



2018

---

# Real Estate Assessment

# Contents

About GRESB .....	3
2018 Real Estate Assessment Changes .....	7
Entity & Reporting Characteristics .....	20
Management .....	28
Policy & Disclosure .....	32
Risks & Opportunities .....	39
Monitoring & EMS .....	46
Performance Indicators .....	50
Building Certifications .....	65
Stakeholder Engagement .....	67
New Construction & Major Renovations .....	80

# About GRESB

---

GRESB is an industry-driven organization transforming the way capital markets assess the environmental, social and governance (ESG) performance of real asset investments.

GRESB data and analytical tools are used by over 70 institutional and retail investors, including pension funds and insurance companies, collectively representing over USD 17 trillion in institutional capital, to engage with investment managers to enhance and protect shareholder value.

For more information, visit [gresb.com](https://gresb.com). Follow @GRESB on Twitter.

## About the GRESB Real Estate Assessment

The GRESB Real Estate Assessment is the global standard for ESG benchmarking and reporting for listed property companies, private property funds, developers and investors that invest directly in real estate. The Assessment evaluates performance against seven sustainability aspects, including information on performance indicators, such as energy, GHG emissions, water and waste. The methodology is consistent across different regions, investment vehicles and property types and aligns with international reporting frameworks, such as GRI and PRI.

The GRESB Real Estate Assessment provides investors with actionable information and tools to monitor and manage the ESG risks and opportunities of their investments, and to prepare for increasingly rigorous ESG obligations. Assessment participants receive comparative business intelligence on where they stand against their peers, a roadmap with the actions they can take to improve their ESG performance and a communication platform to engage with investors.

## The role of the GRESB benchmark

GRESB's global benchmark uses a consistent methodology to compare performance across different regions, investment vehicles and property types. This consistency, combined with our broad market coverage, means our members and participants can apply a single, globally recognized ESG framework to all their real estate investments.

The GRESB Real Estate Assessment is structured around seven Aspects and contains approximately 50 indicators. The indicators follow a plan-do-check-act logic and are designed to encompass the wide variety of property companies and funds included in the benchmark.

While GRESB provides an overall GRESB Score for each participant, it recognizes that this is only a single element within a range of results reported in the benchmark. The key to analyzing GRESB data is in peer group comparisons that take into account country, regional, sectoral and investment type variations.

GRESB is committed to facilitating the inclusion of its ESG metrics in investment decision-making processes and encouraging an active dialogue between investors, fund managers and companies on ESG issues. GRESB updates its Investor Engagement Guide on an annual basis to assist GRESB Investor Members in their engagement with managers.

Additional information about the 2018 participation fee is available [here](#).

## 2018 Participation Fee

Participants can choose to submit the Assessment as a non-member and pay a nominal participation fee or submit the Assessment as a GRESB Member. Participation is free of charge for first time participants who report under the Grace Period, and for companies and funds headquartered in non-OECD countries. GRESB Members, in addition to the benefits received by participants, have access to more advanced analytical tools and services as well as preferential marketing, industry recognition, and networking opportunities.

## Grace Period

GRESB offers participants reporting for the first time the option to not disclose their first year Assessment results to their investors. This "Grace Period" allows participants a year to familiarize themselves with the GRESB reporting and assessment process without externally disclosing their results to GRESB Investor Members.

While Grace Period participant names are disclosed to GRESB Investor Members, Investor Members are not able to request access to Grace Period participant results.

The participation fee is waived for Grace Period participants reporting to GRESB for the first time. Participants will receive a GRESB Scorecard and have the opportunity to purchase a Benchmark Report for a more in-depth analysis of sustainability performance and a detailed indicator-level comparison with peers.

First time participants wishing to opt for the Grace Period can select the option from the settings section in the Assessment Portal.

## Who can see my data?

Data is submitted to GRESB through a secure online platform and can only be seen by current GRESB Staff or authorized personnel from GRESB's parent company, i.e., GBCI, Inc. ("GBCI"). GRESB benchmark scores are not made public. Data collected through the GRESB Real Estate Assessment is only disclosed to the participants themselves and:

- In the case of non-listed property companies and funds, to GRESB Investor Members that are investors in the company or fund.
- In the case of listed real estate companies, to all GRESB Investor Members that invest in listed real estate securities.

No other third parties will see the data. GRESB Investor Members must request access to a participant's benchmark results and scores, allowing the participant the control to either accept or deny this request.

## Timeline and Process

The GRESB Real Estate Assessment opens in the Assessment Portal on April 1, 2018. The submission deadline is July 1, 2018, providing participants with a three-month window to complete the Assessment. This is a fixed deadline, and GRESB will not accept submissions received after this date.

The GRESB validation process starts on June 15 and continues until July 31, 2018. We may need to contact you during this time to clarify any issues with your response.

Results are published in September and are distributed as follows:

- Participants: Receive a Scorecard and Benchmark Report for all of their Assessment submissions.
- Fund Manager and Company Members: In addition to receiving a Scorecard and Benchmark Report for all of their Assessment submissions, Fund Manager and Company Members also have access to the Portfolio Analysis Tool, additional functionality in the Member Portal and preferential marketing, industry recognition, and networking opportunities.
- Investor Members: Receive Benchmark Reports for all of their investments and have access to GRESB's Member Portal, which contains additional analysis tools to create reports based on a selection of their investments.

For an overview of key dates and activities for the 2018 Assessment cycle, please see the [Assessment timeline](#).

## Response Check

A [Response Check](#) is a high-level check of the Assessment response prior to final submission. It helps to reduce errors that may adversely impact the Assessment results and ensures the submission is as complete as possible.

The Response Check is available for request from April 1 to June 8, 2018 subject to available resources. We strongly encourage participants to place their request as early as possible.

Fund Manager and Company Members are able to request a complimentary Response Check for one entity as one of their membership benefits.

## Guidance & Support

The Assessment Portal is accompanied by indicator-specific guidance, available under the “Guidance” tab that explains:

- The intent of each indicator;
- The requirements for each response;
- Explanation of any terminology used;
- References to any third-party documents;
- Basic scoring information;
- The number of points available.

In addition to the guidance in the Portal, each Assessment is accompanied by a Reference Guide. The Reference Guide provides general introductory information to the Assessments and provides a report-format version of the indicator-by-indicator guidance that is available under the Guidance tab in the Portal. The Reference Guide will be available on March 1, 2018.

The GRESB Assessment Portal has the following tools and functionality to help ensure an efficient and accurate submission:

- The pre-filling function adds the information already provided in previous years.
- The document section provides an overview of documents submitted as evidence.
- The Portal allows participants to upload multiple documents as evidence per indicator, eliminating the need to merge different documentation into one file.
- Participants can manage access rights, adding users with different levels of access.

- The Portal has real-time error detection systems and warnings.
- Automated data uploads are available through API connections.
- The Template Tool enables participants to copy information across multiple submissions (available for GRESB Members only).

GRESB works with a select group of Partners who can help participants with their Assessment submission. To learn more about the services offered by GRESB Partners, please refer to our [Partner Directory](#).

Participants are able to contact the [GRESB Helpdesk](#) at any time for support and guidance.

## GRESB Assessment Training Program

GRESB Real Estate Assessment Training is designed to educate participants, potential participants and other GRESB stakeholders (managers, consultants, data partners) on ESG management and reporting through the GRESB Real Estate Assessment.

The training is divided into two sessions – Introductory and Advanced – to reflect the level of experience with GRESB:

- Introductory Training covers the “what” and “how to” of the GRESB Real Estate Assessment. The session presents the Assessment’s scope, processes and scoring components, addressing the Assessment topics at a high level. This training program is best suited for new participants and those who have not yet attended a previous GRESB training.
- Advanced Training tackles complex reporting and scoring components of the Assessment including performance indicators, and includes hands-on case studies and exercises.

Both programs are delivered via face-to-face group sessions, in select locations across all regions with GRESB participation, including Europe, North America and Asia Pacific. [See dates and locations for GRESB Assessment Training](#).

Starting in October 2018, GRESB will run Data Insights Training sessions focussing on the interpretation of the Assessment results and the reporting and benchmarking tools available to Investor Members, Fund Manager and Company Members.

# 2018 GRESB Real Estate Assessment Changes

---

GRESB works closely with its members and broader industry stakeholders to ensure the Assessment addresses material issues in the sustainability performance of real estate investments. Following an extensive industry engagement through the GRESB Advisory Board, Benchmark Committees and Industry Working Groups, the 2018 GRESB Real Estate Assessment introduces an updated structure and developments to the indicators.

The table below has more information on the changes:

## High-level comments

### **Assessment development process focused on creating alignment between the different GRESB business lines and recognizing topics that are directly aligned with investment rationale**

---

Alignment in terminology, interpretation of indicators, document structure and process standardization is important, especially for managers with investments in multiple asset classes. One of the direct outcomes relates to the renaming of the Real Estate Assessment indicators to associate with each Aspect (e.g. Q1 of the Management Aspect becomes MA1, Q30.1 of the Building Certifications Aspect becomes BC1.1). In the long term, this provides more flexibility in adding or removing indicators without affecting the entire Assessment structure.

The desire for better alignment between GRESB Assessments also led to the amendment of indicators in the Management, Policy & Disclosure, Stakeholder Engagement sections which address the management and policy dimensions of a reporting entity.

### **Reduced number of scored open text boxes and new portal functionalities for a faster reporting process**

---

The 2018 Assessment developments are designed with the purpose of scoring performance in a way that encourages improvement in ESG performance (measured, tested performance). Allowing participants the option to provide context to their answers is important and will continue to happen via non-scored open text boxes used for reporting purposes in the Benchmark Report.

### **Updated selection methodology for Validation Plus scope**

---

The validation process continues to be structured in three layers: All Participant Check (APC), Validation Plus (VP) and Validation Interviews (VI). Starting 2018, the random selection of 25% participants for a more detailed check of all supporting evidence will be replaced by a selection of 100% participants being checked on the same subset of indicators. This will allow GRESB to apply a consistent level of scrutiny on all participating entities.

### **Expanded scope on building certifications, with deeper insights on certifications and an updated building certifications database which will improve the search function**

---

We recognize that the property market benefits from a wide availability of certification schemes and energy ratings. Many of them are generally comparable in complexity and robustness. As a next step in evaluating portfolio performance, GRESB is now asking for the applicable building certification level. This is often included in performance targets and engagement objectives and will allow GRESB to provide more

informative output and data analysis. In 2018, the levels are not used for scoring, but the information is relevant for reporting purposes

### **Better integration of future trends including carbon taxonomy**

---

Reporting on Scope 3 emissions becomes mandatory. The 2017 indicator format only prescribes mandatory reporting of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. As institutional investors using GRESB data are increasingly required to calculate and report their own carbon footprint and reduction targets, they need accurate information on all types of emissions.

### **Increased focus on data quality through the recognition of asset-level reporting**

---

GRESB believes that a more granular way of reporting on the quantitative elements of the Assessment is necessary for facilitating more robust data checks and output analytics. As such, in 2018 we will incentivize asset-level reporting for a minimum set of data (i.e., energy consumption, GHG emissions, water consumption, waste generation) through scoring. Note that asset-level reporting will not become mandatory.

### **Increased transparency on scoring and Assessment methodology**

---

In response to multiple requests for additional information on scoring and methodology, GRESB publishes the 2017 Real Estate Scoring document on the Assessment Portal. This document is shared with participants in good faith and can be used by participants as an additional source of information on the Assessment. Please note that the 2018 scoring methodology can differ partially or completely for certain indicators.

### **Health & Well-being Module enters its final year**

---

The GRESB Health & Well-being module is entering its third and final year alongside the Real Estate Assessment. After two years of successful voluntary participation in the module coupled with encouraging results, human health is among the top trends expected to shape the real estate industry in the near future. The final year of the GRESB Health & Well-being Module will build on information accumulated over the past years to further develop material indicators for potential integration in the 2019 Real Estate Assessment.

### **New! Resilience Module**

---

Resilience has emerged as an important topic for real estate and infrastructure investors and the companies, funds and assets they invest in. With the frequency and cost of natural disasters increasing around the world, the topic will remain on the agenda for years to come.

In order to provide our Investor Members with more transparency about the resilience of real estate and infrastructure companies, funds and assets, GRESB is introducing a new Resilience Module for the 2018 Assessment cycle. The new Resilience Module will be available as an optional supplement for 2018 GRESB Assessments, including Real Estate and Infrastructure, and is informed by the Industry Working Groups hosted in January, 2018.



## Entity and reporting characteristics

### RC2 **Add "Millions" in the question text to emphasise the number input should be in millions and implement answer check (i.e., warning, signal, flag)**

---

**Rationale for change:** A frequent mistake made in 2017, which required individual follow-up with many participants during the summer.

