among different sectors of the economy. The Standard was developed by the Foundation for Reporting Standards and the Polish Association of Listed Companies, coordinated with and supported by a group of other institutions, authorities and associations representing various stakeholders. The EU should strive to promote such standards, as they will allow better disclosure of non-financial information and will help to achieve comparability between companies within industries and sectors.

Question 43. Do you agree with the following statement:

The current EU non-financial reporting framework is sufficiently **coherent** (consistent across the different EU and national requirements)?

- 1 - totally disagree
- 2 - mostly disagree
- 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- (x) 4 - mostly agree
- 5 - totally agree
- Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 43 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 44. Do you agree with the following statement:

The costs of disclosure under the NFI Directive disclosure framework are proportionate to the benefits it generates.

- 1 - totally disagree
- 2 - mostly disagree
- 3 - partially disagree and partially agree

- [x] 4 - mostly agree
- [ ] 5 - totally agree
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 44 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

As mentioned before, it is too early to fully assess the cost and benefit analysis of the NFI Directive reporting framework. The companies have provided non-financial information in the first reporting cycle, it is time for investors and other stakeholders to use this information. Additional promotion of the use of non-financial information by investors, banks and insurance companies is needed, in line with initiatives resulting from the Action Plan "Financing Sustainable Future"

Question 45. Do you agree with the following statement:

The scope of application of the NFI Directive (i.e. limited to large public interest entities) is appropriate
("Public-interest entities" means listed companies, banks, insurance companies and companies designated by Member States as public-interest entities).

- [ ] 1 - far too narrow
- [ ] 2 - too narrow
- [x] 3 - about right
- [ ] 4 - too broad
- [ ] 5 - way too broad
- [ ] Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 45 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 46. It has been argued that the NFI Directive could indirectly increase the reporting burden for SMEs, as a result of larger companies requiring additional non-financial information from their suppliers.

Do you agree that SMEs are required to collect and report substantially more data to larger companies as a result of the NFI directive?

- [ ] 1 - totally disagree
- [ ] 2 - mostly disagree

- 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- 4 - mostly agree
- (x) 5 - totally agree
- Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 46 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Yes, the first reporting cycle has proven that the argument. raised by the Polish Association of Listed Companies in the legislative process before the NFI Directive came into force, was accurate. During the preparations of the first non-financial reports we have received many signals that large companies obliged to disclose non-financial reports required non-financial data and information from SMEs in their value chains. That includes not only SMEs which are part of capital groups of large companies, but also – and most of all – independent SMEs which are subcontractors or providers of goods and services for large companies. Many of those SMEs were not prepared to the obligation of preparing significant amount of data that wasn’t gathered by them on regular basis before.

Question 47. Do you agree with the following statement?

The non-binding Guidelines on Non-Financial Reporting issued by the Commission in 2017 help to improve the quality of disclosure.

- 1 - totally disagree
- 2 - mostly disagree
- 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- (x) 4 - mostly agree
- 5 - totally agree
- Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 47 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

The scope, character and form of the non-binding Guidelines proved to be well tailored for the needs of companies that had to prepare their non-financial reports for the first time. That was achieved i.a. through comprehensive explanations what key principles (materiality etc.) mean in case of non-financial information. It is also important that the Guidelines don’t favour any particular standard or reporting framework. In case the Guidelines are revised in the future, more examples of reporting frameworks and standards may prove useful, including national standards used in certain member states.

Question 48. The Commission action plan on financing sustainable growth includes an action to revise the 2017 Guidelines on Non-Financial Reporting to provide further guidance to companies on the disclosure of climate related information, building on the FSB TCFD recommendations. The action plan also states that the guidelines will be further amended regarding disclosures on other sustainability factors. Which other sustainability factors should be considered for amended guidance as a priority?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Environment (in addition to climate change already included in the Action Plan)	○	○	○	○	◉	○
Social and Employee matters	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Respect for human rights	○	○	○	◉	○	○
Anti-corruption and bribery	◉	○	○	○	○	○

Question 49. If you are a preparer company, could you please estimate the **increased cost** of compliance with national laws on non-financial disclosure that were adopted or amended following the adoption of the NFI Directive in 2014, compared to annual non-financial disclosure costs incurred before the adoption of the NFI Directive?