**Impact of change:** Additional portal check.

### RC5.1 **Reporting in "Units" is no longer possible**

---

**Rationale for change:** Using "Units" as a measure for asset size offers limited possibilities for analysis and little comparability (i.e., a "unit" can mean anything from a parking space, to a hotel room, to a bed in student accommodation). As we are incorporating additional data checks and creating a more sophisticated outlier analysis for Performance Indicators, we need to apply the same level of scrutiny to all participants.

**Impact of change:** In 2017, only 26 participants expressed the size of their portfolio (or parts of their portfolio) in units. This option was predominantly used for Parking (indoors), Residential - family homes and Residential - multifamily. We reached out to everyone affected by this change in early January and assessed the impact. With the exception of a few cases of Parking (indoors) portfolios, participants confirmed they would be able to convert the units in sq.ft / m2.

### RC5.2, RC- NC1.2, RC- NC2.2 **Additional question on portfolio characteristics to ensure complete reporting**

---

**Rationale for change:** Ensure participants report on their entire real estate portfolio and do not report on a selected subset.

**Impact of change:** A simple Yes/No question, followed by additional context to provide assurance for participants that portfolios are fairly benchmarked.

### RC6/ RC- NC3 **Replace "United States" in the dropdown list of countries by the full list of US states**

---

**Rationale for change:** The climate on the West Coast is very different from the one on the East Coast. Knowing the location of the assets by state would allow GRESB to break down the peer groups into more specific parts, similar to the sub-regions in Europe (e.g. Benelux).

**Impact of change:** Expand the dropdown. Participants need to calculate their regional allocation of assets in more detail.

# Management

## MA1(Q1) **Open text box no longer scored, but used for reporting purposes**

---

**Rationale for change:** In 2017, 95% responses received Full points or Partial Points. Most participants are able to explain their sustainability objectives, following the standard validation requirements for the answer. This change is in line with our effort to shift more weight from the management to the quality and implementation of sustainability objectives.

**Impact of change:** Reduced reporting burden. The total points assigned to this indicator remains 2p.

## **New option added: Health & Well-being**

---

**Rationale for change:** Health & Well-being is a cross-cutting issue borrowing elements from the entire spectrum of environmental, social and governance indicators. Human health is among the top trends expected to shape the real estate industry in the near future and an increasing number of real estate companies define their strategy around it. We do not expect all GRESB participants to define their development strategy around health & well-being, but we would like to identify the ones who do.

**Impact of change:** This section is not used for scoring, but is relevant for the validation of the supporting evidence.

## MA2(Q2) **“Investment partners (co-investors/JV partners)” is added to the options list. The “Other” answer option has been removed**

---

**Rationale for change:** Investment partners/JV partners is a frequently provided “Other” option. All the other answers provided by participants were duplicated of the already listed elements or a duplicate of the sustainability taskforce addressed in MA4.

**Impact of change:** It is not possible to pre-fill the indicator in 2018. No impact on score.

## MA4 (Q4&Q5) **The open text in Q5 is integrated into Q4 and is used for reporting purposes only**

---

**Rationale for change:** In 2017, 96% participants answered “Yes” in Q5, confirming they have a formal process to inform the most senior decision-maker on the sustainability performance. 98% of these answers received “Full points”, demonstrating that when applicable, internal communication on sustainability is done in a structured way. This indicators presents little opportunity for differentiation from a scoring perspective, but is an important piece for defining the context of the submission.

**Impact of change:** The open textbox is incorporated into MA4 but will not be scored.

## MA5 (Q6) **Restructured indicator coupled with the request for supporting evidence**

---

**Rationale for change:** Specific provisions for rewards, penalties, or support reflect the entity’s strategic priorities and provide the foundation for accountability of senior management and responsibility for employees. In 2017, 90% of participants confirmed that their organizations include sustainability factors in the annual performance targets of the employees. The updated indicator unpacks that claim to determine how incentives are created for the achievement of ESG targets and who benefits from them.

**Impact of change:** A more structural approach to ESG targets. No changes on scoring.

# Policy and Disclosure

## Adjusted the order of indicators within section

---

**Rationale for change:** The order was counterintuitive; starting with the indicators on disclosure and followed by the ones on policy. Restructured the section into fewer indicators that follow a simple flow: policies on E, S, G, and disclosure methods.

**Impact of change:** Better flow of indicators.

### PD1 (Q8) Option “Building safety” is removed

---

**Rationale for change:** In the context of this indicator, the answer is often interpreted in the same way as “Environmental attributes of building materials”. The provision of policy clauses on asset-level structural characteristics that can harm tenant safety is captured in the option “asset-level safety (for tenants)” in PD3.

**Impact of change:** Indicator is still pre-filled, no impact on scoring.

### PD2 Elements of Q9, Q10, Q11 are combined into an indicator addressing policies on social issues

---

**Rationale for change:** Overlapping elements across indicators.

**Impact of change:** Better Assessment structure through individual indicators on each of the E/S/G pillars. PD2 receives 2p.

### PD3 (Q9) Update issues for policy/policies on governance (this change is related to the previous one)

---

**Rationale for change:** The list of items classified as E/S/G issues was not consistent with the definitions of other reporting guidelines.

**Impact of change:** List of governance issues has been updated to reflect the most material governance issues for an efficient operation of the entity. The maximum points available for this indicator is increased from 1p to 2p.

### PD4 Indicator on board diversity

---

**Rationale for change:** Research shows that companies with higher board diversity are more likely to have strong financial performance and fewer instances of bribery, corruption, conflicts of interest and fraud. The aim of this newly created indicator is to zoom into the diversity topic and improve alignment with the GRI, EPRA (GRI102-24 / 103 / 405-1 / 405-2) and PRI standards (IFD20, SG10, LEI10).

**Impact of change:** The indicator is not scored and only used for reporting purposes in 2018.

## **Q10 Remove the indicator**

---

**Rationale for change:** Q10 is overlapping with the updated PD2.

**Impact of change:** Easier reporting.

## **Q11 Remove the indicator**

---

**Rationale for change:** Q11 is overlapping with the updated PD2.

**Impact of change:** Easier reporting.

## **PD6 Indicator on company's commitment to ESG leadership standards or group**

---

**Rationale for change:** The public commitment to sustainability through affiliation to internationally recognised initiatives contributes to the organization's credibility and strengthens investor confidence.

**Impact of change:** The indicator is not scored and only used for reporting purposes in 2018.

## **PD7 Consolidate two reporting indicators (Q14 and Q20) on ESG misconduct, penalties, incidents or accidents**

---

**Rationale for change:** Easier reporting and a better flow of indicators.

**Impact of change:** This indicator is not scored and only used for reporting purposes. However, this information may be used as criteria for the recognition of 2018 GRESB Sector Leaders.

# **Risk and Opportunities**

## **R03.2 (Q15.2) (1) Open text box is no longer scored, (2) % portfolio covered required for each type of risk assessment, (3) required to report on the alignment standard for the risk assessment methodology**

---

**Rationale for change:** Environmental and/or social risk assessments are performed at asset-level. Asking participants to list the assessments performed is important in testing whether multiple risk assessments are considered, but it is not sufficient for mapping the extent of the analysis compared to the exposure. The extra layer of information on coverage reduces the utility of the open text box, which is why the narrative is now only used for reporting purposes.

**Impact of change:** The indicator is aligned with ISO 31000. The alignment standard used is not scored and only used for reporting purposes. The open text box is no longer scored, and the number of points is assigned to the percentages of portfolio covered.

R05, R06, R07 (Q17, Q18, Q19)	<b>Removed the Innovation Case Study column from the tables</b> <hr/> <p><b>Rationale for change:</b> Participants are given the possibility of submitting innovation case studies throughout the year, in a format that is less restrictive than the old template.</p> <p><b>Impact of change:</b> More flexible reporting.</p>
R07(Q19)	<b>The indicator is scored similarly to R05 and R06</b> <hr/> <p><b>Rationale for change:</b> To recognize participants' effort on the implementation of waste management measures in their portfolio.</p> <p><b>Impact of change:</b> The indicator receives 1p, which increases the total number of points assigned to this aspect by 1p.</p>

## Monitoring and EMS

ME1	<b>Q21.1 and Q21.2 merged into one indicator ME1</b> <hr/> <p><b>Rationale for change:</b> Consolidation of the Assessment and validation process.</p> <p><b>Impact of change:</b> Easier reporting, no impact on scoring.</p>
-----	--

## Stakeholder engagement

### The subsection Suppliers is moved before the subsection Tenants/Occupiers

**Rationale for change:** Consistency in Assessment structure.

**Impact of change:** None.

Q32	<b>Remove the indicator</b> <hr/> <p><b>Rationale for change:</b> The baseline information for this indicator changed.</p> <p><b>Impact of change:</b> In 2017, 97% participants indicated they monitored the implementation of their employee policies.</p>
SE1	<b>Restructured answer options</b> <hr/> <p><b>Rationale for change:</b> Requirement for better analytics capabilities.</p> <p><b>Impact of change:</b> Better analytics, no impact on scores or data collection process.</p>

SE2.1, SE 8.1  
(Q34.1, Q37.1)

### **Expand scope of indicator to include survey quantitative metrics**

---

**Rationale for change:** Surveys are the most frequently used methods for receiving feedback from tenants and employees. They can be an effective means of engagement and if designed properly, an important source of information to be used for increasing the satisfaction levels of the tested groups. In view of this, the outcomes of the surveys need to be translated into unambiguous and easily interpretable customer satisfaction score that can be compared over time or between different sectors.

**Impact of change:** The new section is not scored and only used for reporting purposes in 2018.

SE10.2(Q39.2)

### **Score open text box**

---

**Rationale for change:** The indicator builds on the 2017 intent of examining management practices and controls used to monitor tenant compliance. As an added component, we think it is important to address the actions taken as a consequence of the monitoring phase. This is aligned with BBP's Leasing Standard tool, which structures green leases in three layers: presence, actions, commitment.

**Impact of change:** SE10.2 will be validated and can receive maximum 1p.

SE11.1(Q42.1)

### **Open text box no longer scored in 2018, but used for reporting purposes**

---

**Rationale for change:** In 2017, 92.6% received Full points of Partial Points. Most participants are able to describe their community engagement programs, following the standard validation requirements for the answer. However, the word limit of 250 proved difficult for being able to cover multiple initiatives in large portfolios, leading to incomplete answers. This change is in line with our effort to shift more weight from the management to the quality and implementation of sustainability objectives.

**Impact of change:** Reduced reporting burden. The points assigned to the open text box are reallocated to the other elements of the indicator.

SE4.2 (NEW)

### **Indicator on supply chain engagement**

---

**Rationale for change:** The intent of this question is to identify if the reporting entity effectively engages with its suppliers in order to deliver sustainable goals communicated in the previous question. The indicator addressed the Check component in the Plan - Do - Check - Act structure defined by ISO.

**Impact of change:** Indicator not scored in 2018, used for reporting purposes only.

SE6 (NEW)

### **Indicator on stakeholders grievance mechanisms**

---

**Rationale for change:** Even where organizations operate optimally, significant negative sustainability impacts in the supply chain, including human rights violations, may be caused by an organisation's decisions and activities. Grievance mechanisms play an important role to provide an access to remedy and reflects an entity's commitment to ESG management. An organization should establish a mechanism for stakeholders in the supply chain to bring this to the attention of the organization and seek redress.

**Impact of change:** Indicator not scored in 2018, used for reporting purposes only.

# Performance Indicators

## asset-level data

### Enable the download of asset-level data

---

**Rationale for change:** Improve the portal infrastructure in support of asset-level reporting.

**Impact of change:** This can be done once outliers are solved and missing data is completed, enabling the participant to use a curated dataset online (through the portal) and offline. In combination with other functionalities, this contributes to a more flexible asset-level reporting process controlled by the participant.

## Tables structure

### Remove “Floor Area Type” column

---

**Rationale for change:** The information is already reported in RC5.1.

**Impact of change:** Simplified tables.

## Data coverage scoring

### Scoring: Recognize the differences in data collection capabilities between landlord and tenant-controlled areas

---

**Rationale for change:** GRESB continues to encourage data collection efforts for the entire real estate portfolio. This includes tenant-controlled spaces, responsible for important fractions of the portfolio’s carbon emissions. However, GRESB recognizes that access to data from tenant-controlled areas may be limited. As such, starting 2018 we would like to make a distinction between the data coverage in landlord-controlled areas and tenant-controlled areas.

**Impact of change:** Score (and benchmark) data coverage for landlord-controlled areas separately from tenant-controlled areas. The scoring distinction can only be made for participants that choose to report using the option “Base Building + Tenant Spaces”. The data reported in Whole Building will be treated as “Landlord obtained” and will be benchmarked as such. Additional details will be available in the Reference Guide.

## L-f-L data

### Report on Like-for-Like floor area

---

**Rationale for change:** When analyzing the Assessment results, institutional investors would like to be able to put the LFL data into the context of their investment portfolio. The existing indicator structure does not allow this option, as it does not require the size of the LFL portfolio.

**Impact of change:** The change does not have any implications on the data collection process. These values should be known as a starting point for being able to report the LFL consumption values. Requesting the floor area associated with the reported consumption can also be perceived as an additional data check.

## L-f-L scoring

### Scoring: Reallocate the 3 points assigned to LFL data

---

**Rationale for change:** While data collection is encouraged for the entire real estate portfolio, GRESB recognizes that the landlord’s degree of influence over the way tenants operate spaces is limited. Participants may be at a disadvantage when dealing with tenants that are not motivated to reduce their resource consumption or that operate at long business hours.

**Impact of change:** Recognize LFL data availability, regardless of performance (1p) and LFL performance (2p) – as opposed to 3p for LFL performance.

**PI1.3  
(Q25.3)**

**Scoring: Reallocate the 3 points to also reward off-site generation of renewable energy**

---

**Rationale for change:** Recognize the fact that not all properties can generate renewable energy on-site.

**Impact of change:** While on-site renewable energy is preferred, the new scoring structure recognizes that this is not an option for all assets. Additional details will be available in the Reference Guide.

**PI2.0  
(Q26.0)**

**Request additional information on the GHG emissions inventory. The reporting boundary in PI2.1 can be established using an equity share, operational control, or financial control approach and Scope II emissions can be calculated using market- or location-based emission factors**

---

**Rationale for change:** These data points are necessary to increase the comparability of GHG emissions data between participants and enable more accurate carbon footprinting for investors.

**Impact of change:** Improved alignment with the 2015 amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard.

**PI2.1  
(Q26.1)**

**Scoring: Includes Scope 1, Scope 2, Scope 3. Scope 3 emissions should at a minimum include emissions associated with tenant areas and/or indirectly managed assets if these areas have not been reported on already in Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions**

---

**Rationale for change:** The inclusion of Scope 3 in benchmarking enables the scoring of complete real estate portfolios, regardless of operational control. It also recognizes efforts made by participants to collect tenant emissions data.

**Impact of change:** Scoring implications: 2p for Data Coverage of Scope 1, Scope 2, and (new) Scope 3, 1p for LFL change of Scope 1, Scope 2 (no change), and (new) Scope 3.

**PI5(Q29)**

**Enter year dropdown for long term targets**

---

**Rationale for change:** Participants should be able to report on long term targets that go beyond 2028. The change would allow everyone to type the year, under the restriction of the interval 2017 and 2050.

**Impact of change:** Removed limitation in reporting.



## Building Certification

### Expand the list of provisionally validated certification schemes, and disable the “create a new scheme” function for participants

---

**Rationale for change:** GRESB maintains control over the quality of the database and front loads the validation for this section. Participants get immediate feedback on the answers they intend to provide. This will help avoid situations when participants confuse reporting standards with energy ratings, energy ratings with building certifications, etc and the database is updated on a regular basis.

**Impact of change:** Participants can still add new schemes to the building certifications database, which will be published alongside the Assessment. However, they would only be able to do that by sending an email to [info@gresb.com](mailto:info@gresb.com).

### BC1.1&BC1.2 (Q30.1&Q30.2) Expand the scope of the indicator to include building certification level (e.g. “Gold” for LEED, “Very good” for BREEAM), via a predefined drop-down list of certification levels or an open text box for certifications not included in the database

---

**Rationale for change:** We recognize that the property market benefits from a wide availability of certification schemes and energy ratings. Many of them are overall comparable in complexity and robustness. As a next step in evaluating portfolio performance, GRESB would like to start asking for the applicable building certification level. This is often included in performance targets and engagement objectives.

**Impact of change:** Provide more informative output and data analysis, with deeper insights on the building certification and energy rating levels within a portfolio compared to the comparison groups/peers. In 2018, the levels are not used for scoring, but the information is very important for reporting purposes.

### BC1.1, BC1.2, and BC2 Change in score allocation

---

**Rationale for change:** As an green building certification can include energy rating and/or cover the energy performance of a property, more weight should be allocated to building certification-related indicators. In addition, this will disincentivize participants from submitting duplicate entries.

**Impact of change:** 2 points are transferred from Energy Rating indicator (BC2) to Green Building Certification indicators (BC1.1 & BC1.2). The total number of points for Building Certification Aspect remains unchanged.

### asset-level data Introduce BRE-API Integration

---

**Rationale for change:** Build on the existing infrastructure to allow easier access to external sources of information.

**Impact of change:** Allows participants to easily match assets with their certifications.

## New construction and major renovation

### NC1 **Open text box no longer scored, but used for reporting purposes**

---

**Rationale for change:** (Alignment with MA1/Q1) In 2017, 96% responses received Full points or Partial points. Most participants are able to explain their sustainability strategy, following the standard validation requirements for the answer. This change is in line with our effort to shift more weight from the management to the quality and implementation of sustainability strategy.

**Impact of change:** Reduced reporting burden. The total points assigned to this indicator remains 1p.

### **New option added: Green building certification**

---

**Rationale for change:** The added option was a frequently reported Other answer in 2017.

**Impact of change:** No impact on score.

### NC5.1 **Update on wording so that the indicator is clear and answer options are mutually exclusive**

---

**Rationale for change:** Wording was updated to improve terminology, and to ensure the answer options are mutually exclusive.

**Impact of change:** No more double scoring for participants that require certification at a specific level. No impact on score.

### NC5.2 **Participants can also report on projects that are registered to obtain a green building certification**

---

**Rationale for change:** Green building certifications are often only awarded after NCMR projects are completed, and pre-certifications are not available for all building certificates. This change enable participants to report on projects that have registered at an official directory of green building certification scheme but not yet obtained the final certificate.

**Impact of change:** Adapted approach to the use of green building certifications in new construction and/or major renovation projects during the reporting period. No impact on score.

### NC7.1 **The percentage of projects with renewable energy is used for scoring**

---

**Rationale for change:** This enable participant to get recognition on their effort in promoting renewable energy in new construction and/or major renovation projects. And it provides a better differentiation between sustainability best practices.

**Impact of change:** The percentages of all reported renewable projects are added up and capped at 100%, and the total percentage is taken into account in the scoring. It is calculated linearly.

## NC7.2 Evidence is removed

---

**Rationale for change:** The mandatory open text box provides sufficient information for validation. Removing the mandatory upload can reduce the reporting burden.

**Impact of change:** No impact on scoring.

## NC8, NC11 Participants no longer need to provide evidence for “common water efficiency measures” and “common occupant health and well-being measures”

---

**Rationale for change:** Both indicators cover a lot of information, which makes it difficult to provide evidence for each checkbox. To shift the validation focus to the subcategory of "Requirement for planning and design" will concentrate the validation effort and reduce the reporting burden from the participants.

**Impact of change:** Reduced reporting burden. No impact on scoring.

## NC12.1 Shifted the focus of this indicator from health and safety to safety. New options added

---

**Rationale for change:** Emphasize the difference between safety and health.

**Impact of change:** It is not possible to pre-fill the indicator in 2018. No impact on scoring.

## NC14 Open text box no longer scored, but used for reporting purposes

---

**Rationale for change:** To shift the validation focus on the uploaded document, to emphasize the quality and implementation of community impact monitoring.

**Impact of change:** Reduced reporting burden. No impact on scoring.

# Entity & Reporting Characteristics

---

## Entity Characteristics

### EC1 Reporting entity

Entity name: \_\_\_\_\_

Fund Manager Organization Name (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

### EC2 Nature of ownership:

- ☐ Listed entity
  - Please specify ISIN: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Year of commencement: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Legal status:
    - ☐ Property company
    - ☐ Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT)
- ☐ Non-listed entity
  - Year of first closing: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Entity style classification:
    - ☐ Core
    - ☐ Value Added
    - ☐ Opportunistic
  - Open or closed end:
    - ☐ Open end
    - ☐ Closed end
  - Finite or infinite structure:
    - ☐ Finite structure
      - Specify termination date: \_\_\_\_\_
    - ☐ Infinite structure
- ☐ Government entity

**EC3 The reporting period is:**

☐ Calendar year

☐ Fiscal year

Specify the starting month

**EC4 Is the organization a member of an industry association?**

☐ Yes (multiple answers possible)

☐ Asian Association for Investors in Non-listed Real Estate Vehicles (ANREV)

☐ Asia Pacific Real Estate Association (APREA)

☐ British Property Federation (BPF)

☐ European Association for Investors in Non-Listed Real Estate Vehicles (INREV)

☐ European Public Real Estate Association (EPRA)

☐ National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts (NAREIT)

☐ Pension Real Estate Association (PREA)

☐ Real Property Association of Canada (REALpac)

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

## Reporting Characteristics

### RC1 Values are reported in:

 ▼

#### Currency

- |                           |                            |                              |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| ▪ Australian Dollar (AUD) | ▪ Indian Rupee (INR)       | ▪ South Korean Won (KRW)     |
| ▪ Brazilian Real (BRL)    | ▪ Japanese Yen (JPY)       | ▪ Swedish Krona (SEK)        |
| ▪ Canadian Dollar (CAD)   | ▪ Malaysian Ringgit (MYR)  | ▪ Swiss Franc (CHF)          |
| ▪ Chinese Yuan (CNY)      | ▪ Mexican Peso (MXN)       | ▪ United States Dollar (USD) |
| ▪ Danish Krone (DKK)      | ▪ Pound Sterling (GBP)     | ▪ Other: _____               |
| ▪ Euro (EUR)              | ▪ Singapore Dollar (SGD)   |                              |
| ▪ Hong Kong Dollar (HKD)  | ▪ South African Rand (ZAR) |                              |

### RC2 What was the gross asset value (GAV) of the entity at the end of the reporting period in millions?

\_\_\_\_\_

### RC3 Metrics are reported in:

- ☐ m2
- ☐ sq. ft.

### RC4 What is the entity's core business?

- ☐ Management of standing investments only (continue with RC5.1, RC5.2, RC6)
- ☐ Management of standing investments and development of new construction and major renovation projects (continue with RC5.1, RC5.2, RC6, RC-NC1, RC-NC2, RC-NC3)
- ☐ Development of new construction and major renovation projects (continue with Developer Assessment)

**RC5.1 Describe the composition of the entity's standing investments portfolio during the reporting period:**

Property type	% of GAV	Number of Assets	Floor Area		% Indirectly Managed Assets
			m²/sq.ft.	Type	
Retail, High Street				Select type ▼	
Retail, Shopping Center				Select type ▼	
Retail, Warehouse				Select type ▼	
Office				Select type ▼	
Industrial, Distribution Warehouse				Select type ▼	
Industrial, Business Parks				Select type ▼	
Industrial, Manufacturing				Select type ▼	
Residential, Multi-family				Select type ▼	
Residential, Family Homes				Select type ▼	
Senior Homes				Select type ▼	
Residential, Student Housing				Select type ▼	
Hotel				Select type ▼	
Healthcare				Select type ▼	
Medical Office				Select type ▼	
Lodging, Leisure & Recreation				Select type ▼	
Data Centers				Select type ▼	
Self-storage				Select type ▼	
Parking (indoors)				Select type ▼	
Other				Select type ▼	
Other				Select type ▼	

Note: The table above defines the scope of your 2018 GRESB submission and should include the total standing investments portfolio of the investible entity. Any development projects, as well as underdeveloped or vacant land, should be included in the reporting scope defined in RC-NC1 and/or RC-NC2. The reporting scope reported above should exclude cash or other non real estate assets owned by the entity.