Increased amount in Euros of cost of compliance with national laws - **one-off costs of reporting for the first time**:

Increased amount as a % of total operating cost of compliance with national laws - **one-off costs of reporting for the first time**:

%

Increased amount in Euros of cost of compliance with national laws - **estimated recurring costs**:

Increased amount as a % of total operating cost of compliance with national laws - **estimated recurring costs**:

[ ] %

Question 50. How would you assess, overall, the impact of the NFI Directive disclosure framework on the competitiveness of the reporting EU companies compared to companies in other countries and regions of the world?

- ( ) Very positive impact on competitiveness
- (•) Somewhat positive impact on competitiveness
- ( ) No significant impact on competitiveness
- ( ) Somewhat negative impact on competitiveness
- ( ) Very negative impact on competitiveness
- ( ) Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 50 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

[ ]

Country-by-country reporting by extractive and logging industries

Since 2017, companies that are active in the extractive industry or in the logging of primary forests have to be more transparent on the payments they make to governments. Through amendments made in 2013 to the Accounting and Transparency directives, such companies established in the European Union should publish each year a so-called "country-by-country report" summarising payments to governments. These reporting requirements were introduced to help governments of resource-rich countries manage their resources as well as to enable civil society to better hold governments and business into account. This should also help governments of resources-rich countries to implement the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) principles.

Question 51. Do you think that the public reporting requirements on payments to governments ("country-by-country reporting") by extractive and logging industries are:

			3			Don’t know /

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	(partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	no opinion / not relevant
effective (successful in achieving its objectives)						
efficient (costs are proportionate to the benefits it has generated)						
relevant (necessary and appropriate)						
coherent (with other EU requirements)						
designed at the appropriate level (EU level) in order to add the highest value (as compared to actions at Member State level)						

Please explain your response to question 51 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 52. As a preparer company, could you please indicate the annual recurring costs (in € and in relation to total operating costs) incurred for the preparation, audit (if any) and publication of the “country-by-country report”:

Total amount in Euros of **one-off costs of reporting** for the first time for the “country-by-country report”:

Amount as a % of total operating costs of **one-off costs of reporting for the first time** for the “country-by-country report”:

%

Total amount in Euros of annual recurring costs for the “country-by-country report” - **estimated recurring costs**:

Amount as a % of total operating costs of annual recurring costs for the “country-by-country report” - **estimated recurring costs**:

%

Question 53. How would you assess, overall, the impact of country-by-country reporting on the competitiveness of the reporting EU companies?

- Very positive impact on competitiveness
- Somewhat positive impact on competitiveness
- No significant impact on competitiveness
- Somewhat negative impact on competitiveness
- Very negative impact on competitiveness
- Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 53 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Integrated reporting

In addition to a demand to broaden the range of information to be included in corporate reports, there is an ongoing debate on whether and how to integrate financial, non-financial, and other related reports in a meaningful way.

Question 54. Do you agree that integrated reporting can deliver the following **benefits**?

						Don’t know /

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	no opinion / not relevant
More efficient allocation of capital, through improved quality of information to capital providers	○	○	○	●	○	○
Improved decision-making and better risk management in companies as a result of integrated thinking and better understanding of the value-creation process	○	○	○	○	●	○
Costs savings for preparers	●	○	○	○	○	○
Cost savings for users	○	○	○	●	○	○
Other differences (please rate here and specify below)	○	○	○	○	●	○

Please specify what other benefit(s) can integrated reporting deliver:

Introduction of integrated reporting will definitely mean additional cost for preparing companies. This can be off-set only in case of integrated reporting replacing current reporting obligations.
There will be no benefit in adding integrated reports as just another report that companies need to prepare. The real value of integrated reporting lies in those reports replacing all other forms of reports prepared currently by companies. Such a profound change in the overall reporting framework would need deep changes in the whole legislative infrastructure and needs the right time for planning and roll-out.