**Select floor area type:**

- floor area
- lettable floor area

**RC5.2 Does the table above list the entity's entire standing investment portfolio as per the reporting requirements described above?**

☐ Yes

Provide additional context for the reporting boundaries (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

Provide additional context for the reporting boundaries (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

**RC6 Which countries/states are included in the entity's standing investment portfolio?**

Country	% of GAV
Select country ▼	
Select country ▼	
Select country ▼	

## New Construction & Major Renovations



**RC-NC1.1 Describe the composition of the entity's new construction projects during the reporting period:**

Property type	In progress at the end of reporting period			Completed during reporting period		
	Number of Assets	Gross Floor Area	GAV* in million	Number of Assets	Gross Floor Area	GAV* in million
Retail, High Street						
Retail, Shopping Center						
Retail, Warehouse						
Office						
Industrial, Distribution Warehouse						
Industrial, Business Parks						
Industrial, Manufacturing						
Residential, Multi-family						
Residential, Family Homes						
Senior Homes						
Residential, Student Housing						
Hotel						
Healthcare						
Medical Office						
Lodging, Leisure & Recreation						
Data Centers						
Self-storage						
Parking (indoors)						
Other						
Other						

*Note: The table above defines the scope of your 2018 GRESB submission on development projects and should include new construction projects that are in progress at the end of reporting period, as well as projects that are completed during the reporting period. The reporting scope reported above should exclude cash or other non real estate assets owned by the entity.*

*\*GAV either according to fair value or based on construction costs*

**RC-NC1.2 Does the table above list all the entity's new construction projects as per the reporting requirements described above?**



Yes

Provide additional context for the reporting boundaries on new construction projects (maximum 250 words)

---



No

Provide additional context for the reporting boundaries on new construction projects (maximum 250 words)

---

**RC-NC2.1 Describe the composition of the entity's major renovation projects during the reporting period:**

Property type	In progress at the end of reporting period			Completed during reporting period		
	Number of Assets	Gross Floor Area	GAV* in million	Number of Assets	Gross Floor Area	GAV* in million
Retail, High Street						
Retail, Shopping Center						
Retail, Warehouse						
Office						
Industrial, Distribution Warehouse						
Industrial, Business Parks						
Industrial, Manufacturing						
Residential, Multi-family						
Residential, Family Homes						
Senior Homes						
Residential, Student Housing						
Hotel						
Healthcare						
Medical Office						
Lodging, Leisure & Recreation						
Data Centers						
Self-storage						
Parking (indoors)						
Other						
Other						

*Note: The table above defines the scope of your 2018 GRESB submission on development projects and should include major renovation projects that are in progress at the end of reporting period, as well as projects that are completed during the reporting period. The reporting scope reported above should exclude cash or other non real estate assets owned by the entity.*

*\*GAV either according to fair value or based on construction costs*

**RC-NC2.2 Does the table above list all the entity's major renovation projects as per the reporting requirements described above?**



Yes

Provide additional context for the reporting boundaries on major renovation projects (maximum 250 words)

---



No

Provide additional context for the reporting boundaries on major renovation projects (maximum 250 words)

---

**RC-NC3** Which countries/states are included in the entity's new construction and/or major renovation projects portfolio?

Country	% of GAV
Select country ▼	
Select country ▼	
Select country ▼	



# Management

## Sustainability Objectives

2017 Indicator

### MA1 Does the entity have specific ESG objectives?

Q1

☐ Yes

The objectives relate to (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ General sustainability
- ☐ Environment
- ☐ Social
- ☐ Governance
- ☐ Health and well-being

The objectives are

- ☐ Fully integrated into the overall business strategy
- ☐ Partially integrated into the overall business strategy
- ☐ Not integrated into the overall business strategy

The objectives are

- ☐ Publicly available

Please provide a hyperlink or a separate publicly available document

**UPLOAD** OR URL \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Not publicly available

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

Communicate the objectives and explain how the objectives are integrated into the overall business strategy (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**MA2 Does the organization have one or more persons responsible for implementing the ESG objectives referenced in MA1?**

Q2

☐ Yes

Select the persons responsible (multiple answers possible)

☐ Dedicated employee(s) for whom sustainability is the core responsibility

Provide the details for the most senior of these employees

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Job title: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

LinkedIn profile (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Employee(s) for whom sustainability is among their responsibilities

Provide the details for the most senior of these employees

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Job title: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

LinkedIn profile (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ External consultants/manager

Name of the organization

Name of the main contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Job title: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

LinkedIn profile (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Investment partners (co-investors/JV partners)

Name of the main contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Job title: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

LinkedIn profile (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

## Sustainability Decision Making

2017 Indicator

### MA3 Does the organization have a sustainability taskforce or committee that is applicable to the entity?

Q3

☐ Yes

Select the members of this taskforce or committee (multiple answers possible)

☐ Asset managers

☐ Board of Directors

☐ External consultants

Name of the organization

☐ Fund/portfolio managers

☐ Property managers

☐ Senior Management Team

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

### MA4 Does the organization have a senior decision-maker accountable for the entity's sustainability strategy?

Q4 & Q5

☐ Yes

Provide the details for the most senior decision-maker on sustainability issues

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Job title: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

LinkedIn profile (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

The individual is part of

☐ Board of Directors

☐ Senior Management Team

☐ Fund/portfolio managers

☐ Investment Committee

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe the process of informing the most senior decision-maker on the sustainability performance of the entity (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**MA5 Does the organization include ESG factors in the annual performance targets of the employees responsible for this entity?**

**(Q6)**

☐ Yes

Does performance on these targets have predetermined consequences?

☐ Yes

☐ Financial consequences

☐ Non-financial consequences

☐ No

Select the employees to whom these factors apply (multiple answers possible):

☐ All employees

☐ Board of Directors

☐ Senior Management Team

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name\_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date\_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No



# Policy & Disclosure

## ESG Policies

2017 Indicator

**PD1 Does the organization have a policy/policies in place, applicable to the entity level, that address(es) environmental issues?**

**Q8**

☐ Yes

Select all environmental issues included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Biodiversity and habitat
- ☐ Climate/climate change adaptation
- ☐ Energy consumption/management
- ☐ Environmental attributes of building materials
- ☐ GHG emissions/management
- ☐ Resilience
- ☐ Waste management
- ☐ Water consumption/management
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**PD2 Does the organization have a policy/policies in place, applicable to the entity level, that address(es) social issues?**

**(Q9,  
Q10,  
Q11)**

☐ Yes

Select all social issues included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Child labor
- ☐ Diversity and equal opportunity
- ☐ Forced or compulsory labor
- ☐ Occupational safety (for employees)
- ☐ Asset level safety (for tenants)
- ☐ Labor-management relationships
- ☐ Employee performance and career development
- ☐ Stakeholder engagement
- ☐ Worker rights
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No



**PD3 Does the organization have a policy/policies in place, applicable to the entity level, that address(es) governance issues?**

(Q9)

☐ Yes

Select all governance issues included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Bribery and corruption
- ☐ Data protection and privacy
- ☐ Employee remuneration
- ☐ Executive compensation
- ☐ Fiduciary duty
- ☐ Fraud
- ☐ Political contributions
- ☐ Shareholder rights
- ☐ Whistleblower protection
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**PD4 Does the organization monitor diversity indicator(s) for its governance bodies (i.e. C-suite, Board of Directors, Management Committees)?**

NEW

☐ Yes

Select all diversity metrics (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Age group distribution
- ☐ Board tenure
- ☐ Diversity of socioeconomic background
- ☐ Gender ratio
- ☐ International background
- ☐ Racial diversity

Provide additional context for the response (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

## Sustainability Disclosure

2017 Indicator

### PD5.1 Does the organization disclose its ESG actions and/or performance?

Q7.1

☐ Yes (multiple answers possible)

☐ Section in Annual Report

Select the applicable reporting level

☐ Entity

☐ Investment manager

☐ Group

**UPLOAD** OR URL\_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

Aligned with Guideline name ▼

☐ Stand-alone sustainability report(s)

Select the applicable reporting level

☐ Entity

☐ Investment manager

☐ Group

**UPLOAD** OR URL\_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

Aligned with Guideline name ▼

☐ Integrated Report

\*Integrated Report must be aligned with IIRC framework

Select the applicable reporting level

☐ Entity

☐ Investment manager

☐ Group

**UPLOAD** OR URL\_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

Aligned with Guideline name ▼

☐ Dedicated section on corporate website

Select the applicable reporting level

☐ Entity

☐ Investment manager

☐ Group

URL\_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Section in entity reporting to investors

Aligned with Guideline name ▼

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Select the applicable reporting level

☐ Entity

☐ Investment manager

☐ Group

**UPLOAD**

OR URL\_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

Aligned with Guideline name ▼

☐ No

**Guideline name**

- |   |  |   |                                 |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| ▪ ANREV (endorsed INREV Sustainability Reporting Recommendations), 2014 | ▪ EPRA Best Practice Recommendations in Sustainability Reporting, 2017 | ▪ GRI Sustainability Reporting Guidelines, G4             | Guidelines, 2016                |
| ▪ APREA Sustainability Handbook, 2012                                   | ▪ GRI Standards, 2016  | ▪ IIRC International Integrated Reporting Framework, 2013 | ▪ PRI Reporting Framework, 2016 |
|   |  | ▪ INREV Sustainability                                    | ▪ Other: _____                  |

**PD5.2 Does the organization have an independent third party review of its ESG disclosure?**

Q7.2

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible, selections must match answers in PD5.1)

☐ Section in Annual Report

☐ Externally checked by

☐ Externally verified by

using

☐ Externally assured by

using

☐ Stand-alone sustainability report

☐ Externally checked by

☐ Externally verified by

using

☐ Externally assured by

using

☐ Integrated Report

☐ Externally checked by

☐ Externally verified by

using

☐ Externally assured by

using

☐ Section in entity reporting to investors

☐ Externally checked by

☐ Externally verified by

using

☐ Externally assured by

using

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Externally checked by

☐ Externally verified by

using

☐ Externally assured by

using

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**PD6 Has the organization made a commitment to ESG leadership standards or groups that applies to investments in this entity?**

NEW

☐ Yes

Select all issues included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change (IIGCC)
- ☐ Montreal Pledge
- ☐ PRI signatory
- ☐ RE 100
- ☐ Science Based Targets initiative
- ☐ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
- ☐ UN Environment Programme Finance Initiative
- ☐ UN Global Compact
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide applicable hyperlink

URL\_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**PD7.1 Does the entity have a process to communicate about ESG-related misconduct, penalties, incidents or accidents?**

NEW

☐ Yes

The entity would communicate misconduct, penalties, incidents or accidents to:

- ☐ Investors
- ☐ Public
- ☐ Other stakeholders: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe the process (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**PD7.2 Has the entity been involved in any ESG-related misconduct, penalties, incidents or accidents in the reporting year?**

**Q14 &  
Q20**

☐ Yes

Specify the total number of cases imposed

\_\_\_\_\_

Specify the total value of fines and/or penalties result from these cases

\_\_\_\_\_

Provide additional context for the response (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

\* The information in PD7.1 and PD7.2 may be used as criteria for the recognition of 2018 Sector Leaders



# Risks & Opportunities

## Governance

2017 Indicator

**R01 Does the organization have systems and procedures in place to facilitate effective implementation of the governance policy/policies in PD3?**

Q12

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Investment due diligence process
- ☐ Training related to governance risks for employees (multiple answers possible)
  - ☐ Regular follow-ups
  - ☐ When an employee joins the organization
- ☐ Whistle-blower mechanism
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**R02 Did the entity perform entity-level governance and/or social risk assessments within the last three years?**

Q13

☐ Yes

Select all issues included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Bribery and corruption
- ☐ Child labor
- ☐ Diversity and equal opportunity
- ☐ Executive compensation
- ☐ Forced or compulsory labor
- ☐ Labor-management relationships
- ☐ Shareholder rights
- ☐ Worker rights
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

## Environmental & Social

2017 Indicator

**R03.1 Does the entity perform asset-level environmental and/or social risk assessments as a standard part of its due diligence process for new acquisitions?**

Q15.1

☐ Yes

Select all issues included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Building safety and materials
- ☐ Climate change adaptation
- ☐ Contamination
- ☐ Energy efficiency
- ☐ Energy supply
- ☐ Flooding
- ☐ GHG emissions
- ☐ Health and well-being
- ☐ Indoor environmental quality
- ☐ Natural hazards
- ☐ Regulatory
- ☐ Resilience
- ☐ Socio-economic
- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Water efficiency
- ☐ Waste management
- ☐ Water supply
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable



**R03.2 Has the entity performed asset-level environmental and/or social risk assessments of its standing investments during the last three years?**

Q15.2

☐ Yes

Select all issues included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Building safety and materials  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Biodiversity  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Climate change adaptation  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Contamination  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Energy efficiency  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Energy supply  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Flooding  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ GHG emissions  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Health and well-being  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Indoor environmental quality  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Natural hazards  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Regulatory  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Resilience  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Socio-economic  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Transportation  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Water efficiency  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Waste management  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Water supply  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_ %

The risk assessment is aligned with a third party standard

☐ Yes

☐ ISO 31000

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

Describe how the outcomes of the sustainability risk assessments are used in order to mitigate the selected risks (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**R04 Has the entity performed technical building assessments during the last four years to identify improvement opportunities within the portfolio?**

Q16

☐ Yes

Select applicable options (multiple answers possible)

☐ Energy Efficiency

☐ In-house assessment

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ External assessment

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

Name of the organization

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Water Efficiency

☐ In-house assessment

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ External assessment

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

Name of the organization

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Waste Management

☐ In-house assessment

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ External assessment

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

Name of the organization

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Health & Well-being

☐ In-house assessment

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ External assessment

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

Name of the organization

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**R05 Has the entity implemented measures during the last four years to improve the energy efficiency of the portfolio?**

**Q17**

☐ Yes

Describe the measures using the table below.

Category	Measure	% portfolio covered during the last 4 years	% whole portfolio covered	Estimated savings (MWh) [optional]	Target ROI (%) [optional]	Describe implemented measure (measure, payback period, property type, scope, link to MA1 objectives and PI5 targets) (maximum 150 words)
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**Select the applicable categories from the list below:**

- Building automation system upgrades/replacements
- Building energy management systems upgrades/replacements
- Installation of high-efficiency equipment and appliances
- Installation of on-site renewable energy
- Occupier engagement/informational technologies
- Smart grid/smart building technologies
- Systems commissioning or retro-commissioning
- Wall/roof insulation
- Window replacements
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Select the % portfolio covered by each measure:**

- > 0%, < 25%
- ≥ 25%, < 50%
- ≥ 50%, < 75%
- ≥ 75%, ≤ 100%

**R06 Has the entity implemented measures during the last four years to improve the water efficiency of the portfolio?**

**Q18**

☐ Yes

Describe the measures using the table below.

Category	Measure	% portfolio covered during the last 4 years	% whole portfolio covered	Estimated savings (MWh) [optional]	Target ROI (%) [optional]	Describe implemented measure (measure, payback period, property type, scope, link to MA1 objectives and PI5 targets) (maximum 150 words)
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**Select the applicable categories from the list below:**

- Cooling tower water management
- Drip/smart irrigation
- Drought tolerant/native landscaping
- High-efficiency/dry fixtures
- Leak detection system
- Metering of water subsystems
- On-site waste water treatment
- Reuse of storm water and/or grey water for non-potable applications
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Select the % portfolio covered by each measure:**

- > 0%, < 25%
- ≥ 25%, < 50%
- ≥ 50%, < 75%
- ≥ 75%, ≤ 100%

**R07 Has the entity implemented measures during the last four years to improve the waste management of the portfolio?**

Q19

☐ Yes

Describe the measures using the table below.

Category	Measure	% portfolio covered during the last 4 years	% whole portfolio covered	Estimated savings (MWh) [optional]	Target ROI (%) [optional]	Describe implemented measure (measure, payback period, property type, scope, link to MA1 objectives and PI5 targets) (maximum 150 words)
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			
Select category ▼		Select ▼	Select ▼			

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**Select the applicable categories from the list below:**

- Composting landscape and/or food waste
- Ongoing waste performance
- monitoring
- Recycling program
- Waste management
- Waste stream audit
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Select the % portfolio covered by each measure:**

- > 0%, < 25%
- ≥ 25%, < 50%
- ≥ 50%, < 75%
- ≥ 75%, ≤ 100%



# Monitoring & EMS

## Environmental Management Systems

2017 Indicator

**ME1** Does the organization have an Environmental Management System (EMS) that applies to the entity level?

Q21.1 &  
Q21.2

- ☐ Yes
  - ☐ The EMS is aligned with a standard:
    - ☐ ISO 14001
    - ☐ EMAS (EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme)
    - ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ The EMS is externally certified by an independent third party
    - Name of the organization
    - ☐ ISO 14001
    - ☐ EMAS (EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme)
    - ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ The EMS is not aligned with a standard nor certified externally
- ☐ No

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

## Data Management Systems

2017 Indicator

**ME2 Does the organization have a data management system in place that applies to the entity level?**

Q22

☐ Yes

Select one of the following

☐ Developed internally

☐ Bespoke (custom) internal system developed by a third party

Name of the organization

☐ External system

Name of the system: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the organization

Select the performance indicators included (multiple answers possible)

☐ Energy consumption

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ GHG emissions/management

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Building safety

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Indoor environmental quality

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Resilience

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Waste streams/management

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Water

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of portfolio covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

## Monitoring Consumption

2017 Indicator

**ME3** Does the entity monitor the energy consumption of the portfolio?

Q23

☐ Yes

Percentage of whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

Type of monitoring (multiple answers possible)

☐ Automatic meter readings

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Based on invoices

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Manual-visual readings

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Provided by the tenant

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ No

☐ Not applicable



**ME4 Does the entity monitor the water consumption of the portfolio?****Q24**☐ Yes

Percentage of whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Type of monitoring (multiple answers possible)

☐ Automatic meter readings

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ Based on invoices

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ Manual-visual readings

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ Provided by the tenant

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ No☐ Not applicable**ME5 Does the entity monitor the waste production of the portfolio?****NEW in  
2017**☐ Yes

Percentage of whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Type of monitoring (multiple answers possible)

☐ Internal tracking

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ Provided by haulers

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ Provided by the tenant

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of the whole portfolio covered by floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Explain (a) the calculation methodology for percentage of whole portfolio covered, and (b) limitations and assumptions made in the calculation (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No☐ Not applicable



# Performance Indicators

## Energy Consumption Data

2017 Indicator

**PI1.0 Does the entity collect energy consumption data for this property type?**

Q25.0

☐ Yes

Please provide the TOTAL floor area of your portfolio for this property type, regardless of energy supply and energy data availability and complete PI1.1 - PI1.3 for this property type.

Managed Assets	Floor area (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft)
Common Areas	
Tenant Space	
Tenant Space, Energy Purchased by Landlord	
Tenant Space, Energy Purchased by Tenant	
Whole Building	
Shared Services	
Indirectly Managed Assets	Floor area (m <sup>2</sup> /sq.ft)
Whole Building	

Will the energy consumption data of this property type be reported at the asset level?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No

**PI1.1 Energy consumption for this property type**

Q25.1

Report absolute values and like-for-like consumption for 2016 and 2017. All assets in the whole portfolio for this property type should be included.

To make sure you insert data in the correct section of the table, check the definition of “Managed Assets” and “Indirectly Managed Assets”.

Only use Whole Building if no breakdown of data is possible between Base Building and Tenant Space. Additionally, if consumption cannot be separated between Common Areas and Shared Services/Central Plant, provide both in Shared Services/Central Plant.

Managed Assets			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
			Absolute Consumption				Like-for-Like Consumption				
			2016	2017			2016	2017	Data coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Like-for-Like Change (%)	
Consumption (MWh)	Consumption (MWh)	Data coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Maximum coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Consumption (MWh)	Consumption (MWh)						
1	Base Building	Common Areas	Fuels							calculated	
2		District Heating & Cooling							calculated		
3			Electricity						calculated		
4			Shared Services/ Central Plant	Fuels						calculated	
5		District Heating & Cooling							calculated		
6				Electricity						calculated	
7			Outdoor/ Exterior Areas/ Parking	Fuels			N/A	N/A		N/A	calculated
8		Electricity				N/A	N/A		N/A	calculated	
9	Total energy consumption Base Building (rows 1-8)			calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated
10	Tenant Space	Purchased by landlord	Fuels								calculated
11			District Heating & Cooling								calculated
12			Electricity								calculated
13		Purchased by tenant	Fuels								calculated
14			District Heating & Cooling								calculated
15			Electricity								calculated
16	Total energy consumption Tenant Areas (rows 10-15)			calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated
17	Whole Building	Combined consumption common areas + tenant space	Fuels								calculated
18			District Heating & Cooling								calculated
19			Electricity								calculated
20	Total energy consumption Whole Building (rows 17-19)			calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated
21	Total energy consumption Managed Assets (rows 9 + 16 + 20)			calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated
Indirectly Managed Assets											
22	Whole Building	Tenant space	Fuels								calculated
23			District Heating & Cooling								calculated
24			Electricity								calculated
25		Outdoor/ Exterior Areas/ Parking	Fuels			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
26			Electricity			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
27			Total energy consumption Indirectly Managed Assets (rows 22-26)			calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated
28	Total energy consumption of Whole Portfolio (rows 21 + 27)			calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated

Explain (a) assumptions made in reporting, (b) limitations in the ability to collect data, and (c) exclusions from like-for-like portfolio (maximum 250 words)

Does the entity report the average annual vacancy rate in the like-for-like portfolio for this property type?

☐ Yes

2016: \_\_\_\_\_ %

2017: \_\_\_\_\_ %

☐ No

☐ The information above is correct and complete for all this property type assets

## PI1.2 Energy use intensity rates for this property type

Q25.2

Does the entity report energy use intensities in the whole portfolio for this property type?

☐ Yes

If optional base-line year data is provided, specify year of the data

Year ▼

	A	B	C	D
	Optional base-line year (include year)	2015	2016	2017
Energy use intensity				
% of portfolio covered				

Select the elements for which intensities are normalized in your calculations

- ☐ Air conditioning and/or natural ventilation
- ☐ Building age
- ☐ Degree days
- ☐ Footfall
- ☐ Occupancy rate
- ☐ Operational hours
- ☐ Weather conditions
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ None of the above

Explain (a) the energy use intensity calculation method, (b) assumptions made in the calculation, and (c) how intensities are used by the entity in its operations (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

### PI1.3 Renewable energy generated for this property type

Q25.3

Does the entity collect absolute renewable energy consumption and generation data in the whole portfolio for this property type?

☐ Yes

Report absolute renewable energy generation and consumption. All assets in the portfolio for this property type should be included

	A	B
	2016	2017
On-site renewable energy (generated and consumed on-site)	MWh	MWh
Off-site renewable energy (generated off-site or purchased from third party)	MWh	MWh
On-site renewable energy (generated on-site and exported)	MWh	MWh
Total renewable energy	calculated	calculated
Percentage renewable energy	%	%

☐ No

Has the entity's energy consumption data reported above been reviewed by an independent third party?

☐ Yes

☐ Externally checked

Checked by

☐ Externally verified

Verified by

Using scheme

☐ Externally assured

Assured by

Using scheme

### UPLOAD

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

### Scheme name

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AA1000AS</li> <li>▪ Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)</li> <li>▪ Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe</li> <li>▪ Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation</li> <li>▪ ASAE3000</li> <li>▪ Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)</li> <li>▪ Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)</li> <li>▪ California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as Californian Air Resources Board regulations)</li> <li>▪ Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025</li> <li>▪ Carbon Trust Standard</li> <li>▪ CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement and Reduction Scheme)</li> <li>▪ Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard</li> <li>▪ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)</li> <li>▪ Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT</li> <li>▪ DNV Verisustain Protocol/</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting</li> <li>▪ Earthcheck Certified</li> <li>▪ Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard</li> <li>▪ ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology</li> <li>▪ IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues</li> <li>▪ ISAE 3000</li> <li>▪ ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements</li> <li>▪ ISO14064-3</li> <li>▪ JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification</li> <li>▪ Korean GHG and energy target management system</li> <li>▪ NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C</li> <li>▪ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)</li> <li>▪ RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)</li> <li>▪ RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>professional body</li> <li>▪ Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program</li> <li>▪ SGS Sustainability Report Assurance</li> <li>▪ Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)</li> <li>▪ Standard 3410N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants</li> <li>▪ State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.</li> <li>▪ Swiss Climate CO2 label</li> <li>▪ Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol</li> <li>▪ The Climate Registry's General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))</li> <li>▪ Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme</li> <li>▪ Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws</li> </ul> |
|---|---|--|

☐ Yes

The GHG emissions reported below are calculated using:

☐ Location-based method

☐ Market-based method

The inventory reporting boundary of the GHG emissions reported below is determined using:

☐ Equity share approach

☐ Financial control approach

☐ Operational control approach

Will the GHG emission data of this property type be reported at the asset level?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No

## PI2.1 GHG emissions for this property type

Q26.1

Report absolute values and like-for-like consumption for 2016 and 2017. All assets in the whole portfolio for this property type should be included.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	Absolute GHG Emissions				Like-for-Like GHG Emissions			
	2016	2017			2016	2017	Data coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Like-for-Like Change (%)
	Emissions (tonnes)	Emissions (tonnes)	Data coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Maximum Potential Coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Emissions (tonnes)	Emissions (tonnes)		
1	Scope 1							calculated
2	Scope 2							calculated
3	Scope 3							calculated
	2016	2017			2016	2017	Data coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Like-for-Like Change (%)
	Metric tonnes equivalent (tonnes)	Metric tonnes equivalent (tonnes)			Metric tonnes equivalent (tonnes)	Metric tonnes equivalent (tonnes)		
4	GHG Offsets purchased		N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
5	Net GHG Emissions after offsets		N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated

\*Row 4 and 5 will not be scored in 2018

Note: Scope 3 emissions in 2018 GRESB Assessment should be calculated as the emissions associated with tenant controlled areas/electricity purchased by the tenant and indirectly managed assets if these have not been reported upon already in Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Note that if tenant emissions data is not available, data coverage for these areas should be 0, while the maximum data coverage should correspond to the tenant areas generating the emissions. Scope 3 emissions should not include emissions generated through the entity's operations or by its employees, transmission losses or upstream supply chain emissions. "

Explain (a) the GHG emissions calculation standard/methodology/protocol, (b) used emission factors, (c) level of uncertainty in data accuracy, (d) exclusions from like-for-like portfolio, and (e) Scope 3 emissions, (f) source and characteristics of GHG emissions offsets (maximum 250 words)

☐ The information above is correct and complete for all this property type assets



## PI2.2 GHG emissions intensity rates for this property type

Q26.2

Does the entity report GHG emissions intensities?