Please explain your response to question 54 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 55. Do you agree with the following statement?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
A move towards more integrated reporting in the EU should be encouraged	○	○	○	○	●	○
The costs of a more integrated reporting would be proportionate to the benefits it generates (would be efficient)	○	○	○	○	●	○

Please explain your response to question 55 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

We are in favour of the EU encouraging companies to prepare and investors and other stakeholders to use integrated reports, yet we don't agree that this should be done fast and in an obligatory way.
The costs of integrated reporting would be proportionate to the benefits it generates only in case integrated reports replace all other forms of reports. In case integrated reports are introduced as just another additional type of annual reports, the costs to prepare them would outweigh significantly any benefits they may incure.

Question 56. Is the existing EU framework on public reporting by companies an obstacle to allowing companies to move freely towards more integrated reporting?

- ● Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

If you answered "Yes" to question 56, please clarify your response and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

The existing EU framework on public reporting creates no benefits for companies to prepare and investors and other stakeholders to use integrated reports. Companies in majority see no point in preparing integrated reports as long as they are still obliged to prepare separate financial, non-financial, governance etc. reports. In fact the existing reporting framework discourages companies from preparing integrated reports and encourages a disintegrated, separated and granulated view of the company's capitals and prevents the management boards from seeing a broader picture of the relations of their companies and the natural and social environments.

Please explain your response to question 56 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

VI. The digitalisation challenge

In the area of public reporting by companies technology is changing 1) the way companies prepare and disseminate corporate reports and 2) the way investors and the public access and analyse company information. On 6 October 2017, the ’eGovernment Declaration’ was signed in Tallin in the framework of the eGovernement Ministerial Conference. It marked a clear political commitment at EU level towards ensuring high quality, user-centric digital public services for citizens and seamless cross-border public services for businesses.

Digitalisation is soon to become reality for issuers with securities listed on European regulated markets (“listed companies”). These companies must file their Annual Financial Reports with the relevant Officially Appointed Mechanisms (OAMs). An Annual Financial Report mainly contains the audited financial statements, the management report and some other statements. In 2013, the Transparency Directive was amended to introduce as from 1 January 2020 a structured electronic reporting for Annual Financial Reports based on a so-called "European Single Electronic Format" (ESEF). It also established a single European Electronic Access Point (EEAP) in order to interconnect the different national OAMs. The objectives were to facilitate the filing of information by listed companies, and facilitate access to and use of company information by users on a pan-EU basis, thus reducing operational costs for both parties.

Beyond listed companies, the Commission is currently working, as announced in the 2017 Commission Work Programme, on an EU Company Law package making the best of digital solutions and providing efficient rules for cross-border operations whilst respecting national social and labour law prerogatives, which is not subject to this public consultation.

Question 57. Do you consider the existing EU legislation to be an obstacle to the development and free use by companies of digital technologies in the field of public reporting?

- ○ Yes
- ● No
- ○ Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Question 58. Do you consider that increased digitalisation taking place in the field diminishes the relevance of the EU laws on public reporting by companies (for instance, by making paper based formats or certain provisions contained in the law irrelevant)?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

If you answered "Yes" to question 58, please clarify your response and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

> The digitalisation processes require structured data. Once large amount of structured financial data from a certain group of companies is available (i.e. once ESEF reports are prepared) it is highly probable that users of information will concentrate more on the data that is available in a digitalized, structured form (financial data), thus diminishing the importance of other information prepared by companies in a non-structured way.