☐ Yes

If optional base-line year data is provided, specify year of the data

Year ▼

	A	B	C	D
	Optional base-line year (include year)	2015	2016	2017
GHG emissions intensity				
% of portfolio covered				

Select the elements for which intensities are normalized in your calculations

- ☐ Air conditioning and/or natural ventilation
- ☐ Building age
- ☐ Degree days
- ☐ Footfall
- ☐ Occupancy rate
- ☐ Operational hours
- ☐ Weather conditions
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ None of the above

Explain (a) the GHG emissions intensity calculation method, (b) assumptions made in the calculation, and (c) how intensities are used by the entity in its operations (maximum 250 words): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

Has the entity's GHG emissions data reported above been reviewed by an independent third party?

☐ Yes

☐ Externally checked

Checked by

☐ Externally verified

Verified by

Using scheme

☐ Externally assured

Assured by

Using scheme

### UPLOAD

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

### Scheme name

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AA1000AS</li> <li>▪ Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)</li> <li>▪ Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe</li> <li>▪ Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation</li> <li>▪ ASAE3000</li> <li>▪ Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)</li> <li>▪ Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)</li> <li>▪ California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as Californian Air Resources Board regulations)</li> <li>▪ Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025</li> <li>▪ Carbon Trust Standard</li> <li>▪ CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement and Reduction Scheme)</li> <li>▪ Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard</li> <li>▪ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)</li> <li>▪ Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT</li> <li>▪ DNV Verisustain Protocol/</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting</li> <li>▪ Earthcheck Certified</li> <li>▪ Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard</li> <li>▪ ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology</li> <li>▪ IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues</li> <li>▪ ISAE 3000</li> <li>▪ ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements</li> <li>▪ ISO14064-3</li> <li>▪ JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification</li> <li>▪ Korean GHG and energy target management system</li> <li>▪ NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C</li> <li>▪ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)</li> <li>▪ RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)</li> <li>▪ RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>professional body</li> <li>▪ Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program</li> <li>▪ SGS Sustainability Report Assurance</li> <li>▪ Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)</li> <li>▪ Standard 3410N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants</li> <li>▪ State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.</li> <li>▪ Swiss Climate CO2 label</li> <li>▪ Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol</li> <li>▪ The Climate Registry's General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))</li> <li>▪ Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme</li> <li>▪ Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws</li> </ul> |
|---|---|--|

### PI3.0 Does the entity collect water use data for this property type?

Q27.0

- ☐ Yes  
Will the water consumption data of this property type be reported at the asset level?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No

### PI3.1 Water use for this property type

Q27.1

Report absolute values and like-for-like consumption for 2016 and 2017. All assets in the whole portfolio for this property type should be included.

To make sure you insert data in the correct section of the table, check the definition of “Managed Assets” and “Indirectly Managed Assets”.

Only use Whole Building if no breakdown of data is possible between Base Building and Tenant Space. Additionally, if consumption cannot be separated between Common Areas and Shared Services/ Central Plant, provide both in Shared Services/Central Plant.

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
Managed Assets		Absolute Consumption				Like-for-Like Consumption				
		2016	2017			2016	2017	Data coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Like-for-Like Change (%)	
		Consumption (m³)	Consumption (m³)	Data coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Maximum Potential Coverage (m²/sq.ft.)	Consumption (m³)	Consumption (m³)			
1	Base Building	Common Areas							calculated	
2		Shared Services/Central Plant							calculated	
3		Outdoor/Exterior Areas/Parking			N/A	N/A			N/A	calculated
4	Total water usage Base Building (rows 1- 3)		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated
5	Tenant Space	Purchased by landlord								calculated
6		Purchased by tenant								calculated
7	Total water usage Tenant Areas (rows 5 - 7)		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated
8	Whole Building	Combined consumption common areas + tenant space								calculated
9	Total water usage Whole Building (row 8)		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated
10	Total water usage Managed Assets (rows 4+7+9)		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated
Indirectly Managed Assets										
11	Whole Building	Tenant space								calculated
12		Outdoor/Exterior areas/Parking			N/A	N/A				N/A
13	Total water usage Indirectly Managed Assets (rows 11-12)		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated
14	Total water usage Whole Portfolio (rows 10 + 13)		calculated	calculated	N/A	N/A	calculated	calculated	N/A	calculated

Explain (a) assumptions made in reporting, (b) limitations in the ability to collect data and (c) exclusions from like-for-like portfolio (maximum 250 words)

Does the entity report the average annual vacancy rate in the like-for-like portfolio for this property type?

- ☐ Yes  
2016: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
2017: \_\_\_\_\_ %
- ☐ No
- ☒ The information above is correct and complete for all this property type assets

### PI3.2 Water intensity rates for this property type

Q27.2

Does the entity report water use intensities?

☐ Yes

If optional base-line year data is provided, specify year of the data

Year ▼

	A	B	C	D
	Optional base-line year (include year)	2015	2016	2017
Water use intensity				
% of portfolio covered				

Select the elements for which intensities are normalized in your calculations

- ☐ Air conditioning and/or natural ventilation
- ☐ Building age
- ☐ Degree days
- ☐ Footfall
- ☐ Occupancy rate
- ☐ Operational hours
- ☐ Weather conditions
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ None of the above

Explain (a) the water use intensity calculation method, (b) assumptions made in the calculation, and (c) how intensities are used by the entity in its operations (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

### PI3.3 Water reuse and recycling for this property type

Q27.3

☐ Yes

Report absolute water reuse, recycling, and on-site capture data. All assets in the whole portfolio for this property type should be included.

	A	B
	Absolute measurement	
	2016	2017
On-site water reuse (greywater, blackwater)	m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup>
On-site capture (rainwater, fog, condensate)	m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup>
On-site extraction (groundwater)	m <sup>3</sup>	m <sup>3</sup>
Total reused and recycled water	calculated	calculated
Percentage reused and recycled water	%	%

☐ No

Has the entity's water use data reported above been reviewed by an independent third party?

☐ Yes

☐ Externally checked

Checked by

☐ Externally verified

Verified by

Using scheme

☐ Externally assured

Assured by

Using scheme

### UPLOAD

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

### Scheme name

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AA1000AS</li> <li>▪ Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)</li> <li>▪ Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe</li> <li>▪ Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation</li> <li>▪ ASAE3000</li> <li>▪ Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)</li> <li>▪ Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)</li> <li>▪ California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as Californian Air Resources Board regulations)</li> <li>▪ Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025</li> <li>▪ Carbon Trust Standard</li> <li>▪ CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement and Reduction Scheme)</li> <li>▪ Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard</li> <li>▪ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)</li> <li>▪ Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT</li> <li>▪ DNV Verisustain Protocol/</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting</li> <li>▪ Earthcheck Certified</li> <li>▪ Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard</li> <li>▪ ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology</li> <li>▪ IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues</li> <li>▪ ISAE 3000</li> <li>▪ ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements</li> <li>▪ ISO14064-3</li> <li>▪ JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification</li> <li>▪ Korean GHG and energy target management system</li> <li>▪ NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C</li> <li>▪ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)</li> <li>▪ RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)</li> <li>▪ RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>professional body</li> <li>▪ Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program</li> <li>▪ SGS Sustainability Report Assurance</li> <li>▪ Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)</li> <li>▪ Standard 3410N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants</li> <li>▪ State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.</li> <li>▪ Swiss Climate CO2 label</li> <li>▪ Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol</li> <li>▪ The Climate Registry's General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))</li> <li>▪ Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme</li> <li>▪ Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws</li> </ul> |
|---|---|--|

## PI4.0 Does the entity collect waste data for this property type?

Q28.0

☐ Yes

Will the waste data of this property type be reported at the asset level?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No

## PI4.1 Waste management for this property type

Q28.1

Report absolute values for 2016 and 2017. All assets in the whole portfolio for this property type should be included.

		A	B
		Absolute measurement	
		2016 Weight (tonnes)	2017 Weight (tonnes)
1	Managed Assets	Total weight of hazardous waste in metric tonnes	
2		Total weight of non-hazardous waste in metric tonnes	
3		% Managed portfolio covered	
4	Indirectly Managed	Total weight of hazardous waste in metric tonnes	
5		Total weight of non-hazardous waste in metric tonnes	
6		% Indirectly Managed portfolio covered	

		A	B
Proportion of waste by disposal route (% of total by weight)		2016	2017
7	Whole Portfolio [property type]	Landfill	
8		Incineration	
9		Diverted (total)	
10		Diverted - waste to energy (optional)	
11		Diverted - recycling (optional)	
12		Diverted - other (optional)	
13		Other _____	

Explain (a) assumptions made in reporting, (b) limitations in the ability to collect data, and (c) exclusions from portfolio (maximum 250 words)

☐ The information above is correct and complete for all this property type assets

Has the entity's waste management data reported above been reviewed by an independent third party?

☐ Yes

☐ Externally checked

Checked by

☐ Externally verified

Verified by

Using scheme

☐ Externally assured

Assured by

Using scheme

### UPLOAD

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

### Scheme name

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AA1000AS</li> <li>▪ Advanced technologies promotion Subsidy Scheme with Emission reduction Target (ASSET)</li> <li>▪ Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) des Airports Council International Europe</li> <li>▪ Alberta Specified Gas Emitters Regulation</li> <li>▪ ASAE3000</li> <li>▪ Attestation Standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants/AICPA (AT101)</li> <li>▪ Australia National Greenhouse and Energy Regulations (NGER Act)</li> <li>▪ California Mandatory GHG Reporting Regulations (also known as Californian Air Resources Board regulations)</li> <li>▪ Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA) Handbook: Assurance Section 5025</li> <li>▪ Carbon Trust Standard</li> <li>▪ CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement and Reduction Scheme)</li> <li>▪ Chicago Climate Exchange verification standard</li> <li>▪ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)</li> <li>▪ Corporate GHG Verification Guidelines from ERT</li> <li>▪ DNV Verisustain Protocol/</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verification Protocol for Sustainability Reporting</li> <li>▪ Earthcheck Certified</li> <li>▪ Enviro-Mark Solutions' CEMARS (Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme) standard</li> <li>▪ ERM GHG Performance Data Assurance Methodology</li> <li>▪ IDW AsS 821: IDW Assurance Standard: Generally Accepted Assurance Principles for the Audit or Review of Reports on Sustainability Issues</li> <li>▪ ISAE 3000</li> <li>▪ ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements</li> <li>▪ ISO14064-3</li> <li>▪ JVETS (Japanese Voluntary Emissions Trading Scheme) Guideline for verification</li> <li>▪ Korean GHG and energy target management system</li> <li>▪ NMX-SAA-14064-3-IMNC: Instituto Mexicano de Normalización y Certificación A.C</li> <li>▪ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)</li> <li>▪ RevR 6 Bestyrkande av hållbarhetsredovisning (RevR 6 Assurance of Sustainability)</li> <li>▪ RevR6 Procedure for assurance of sustainability report from Far, the Swedish auditors</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>professional body</li> <li>▪ Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program</li> <li>▪ SGS Sustainability Report Assurance</li> <li>▪ Spanish Institute of Registered Auditors (ICJCE)</li> <li>▪ Standard 3410N Assurance engagements relating to sustainability reports of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Registered Accountants</li> <li>▪ State of Israel Ministry of Environmental Protection, VERIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN ISRAEL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR CONDUCTING VERIFICATIONS, Process A.</li> <li>▪ Swiss Climate CO2 label</li> <li>▪ Thai Greenhouse Gas Management Organisation (TGO) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Verification Protocol</li> <li>▪ The Climate Registry's General Verification Protocol (also known as California Climate Action Registry (CCAR))</li> <li>▪ Tokyo Emissions Trading Scheme</li> <li>▪ Verification under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) Directive and EU ETS related national implementation laws</li> </ul> |
|---|---|--|

## PI5 Has the entity set long-term reduction targets?

Q29

☐ Yes

	Target type	Long-term target	Baseline year	End year	2017 target	Portfolio coverage	Are these targets communicated externally?
Energy consumption	Type ▼					Select ▼	Y/N
GHG emissions	Type ▼					Select ▼	Y/N
Water consumption	Type ▼					Select ▼	Y/N
Waste diverted from landfill	Type ▼					Select ▼	Y/N
Other _____	Type ▼					Select ▼	Y/N

Clarify if and how these targets relate to the objectives reported in MA1 (maximum 250 words)

---

☐ No

### Select target type:

- Absolute
- Like-for-like
- Intensity-based

### Select the % portfolio covered by each target:

- > 0%, < 25%
- ≥ 25%, < 50%
- ≥ 50%, < 75%
- ≥ 75%, ≤ 100%





# Building Certifications

## Green Building Certificates

2017 Indicator

**BC1.1** Does the entity's portfolio include standing investments that obtained a green building certificate at the time of design, construction, and/or renovation?

Q30.1

☐ Yes

Specify the certification scheme(s) used and the percentage of the portfolio certified for this property type (multiple answers possible)

Scheme name/sub-scheme name	Level of certification	% portfolio covered by floor area	Number of certified assets
Scheme / sub-scheme ▼	Level ▼		
Scheme / sub-scheme ▼	Level ▼		
Scheme / sub-scheme ▼	Level ▼		

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

*A list of provisionally validated certification schemes is provided in the Appendix of the Reference Guide. If you wish to add a new scheme, please contact [info@gresb.com](mailto:info@gresb.com), and you will be asked to complete the validation questions for the scheme (see Reference Guide Appendix).*

**BC1.2** Does the entity's portfolio include standing investments that hold a valid operational green building certificate?

Q30.2

☐ Yes

Specify the certification scheme(s) used and the percentage of the portfolio certified for this property type (multiple answers possible)

Scheme name/sub-scheme name	Level of certification	% portfolio covered by floor area baseline year (optional in 2018)	% portfolio covered by floor area 2016 (optional in 2018)	% portfolio covered by floor area 2017	Number of certified assets 2017
Scheme / sub-scheme ▼	Level ▼				
Scheme / sub-scheme ▼	Level ▼				
Scheme / sub-scheme ▼	Level ▼				

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

*A list of provisionally validated certification schemes is provided in the Appendix of the Reference Guide. If you wish to add a new scheme, please contact [info@gresb.com](mailto:info@gresb.com), and you will be asked to complete the validation questions for the scheme (see Reference Guide Appendix).*

## BC2 Does the entity's portfolio include standing investments that obtained an energy rating?

Q31

☐ Yes

Specify the energy efficiency rating scheme used and the percentage of the portfolio rated for this property type (multiple answers possible)

☐ EU EPC (Energy Performance Certificate)

Percentage of the portfolio based on floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Country	Coverage (%) (coverage within the country)	Number of rated assets	Floor area weighted score*	
			2016	2017
Country ▾				
Country ▾				

\*full flexibility to describe performance – e.g. levels A-G; colors; numbers

☐ NABERS Energy

Percentage of the portfolio based on floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Floor area weighted score: \_\_\_\_\_

Score	Coverage 2016 (%) (coverage for each score category)	Coverage 2017 (%) (coverage for each score category)
0 - 2.5 stars		
3 - 3.5 stars		
4 - 4.5 stars		
5 - 6 stars		

☐ ENERGY STAR

Year	% portfolio covered*	Floor area weighted score
2016		
2017		

☐ Government energy efficiency benchmarking

Percentage of the portfolio based on floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Floor area weighted score: \_\_\_\_\_

Country	Coverage (%) (coverage within the country)	Number of rated assets	Floor area weighted score*	
			2016	2017
Country ▾				
Country ▾				

☐ Other

Specify name: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of the portfolio based on floor area: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Country	Coverage (%) (coverage within the country)	Number of rated assets	Floor area weighted score*	
			2016	2017
Country ▾				
Country ▾				

\*full flexibility to describe performance

☐ No

☐ Not applicable



# Stakeholder Engagement

## Employees

2017 Indicator

**SE1 Does the organization provide regular trainings for the employees responsible for the entity?**

**Q33**

☐ Yes

Percentage of employees who received professional training in 2017:  
\_\_\_\_\_ %

Percentage of employees who received sustainability-specific training in 2017:  
\_\_\_\_\_ %

Sustainability-specific training focuses on the following elements (multiple answers possible)

☐ Training topics on environmental issues

- ☐ Contamination
- ☐ Greenhouse gas emissions
- ☐ Energy
- ☐ Natural hazards
- ☐ Regulatory standards
- ☐ Supply chain environmental impacts
- ☐ Waste
- ☐ Water
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Training topics on social issues

- ☐ Community social and economic impacts
- ☐ Safety
  - ☐ Community safety
  - ☐ Customer / tenant safety
  - ☐ Employee safety
  - ☐ Supply chain safety
- ☐ Health and well-being
  - ☐ Community health and well-being
  - ☐ Customer / tenant health and well-being
  - ☐ Employee health and well-being
  - ☐ Supply chain health and well-being
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**SE2.1 Has the organization undertaken an employee satisfaction survey during the last three years?**

Q34.1

☐ Yes

The survey is undertaken (multiple answers possible)

☐ Internally

Percentage of employees covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

Survey response rate: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ By an independent third party

Percentage of employees covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

Name of the organization

Survey response rate: \_\_\_\_\_%

The survey includes quantitative metrics

☐ Yes

Metrics include

☐ Net Promoter Score

☐ Overall satisfaction score

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**SE2.2 Does the organization have a program in place to improve its employee satisfaction based on the outcomes of the survey referred to in SE2.1?**

Q34.2

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

☐ Development of action plan

☐ Feedback sessions with Senior Management Team

☐ Feedback sessions with separate teams/departments

☐ Focus groups

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**SE3.1 Does the organization monitor employee health and well-being needs?**

Q35.1

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

☐ Employee surveys on health and well-being

Percentage of employees: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Physical and/or mental health checks

Percentage of employees: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of employees: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**SE3.2 Has the organization monitored conditions for and/or tracked indicators of employee safety during the last three years?**

Q35.2

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

☐ Work station and/or workplace checks

Percentage of employees: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Absentee rate

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Injury rate

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Lost day rate

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other metrics: \_\_\_\_\_

Rate of other metric(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Explain the employee occupational safety indicators calculation method (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

## Suppliers

2017 Indicator

### SE4.1 Does the entity include ESG-specific requirements in procurement processes to drive sustainable procurement?

Q40

☐ Yes

Select all issues covered by procurement processes (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Business ethics
- ☐ Environmental process standards
- ☐ Environmental product standards
- ☐ Human rights
- ☐ Human health-based product standards
- ☐ Occupational safety
- ☐ Health and well-being
- ☐ ESG-specific requirements for sub-contractors
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Select the external parties to whom the requirements apply (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Contractors
- ☐ Property/asset managers
- ☐ Suppliers
- ☐ Supply chain (beyond 1 tier suppliers and contractors)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

### SE4.2 Does the entity engage with its supply chains to ensure the specific ESG requirements in SE4.1 are met?

NEW

☐ Yes

Describe the process (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**SE5.1 Does the organization monitor property/asset managers' compliance with the ESG-specific requirements in place for this entity?**

Q41.1

☐ Yes

The organization monitors compliance of:

☐ Internal property/asset managers

☐ External property/asset managers

☐ Both internal and external property/asset managers

Select all methods used (multiple answers possible)

☐ Checks performed by independent third party

Name of the organization

☐ Property/asset manager sustainability training

☐ Property/asset manager self-assessments

☐ Regular meetings and/or checks performed by the organization's employees

☐ Require external property/asset managers' alignment with a professional standard

Standard: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**SE5.2 Does the organization monitor other direct external suppliers' and/or service providers' compliance with the ESG-specific requirements in place for this entity?**

Q41.2

☐ Yes

Select all methods used (multiple answers possible)

☐ Checks performed by an independent third party

Name of the organization

☐ Regular meetings and/or checks performed by the organization's employees

☐ Regular meetings and/or checks performed by external property/asset managers

☐ Require supplier/service providers' alignment with a professional standard

Standard: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Supplier/service provider sustainability training

☐ Supplier/service provider self-assessments

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable



**SE6 Is there a formal process for stakeholders to communicate grievances that applies to this entity?**

NEW

☐ Yes

Select all characteristics applicable to the process:

- ☐ Dialogue based
- ☐ Legitimate
- ☐ Accessible
- ☐ Improvement based
- ☐ Predictable
- ☐ Equitable
- ☐ Rights compatible
- ☐ Transparent
- ☐ Safe
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Which stakeholders does the process apply to? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Community
- ☐ Contractors
- ☐ Employees
- ☐ External property/asset managers
- ☐ Service providers
- ☐ Suppliers
- ☐ Supply chain (beyond tier 1 suppliers and contractors)
- ☐ Tenants
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

## Tenants/Occupiers

2017 Indicator

### SE7 Does the entity have a tenant engagement program in place that includes sustainability-specific issues?

Q36

☐ Yes

Select all approaches to engage tenants (multiple answers possible)

☐ Building/asset communication

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Provide tenants with feedback on energy/water consumption and waste

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Social media/online platform

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Tenant engagement meetings

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Tenant events focused on increasing sustainability awareness

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Tenant sustainability guide

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Tenant sustainability training

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ No

#### Percentage portfolio covered

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> > 0%, < 25%  | <input type="checkbox"/> ≥ 25%, < 50%  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ≥ 50%, < 75% | <input type="checkbox"/> ≥ 75%, ≤ 100% |

**SE8.1 Has the entity undertaken tenant satisfaction surveys during the last three years?**

Q37.1

☐ Yes

The survey is undertaken (multiple answers possible)

☐ Internally

Percentage of tenants covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

Survey response rate: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ By an independent third party

Percentage of tenants covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

Name of the organization

Survey response rate: \_\_\_\_\_%

The survey includes quantitative metrics

☐ Yes

Metrics include

☐ Net Promoter Score

☐ Overall satisfaction score

☐ Satisfaction with communication

☐ Satisfaction with responsiveness

☐ Satisfaction with property management

☐ Understanding tenant needs

☐ Value for money

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**SE8.2 Does the entity have a program in place to improve tenant satisfaction based on the outcomes of the survey referred to in SE8.1?**

Q37.2

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Development of an asset-specific action plan
- ☐ Feedback sessions with asset/property managers
- ☐ Feedback sessions with individual tenants
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe the tenant satisfaction improvement program (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**SE9 Does the entity have a fit-out and refurbishment program in place for tenants that includes sustainability-specific issues?**

Q38

☐ Yes

Select all topics included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Fit-out and refurbishment assistance for meeting the minimum fit-out standards

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

- ☐ Tenant fit-out guides

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

- ☐ Minimum fit-out standards are prescribed

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

- ☐ Procurement assistance for tenants

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

☐ No

**Percentage portfolio covered**

- > 0%, < 25%
- ≥ 25%, < 50%
- ≥ 50%, < 75%
- ≥ 75%, ≤ 100%

**SE10.1 Does the entity include sustainability-specific requirements in its standard lease contracts?**

Q39.1

☐ Yes

Select all topics included (multiple answers possible)

☐ Cooperation and works:

- ☐ Environmental initiatives
- ☐ Enabling upgrade works
- ☐ Sustainability management collaboration
- ☐ Premises design for performance
- ☐ Managing waste from works
- ☐ Social initiatives
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Management and consumption:

- ☐ Energy management
- ☐ Water management
- ☐ Waste management
- ☐ Indoor environmental quality management
- ☐ Sustainable procurement
- ☐ Sustainable utilities
- ☐ Sustainable transport
- ☐ Sustainable cleaning
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Reporting and standards:

- ☐ Information sharing
- ☐ Performance rating
- ☐ Design/development rating
- ☐ Performance standards
- ☐ Metering
- ☐ Comfort
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**SE10.2 Does the entity monitor compliance with the sustainability-specific requirements in its lease contracts?**

**Q39.2**

☐ Yes

Describe the process to monitor the compliance and the consequences in case of non-compliance (maximum 500 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**Community**

**2017 Indicator**

**SE11.1 Does the entity have a community engagement program in place that includes sustainability-specific issues?**

**Q42.1**

☐ Yes

Select all topics included (multiple answers possible)