The impact of electronic structured reporting

Question 59. Do you think that, as regards public reporting by listed companies, the use of electronic structured reporting based on a defined taxonomy (ESEF) and a single access point (EEAP) will meet the following intended objectives:

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
improve transparency for investors and the public				X		
improve the relevance of company reporting				X		
reduce preparation and filing costs for companies		X				
reduce costs of access for investors and the public					X	

reduce other reporting costs through the re-use of companies' public reporting of electronic structured data for other reporting purposes (e.g. tax authorities, national statistics, other public authorities)	○	●	○	○	○	○

Please provide an estimated order of magnitude or qualitative comments for such cost reductions (e.g. % of preparation costs or % of costs of accessing and analysing data...):

Question 60. In your opinion, on top of the financial statements, do you think that the following documents prepared by listed companies should contain electronic structured data?

Financial reporting

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Half-yearly interim financial statements	○	○	○	○	●	○
Management report	○	○	○	●	○	○
Corporate governance statement	○	●	○	○	○	○
Other disclosure or statements requirements under the Transparency						

Directive such as information about major holdings	○	○	○	○	○	◉

Non-financial reporting and other reports

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Non-financial information	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Country-by-country report on payments to governments	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Other documents (please rate here and specify below)	○	○	○	○	○	○

Question 61. Once the ESEF is fully developed and in place for listed companies, would this EU language add value as a basis to structure the financial statements, management reports etc. published by any limited liability company in the EU?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 61 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Question 62. As regards the non-financial information that listed companies, banks and insurance companies must publish, do you think that digitalisation of this information could bring about the following benefits?

	1 (totally disagree)	2 (mostly disagree)	3 (partially disagree and partially agree)	4 (mostly agree)	5 (totally agree)	Don't know / no opinion / not relevant
Facilitate access to information by users	( )	( )	(•)	( )	( )	( )
Increase the granularity of information disclosed	( )	( )	( )	(•)	( )	( )
Reduce the reporting costs of preparers	(•)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Please explain your response to question 62 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Digitalisation of non-financial information is a complex matter as companies differ significantly in terms and scope of non-financial information published, due to the fact that different ESG aspects are material for different companies. No digitalisation of non-financial reports should be encouraged or implemented before the EU sustainability taxonomy is developed. Nonetheless we would like to stress that the EU sustainability taxonomy should be developed with broad inclusion of representatives of companies in the technical expert group, as only those representatives may point towards specificities and issues that may be otherwise omitted by representatives of other groups of stakeholders. The right development of the taxonomy is key to it being widely used first by financial institutions, investors, banks and insurance companies and later by companies disclosing non-financial reports.

Question 63. Digitalisation facilitates the widespread dissemination and circulation of information. Besides, the same corporate reporting information may be available from different sources, such as a company’s web site, an OAM, a business register, a data aggregator or other sources. In a digitalised economy, do you consider that electronic reporting should be secured by the reporting company with electronic signatures, electronic seals and/or other trust services?

- (x) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Don’t know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 63 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Data storage mechanisms – data repositories

Today, the self-standing national databases maintained by each Officially Appointed Mechanisms (OAMs) are not interconnected to each other, or to a central platform.

The European Financial Transparency Gateway (EFTG) is a pilot project funded by the European Parliament that aims to virtually connect the databases using the distributed ledger technology in order to provide a single European point of access to investors searching for investment opportunities on a pan-EU basis. The European Financial Transparency Gateway could be used as a basis for achieving a single European Electronic Access Point (EEAP).

Question 64. Considering the modern technologies at hand to interconnect databases on information filed by listed companies with the OAMs, 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 relevant
A pan-EU digital access to databases based on modern technologies would improve investor protection	○	○	○	●	○	○
A pan-EU digital access to databases based on modern technologies would promote cross border investments and efficient capital markets	○	○	○	●	○	○
The EU should take advantage of a pan-EU digital access to make information available for free to any user	○	○	○	○	●	○

Question 65. Public reporting data in the form of structured electronic data submitted by listed companies could potentially be re-used for different purposes by different authorities. For instance, by filing a report once with an OAMs and re-using it for filing purposes with a business register. In your opinion, should the EU foster the re-use of data and the "file only once" principle?

- ● Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Please explain your response to question 65 and substantiate it with evidence or concrete examples:

Coherence with other Commission initiatives in the field of digitalisation

On 1 December 2017, the Commission launched a Fitness Check on the supervisory reporting frameworks. In parallel, the financial data standardisation (FDS) project, launched in 2016, aims for a 'common financial data language' across the board for supervisory purposes. The Commission will report by summer 2019 (for more details, see Commission report on the follow up to the call for evidence - EU regulatory framework for financial services, December 2017 section 3.3).

Question 66. Should the EU strive to ensure that labels and concepts contained in public reporting by companies are standardised and aligned with those used for supervisory purposes?

- ( ) 1 - totally disagree
- ( ) 2 - mostly disagree
- ( ) 3 - partially disagree and partially agree
- (x) 4 - mostly agree
- ( ) 5 - totally agree
- ( ) Don't know / no opinion / not relevant

Other comments

Question 67. Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

We would like to stress two most important propositions mentioned before:

- Possibility to introduce less burdensome, lighter reporting frameworks for small and micro companies, i. a. in form of local reporting frameworks supported by member states.
- Single reporting principle as a general principle that should be taken into account in all future reforms of the EU reporting framework for all companies.
- Single reporting should be natural consequence of the imminent entry into force of the single reporting format - ESEF, which, through appropriate coding, will allow easy identification of information from the report for every interested person. One report could be available to all stakeholders (including tax, statistics and capital market authorities) making information sharing for all interested parties much more efficient.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AD
: Accounting Directive

BAD
: Bank Accounts Directive

CEP
: Centre for European Studies

CBCR
: Country by Country Reporting

CLD
: Company Law Directive

CMD
: Capital Maintenance Directive

CMU
: Capital Markets Union

CRD
: Capital Requirements Directive

CRR
: Capital Requirements Regulation

DG FISMA
: Directorate General Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union

DLT& API
: Distributed Ledger Technology & Application Programme Interface

EC
: European Commission

EFRAG
: European Financial Reporting Advisory Group

EFTG
: European Financial Transparency Gateway

EITI
: Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative

ESG
: Environmental, Social & Governance factors

ESMA
: European Securities and Markets Authority

ESRB
: European Systemic Risk Board

FSB
: Financial Stability Board

GAAPs
: General Accepted Accounting Principles

HLEG
: High-Level Expert Group

IAD
: Insurance Accounts Directive

IAS
: International Accounting Standards

IASB
: International Accounting Standards Board

IFRS
: International Financial Reporting Standards

IFRS 4
: International Financial Reporting Standards on Insurance contracts

IFRS 9
: International Financial Reporting Standards on Financial Instruments

IFRS 17
: will replace IFRS 4 as of 1 January 2021

IIRC
: International Integrated Reporting Council

KPIs
: Key Performance Indicators

NFR
: Non-Financial Reporting Directive (also called NFI for Non-Financial Information)

NGOs
: Non-governmental Organisation

OAMs
: Officially Appointed Mechanisms

OECD

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

PIE

Public Interest Entities

P&L

Profit and Loss account

SMEs

Small and Medium Enterprises

SRB

Single Resolution Board

SSM

Single Supervisory Mechanism

TCFD

Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures

TD

Transparency Directive

3. 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) here:

Useful links

Consultation details (http://ec.europa.eu/info/consultations/finance-2018-companies-public-reporting_en)

Specific privacy statement (http://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2018-companies-public-reporting-consultation-document_en)

More on the Transparency register (http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en)

Contact

fisma-public-reporting-by-companies@ec.europa.eu