☐ Effective communication and process to address community concerns

☐ Enhancement programs for public spaces

☐ Employment creation in local communities

☐ Community health and well-being

☐ Research and network activities

☐ Resilience, including assistance or support in case of disaster

☐ Supporting charities and community groups

☐ Sustainability education program

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe the community engagement program and the monitoring process (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**SE11.2 Does the entity monitor its impact on the community?**

**Q42.2**

☐ Yes

Select the areas of impact that are monitored (multiple answers possible)

☐ Housing affordability

☐ Impact on crime levels

☐ Livability score

☐ Local income generated

☐ Local residents' well-being

☐ Walkability score

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

# New Construction & Major Renovations

---

## Sustainability Requirements

2017 Indicator

**NC1** Does the entity have a sustainability strategy in place for new construction and major renovation projects?

**NC1**

☐ Yes

Elements addressed in the strategy (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Biodiversity and habitat
- ☐ Climate/climate change adaptation
- ☐ Energy consumption/management
- ☐ Environmental attributes of building materials
- ☐ GHG emissions/management
- ☐ Green building certifications
- ☐ Building safety
- ☐ Health and well-being
- ☐ Location and transportation
- ☐ Resilience
- ☐ Supply chain
- ☐ Water consumption/management
- ☐ Waste management
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The strategy is

☐ Publicly available

Please provide a hyperlink or a separate publicly available document

**UPLOAD** OR URL \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Not publicly available

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

Communicate the objectives and explain how the objectives are integrated into the overall business strategy (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No



**NC2 Does the entity have sustainable site selection criteria in place for new construction and major renovation projects?**

NC2

☐ Yes

Select all criteria included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Connect to multi-modal transit networks
- ☐ Locate projects within existing developed areas
- ☐ Protect, restore, and conserve aquatic ecosystems
- ☐ Protect, restore, and conserve farmland
- ☐ Protect, restore, and conserve floodplain functions
- ☐ Protect, restore, and conserve habitats for threatened and endangered species
- ☐ Redevelop brownfield sites
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The entity's sustainable site selection criteria are aligned with

☐ Third-party guidelines

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Third-party rating system(s)

Specify scheme(s)/sub-scheme(s): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Not aligned

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**NC3 Does the entity have sustainable site design/development requirements for new construction and major renovation projects?**

NC3

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Manage waste by diverting construction and demolition materials from disposal
- ☐ Manage waste by diverting reusable vegetation, rocks, and soil from disposal
- ☐ Protect air quality during construction
- ☐ Protect surface water and aquatic ecosystems by controlling and retaining construction pollutants
- ☐ Protect and restore habitat and soils disturbed during construction and/or during previous development
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The entity's sustainable site design/development criteria are aligned with

☐ Third-party guidelines

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Third-party rating system(s)

Specify scheme(s)/sub-scheme(s): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Not aligned

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

## Materials and Certifications

2017 Indicator

### NC4 Does the entity require that the environmental and health attributes of building materials be considered for new construction and major renovation projects?

NC4

☐ Yes

Select all issues addressed (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Formal adoption of a policy on health attributes of building materials
- ☐ Formal adoption of a policy on the environmental attributes and performance of building materials
- ☐ Requirement for information (disclosure) about the environmental and/or health attributes of building materials (multiple answers possible)
  - ☐ Health and environmental information
  - ☐ Environmental Product Declarations
  - ☐ Health Product Declarations
  - ☐ Other types of health and environmental information: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Material characteristics specification, including (multiple answers possible)
  - ☐ Preference for materials that disclose environmental impacts
  - ☐ Preference for materials that disclose potential health hazards
  - ☐ "Red list" of prohibited materials or ingredients that should not be used on the basis of their human and/or environmental impacts
  - ☐ Locally extracted or recovered materials
  - ☐ Rapidly renewable materials, low embodied carbon materials, and recycled content materials
  - ☐ Materials that can easily be recycled
  - ☐ Third-party certified wood-based materials and products
  - Types of third-party certification used: \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ Low-emitting materials
  - ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**NC5.1 Does the entity's new construction and major renovation portfolio include projects that are aligned with green building rating standards**

NC5.1

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ The entity requires projects to align with requirements of a third-party green building rating system but does not require certification

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Green building rating systems (include all that apply): \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ The entity requires projects to achieve certification with a green building rating system but does not require a specific level of certification

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Green building rating systems (include all that apply): \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ The entity requires projects to achieve a specific level of certification

Percentage portfolio covered ▼

Green building rating systems (include all that apply): \_\_\_\_\_

Level of certification adopted as a standard by the entity (include all applicable rating systems): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**Percentage portfolio covered**

- |                |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|
| ▪ > 0%, < 25%  | ▪ ≥ 25%, < 50%  |
| ▪ ≥ 50%, < 75% | ▪ ≥ 75%, ≤ 100% |

**NC5.2 Does the entity's new construction and major renovation portfolio include projects that obtained or are registered to obtain a green building certificate?**

NC5.2

☐ Yes

Specify the certification scheme(s) used and the percentage of the portfolio registered and/or certified (multiple answers possible)

Scheme name/ sub-scheme name	Level of certification	% portfolio covered by floor area	Number of certified projects
Select scheme ▼			
Select scheme ▼			
Select scheme ▼			

Scheme name/ sub-scheme name	Level of certification	% portfolio covered by floor area	Number of certified projects
Select scheme ▼			
Select scheme ▼			
Select scheme ▼			

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

*A list of provisionally validated certification schemes is provided in the Appendix of the Reference Guide. If you wish to add a new scheme, please contact [info@gresb.com](mailto:info@gresb.com), and you will be asked to complete the validation questions for the scheme (see Reference Guide Appendix).*

## Energy Efficiency

2017 Indicator

**NC6 Does the entity have minimum energy efficiency requirements for new construction and major renovation projects?**

NC6

☐ Yes

☐ Requirements for planning and design include (multiple answers possible)

☐ Integrative design process

☐ To exceed relevant energy codes or standards

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Common energy efficiency measures include (multiple answers possible)

☐ Air conditioning

☐ Commissioning

☐ Energy modeling

☐ Lighting

☐ Occupant controls

☐ Space heating

☐ Ventilation

☐ Water heating

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Operational energy efficiency monitoring (multiple answers possible)

☐ Energy use analytics

☐ Post-construction energy monitoring for on

Average years: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Sub-meter

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**NC7.1 Does the entity incorporate on-site renewable energy in the design of new construction and major renovation projects?**

NC7.1

☐ Yes

Projects designed to generate on-site renewable energy (multiple answers possible)

☐ Biofuels

Percentage of all projects: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Geothermal

Percentage of all projects: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Hydro

Percentage of all projects: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Solar/photovoltaic

Percentage of all projects: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Wind

Percentage of all projects: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of all projects: \_\_\_\_\_%

Average design target for the fraction of total energy demand met with on-site renewable energy: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**NC7.2 Are the entity's new construction and major renovation projects designed to meet net-zero energy codes and/or standards?**

NC7.2

☐ Yes

Applicable net-zero standard:

☐ Description of the entity's definition of "net-zero energy" (max 150 words):

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Description of the applicable reference code and/or standard (max 150 words):

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of projects covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

☐ No

## Water Conservation and Waste Management

2017 Indicator

### NC8 Does the entity promote water conservation in its new construction and major renovation projects?

NC8

☐ Yes

The entity promotes water conservation through (multiple answers possible)

☐ Requirements for planning and design include (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Development and implementation of a commissioning plan
- ☐ Integrative design for water conservation
- ☐ Requirements for indoor water efficiency
- ☐ Requirements for outdoor water efficiency
- ☐ Requirements for process water efficiency
- ☐ Requirements for water supply
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Common water efficiency measures include (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Commissioning of water systems
- ☐ Drip/smart irrigation
- ☐ Drought tolerant/low-water landscaping
- ☐ High-efficiency/dry fixtures
- ☐ Leak detection system
- ☐ Occupant sensors
- ☐ On-site wastewater treatment
- ☐ Re-use of stormwater and grey water for non-potable applications
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Operational water efficiency monitoring (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Post-construction water monitoring for on  
Average years: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Sub-meter
- ☐ Water use analytics
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable



**NC9 Does the entity promote efficient on-site solid waste management during the construction phase of its new construction and major renovation projects?**

NC9

☐ Yes

The entity promotes efficient solid waste management through (multiple answers possible)

☐ Management and construction practices (multiple answers possible)

☐ Construction waste signage

☐ Education of employees/contractors on waste management

☐ Incentives for contractors for recovering, reusing and recycling building materials

☐ Targets for waste stream recovery, reuse and recycling

☐ Waste management plans

☐ Waste separation facilities

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ On-site waste monitoring (multiple answers possible)

☐ Hazardous waste monitoring

☐ Non-hazardous waste monitoring

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

## Supply Chain

2017 Indicator

### NC10.1 Does the entity have ESG requirements in place for its contractors?

NC10.1

☐ Yes

Select all topics included (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Business ethics
- ☐ Community engagement
- ☐ Environmental process standards
- ☐ Environmental product standards
- ☐ Fundamental human rights
- ☐ Human health-based product standards
- ☐ On-site occupational safety
- ☐ ESG-specific requirements for sub-contractors
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Percentage of projects covered: \_\_\_\_\_%

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

### NC10.2 Does the organization monitor its contractors' compliance with its ESG-specific requirements in place for this entity?

NC10.2

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Contractors provide update reports on environmental and social aspects during construction
- ☐ External audits by third party  
Percentage of projects audited during the reporting period: \_\_\_\_\_%  
Name of the organization
- ☐ Internal audits  
Percentage of projects audited during the reporting period: \_\_\_\_\_%
- ☐ Weekly/monthly (on-site) meetings and/or ad hoc site visits  
Percentage of projects visited during the reporting period: \_\_\_\_\_%
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

## Health, Safety and Well-being

2017 Indicator

### NC11 Does the entity promote occupant health and well-being in its new construction and major renovation projects?

NC11

☐ Yes

The entity addresses health and well-being in the design of its product through (multiple answers possible)

☐ Requirements for planning and design, including (multiple answers possible)

☐ Health Impact Assessment

☐ Integrated planning process

☐ Other planning process: \_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD** or Document name \_\_\_\_\_ AND Publication date \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Common occupant health and well-being measures, including (multiple answers possible)

☐ Access to spaces for active and passive recreation

☐ Active design features

☐ Commissioning

☐ Daylight

☐ Indoor air quality monitoring

☐ Indoor air quality source control

☐ Natural ventilation

☐ Occupant controls

☐ Provisions for active transport

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Provisions to verify health and well-being performance include (multiple answers possible)

☐ Occupant education

☐ Post-construction health and well-being monitoring (e.g., occupant comfort and satisfaction) for on

Average years: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**NC12.1 Does the entity promote on-site safety during the construction phase of its new construction and major renovation projects?**

NC12.1

☐ Yes

The entity promotes on-site safety through (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Availability of medical personnel
- ☐ Communicating safety information
- ☐ Continuously improving safety performance
- ☐ Demonstrating safety leadership
- ☐ Entrenching safety practices
- ☐ Managing safety risks
- ☐ Personal Protective and Life Saving Equipment
- ☐ Promoting design for safety
- ☐ Training curriculum
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

☐ Not applicable

**NC12.2 Does the organization monitor safety indicators at construction sites?**

NC12.2

☐ Yes

Select all applicable options (multiple answers possible)

☐ Injury rate

\_\_\_\_\_

Explain the injury rate calculation method (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Fatalities

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Near misses

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other metrics: \_\_\_\_\_

Rate of other metric(s): \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

## Community Impact and Engagement

2017 Indicator

**NC13** Does the entity assess the potential socio-economic impact of its new construction and major renovation projects on the community as part of planning and pre-construction?

NC13

☐ Yes

Select the areas of impact that are assessed (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Housing affordability
- ☐ Impact on crime levels
- ☐ Livability score
- ☐ Local income generated
- ☐ Local residents' well-being
- ☐ Walkability score
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ No

**NC14** Does the entity have a systematic process to monitor the impact of new construction and major renovation projects on the local community during different stages of the project?

NC14

☐ Yes

The entity's process includes (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Analysis and interpretation of monitoring data
- ☐ Development and implementation of a communication plan
- ☐ Development and implementation of a community monitoring plan
- ☐ Development and implementation of a risk mitigation plan
- ☐ Identification of nuisance and/or disruption risks
- ☐ Identification of stakeholders and impacted groups
- ☐ Management practices to ensure accountability for performance goals and issues identified during community monitoring
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe the monitoring process (maximum 250 words)

\_\_\_\_\_

**UPLOAD**

Indicate where in the evidence the relevant information can be found\_\_\_\_\_

☐ No